Agenda
Minnetonka City Council
Regular Meeting, Monday, Aug. 26, 2019
6:30 p.m.
Council Chambers

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call: Happe-Bergstedt-Ellingson-Calvert-Schack-Carter-Wiersum
4. Approval of Agenda
5. Approval of Minutes:
   A. July 22, 2019 regular council meeting
6. Special Matters:
   A. Recognition of Firefighter Alan Burton upon his retirement
      Recommendation: Recognize Alan Burton
   B. Recognition of Finance Director and City Treasurer Merrill Shepherd King upon her retirement
      Recommendation: Recognize Merrill Shepherd King
   C. Proclamation declaring Sept. 15 – 21 as Minnetonka Medicare Education Week
   D. Proclamation declaring Sept. 9 – 15 as Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week
   E. Proclamation declaring Sept. 8, 2019 as Women’s Suffrage Ratification Centennial Day
7. Reports from City Manager & Council Members
8. Citizens Wishing to Discuss Matters Not on the Agenda
9. Bids and Purchases:
   A. Bids for the Crosby Road culvert project
      Recommendation: Award the contract and amend the CIP (5 votes)
10. Consent Agenda - Items Requiring a Majority Vote:

A. Resolutions pertaining to levying the 2019 Special Assessments
   Recommendation: Adopt the resolutions (4 votes)

B. Conditional use permit for a dental clinic at 11300 Wayzata Blvd
   Recommendation: Adopt the resolution approving the permit (4 votes)

C. Resolution approving a conditional use permit and an expansion permit for an accessory structure at 16913 Hwy 7
   Recommendation: Adopt the resolution approving the request (4 votes)

D. Resolution approving the final plat of LEGACY OAKS 4th ADDITION
   Recommendation: Adopt the resolution approving the final plat (4 votes)

11. Consent Agenda - Items Requiring Five Votes: None

12. Introduction of Ordinances: None

13. Public Hearings: None

14. Other Business:

   A. Resolution approving the preliminary plat of BIRD SONG, a 13-lot subdivision of the existing property at 2410 Oakland Road
      Recommendation: Adopt the resolution approving the preliminary plat (5 votes)

   B. Mountain bike study and concept plan
      Recommendation: Approve the concept plan for mountain bike trails at Lone Lake Park (4 votes)

15. Appointments and Reappointments: None

16. Adjournment
Mountain Biking Email Feedback (June 1, 2018 – August 20, 2019)

From: William Wood
Sent: Friday, June 1, 2018 9:05 PM
To: nevenrude@eminnetonka.com; Jack Acomb; James Durbin; Chris Gabler; Cynthia Kist; Peggy Kvam; Madeline Seveland; Christopher Walick; Brad Wiersum; Deborah Calvert; Patty Acomb; Bob Ellingson; Tony Wagner; Mike Happe; Tim Bergstedt
Cc: nevenrude@eminnetonka.com; Jack Acomb; James Durbin; Chris Gabler; Cynthia Kist; Peggy Kvam; Madeline Seveland; Christopher Walick; Brad Wiersum; Deborah Calvert; Patty Acomb; Bob Ellingson; Tony Wagner; Mike Happe; Tim Bergstedt
Subject: Letter in opposition to proposed mountain biking in Lone Lake Park

Dear Editors – The letter below the dashes is for publication in the Sun Sailor. If possible, please include in the June 7th edition. If not, please print as soon as can be done. I am copying the Minnetonka Park Board and the City Council on this email. Thank you.

William Wood

2201 Dwight Lane

Minnetonka, MN 55305

-------------------------------

To the people of Minnetonka,

I am writing on June 1. You will be reading this sometime after the June 6 meeting of the Minnetonka Park Board, at which the Board will have discussed a hurried proposal to add mountain biking to Lone Lake Park. The Park Board likely will have recommended the proposal, and if so the City Council will soon decide whether to implement it.

Let me tell you my experience of Lone Lake. I worked in one of the nearby offices and would take walks into Lone Lake on my lunches. At first, I stayed to the “official” trails, which are themselves wonderful. One day, however, I decided to see what that inviting little footpath branching up the hill near the Rowland parking area might offer. What it offered was this: you climb the hill, and suddenly you are in a wonderland. It looks like this:
I explored the area more and more each day, trying all the “unofficial” footpaths in the park. I startled a sleeping deer. I found a mother and her ducklings. I saw all manner of birds. The serenity, the beauty, the gentle sounds and forest smells. This is your park, Minnetonkan’s. Did you know? We have a TREASURE in our back yard.

But Minnetonkan’s, please realize: this is precisely the location of the proposed mountain bike trail. That serenity will be replaced with the rattling of bikes, the hooting of bikers. The trail will twist back and forth, back and forth, over it all. What is happening is a small group of “enthusiasts” want to take this place away from you, use it for their sport. They are hoping you will not know what they want to take from you. They are hoping you will be silent.

Lone Lake is Minnetonka’s natural wonder. Visit it. Walk its paths. Experience what the mountain bike proposal would destroy. Then please, please, write the members of the City Council and ask them to stop this terrible, irreparable harm from happening.
William Wood
Minnetonka resident

From: Jon Richie
Sent: Saturday, June 2, 2018 4:30 PM
To: Jack Acomb; James Durbin; Nelson Evenrud; Chris Gabler; Cynthia Kist; Peggy Kvam; Madeline Seveland; Christopher Walick; Kelly ODea; Sara Woeste; Jesse Izquierdo; Brad Wiersum;; Deborah Calvert; Patty Acomb; Bob Ellingson; Tony Wagner; Mike Happe; Tim Bergstedt
Subject: Lone Lake Mountain bike trail

I have been a resident of Minnetonka since the 60’s. Over that time I have seen many people out of doors in our public areas, many of these prior too – and after becoming parks. People walking, hiking, biking, walking their dog, couples and families having a picnic in a park or along a creek. From the time I was a kid until my 20’s horses where commonplace on the residential streets owned by residents and boarded by a neighbor who lived on a 10 acre parcel, five of which were in my immediate neighborhood. I lived through (and played part in) the tennis craze of the 1970’s. Tennis courts appeared in almost every neighborhood – after ground surveys where taken, earth graded, asphalt spread and concrete poured, court striping, nets and a 10+ foot chain link fence installed. After time tennis courts began to lose their luster and people started playing indoors year round. Similarly, hockey rinks appeared more and more frequently around schools and in neighborhoods in response to more kids who wanted to play hockey. I spent many days and nights playing hockey with my friends until the lights were turned off. Besides the shoveling we had to do to keep the rinks clear when it snowed we never really thought about everything it takes to keep them up and running. First there is the cost of boards, chain link backstops and 2 nets for every rink. Then there is the cost of labor to install and flood the rinks. Then the cost of snow removal every time it snows 3 to 4 men plus heavy equipment, the cost to re-flood the rinks, the cost to pay for lights and the cost of a warming house attendant. On top of this neighbors could look forward to nights of pucks banging off the boards and kids yelling. These days most kids don’t want to skate in the cold, but rather play indoors – year round.

This brings me to the proposed mountain bike trail in Lone Lake. I remember when this property was not a city park, but a private ski area. I was thrilled when it became a city park. I have visited this park many times along with Jidana, Evergreen, Big Willow, Purgatory to name a few. I can be found everyday in one of these parks walking with my Golden Retriever. Many times we don’t even see another person, other times we do. I for one see the idea of mountain bike trails to be one of the best ideas ever proposed in our city parks. My reasons for stating are as follows:

1. Mountain biking is not a fad and will not be going away soon.
2. The terrain at Lone Lake is perfectly suited to this activity.
3. The cost of marking “official” trails will be minimal.
4. Many existing informal footpaths will make ideal mountain bike trails reducing environmental impact.
5. By utilizing portions of existing footpath it will greatly reduce cost to the taxpayer and the city parks department.
6. There is no need to install lighting, grade earth, put down asphalt, pour concrete, install chain link fencing, staff a warming house or worry about snow removal - ever.
7. There will be no need to install a sprinkler system e.g. soccer fields, softball etc.
8. A great activity for individuals and families to get outside – together.
9. The proposed trail would be multi use and utilized by others besides bikers.
10. There are 51 parks in the city of Minnetonka. Lone Lake is where it belongs.

* IF mountain biking ever goes away in the future the trails we be reclaimed by nature - naturally. At no cost to the city.

As previously stated, I use one Minnetonka park at least five+ times every week. I am a hiker and a dog walker and I have no problem sharing our parks with mountain bikes. There is room.

Minnetonka is truly blessed to have such natural amenities e.g. a portion of Lake Minnetonka, Minnehaha Creek, woods, hills and ponds. We as a city should do everything possible to embrace, engage and enhance our natural surroundings be it hiking, kayaking, canoeing, snow shoeing, cross country skiing or biking, be it on the rail trail - or a mountain bike trail.

Jon Richie
Minnetonka

From: Joan Z Carter
Sent: Monday, June 4, 2018 2:05 PM
To: Brad Wiersum; Deborah Calvert; Patty Acomb; Bob Ellingson; Tony Wagner; Mike Happe; Tim Bergstedt
Subject: Fwd: Solution - Mtn Biking in Mtka

Dear Mayor and City Council Persons:

I am forwarding the comments I sent to the Park Board regarding mountain biking in Lone Lake Park. I respectfully request that Minnetonka find an alternate location for mountain biking, one that reunifies our City, bringing together conservationists and bikers. There are at least two locations that will do this: 1) Adjacent Glen Lake Golf Course & the Hennepin County Home School and 2) Victoria-Evergreen, Civic Center Park, I-494 corridor from Stone Road to I-394. The choice of looking only at Lone Lake has divide us, pitting outdoor enthusiasts against outdoor enthusiast, neighbor against neighbor.

When we moved into our house in 1996, there was an impenetrable wall of buckthorn in our yard [like our neighborhood and parks]. The City Naturalists came to our block party and other neighborhood meetings. Minnetonka residents were encouraged to remove the buckthorn. We did and our yard has thrived. Purgatory and Lone Lake Parks have seen an even more remarkable transformation. There are dedicated and knowledgeable volunteers in this City. Please protect these resources. There are other options that will satisfy both conservations and bikers. Please encourage a collaboration.

Thank you for serving Minnetonka.

Best Regards,

Joan Carter

Begin forwarded message:
From: Joan Carter
Subject: Solution - Mtn Biking in Mtnk

Date: June 3, 2018 at 1:00:22 PM CDT

To: jacob@eminnetonka.com, jdurbin@eminnetonka.com, nevenrud@eminnetonka.com, cgalber@eminnetonka.com, ckist@eminnetonka.com, pkvam@eminnetonka.com, sevelandm@eminnetonka.com, cwalick@eminnetonka.com

Cc: kodea@eminnetonka.com

Dear Park Board Members -

I am a mountain biker and an environmentalist. Our neighborhood and parks have changed tremendously during our 20 years of living in Minnetonka. This is due to the efforts of the City and the hard work of a group of dedicated and knowledgeable residents. We (the people of Minnetonka) owe them a debt of gratitude. I have read all of the provided reports and followed up by reading as many of the supporting documents as I was able to find. I could list many inaccuracies, inconsistencies, and manipulations of facts. Instead I will use my time to advocate for a solution. Reading the comments it is clear the decision to look only at Lone Lake Park has divided our City, pitting outdoor enthusiast against outdoor enthusiast.

Please consider alternate locations that will bring the outdoor enthusiasts together, Conservationists AND Bikers, many of us are both. There are two locations that will do this: 1) Adjacent Glen Lake Golf Course & the Hennepin County Home School and 2) Victoria-Evergreen, Civic Center Park, I-494 corridor from Stone Road to I-394. There is significant data to support not building trails in Lone Lake. The priority of the environment and preserving high quality restoration is an area of importance that nearly all Minnetonka residents agree on. You listened and eliminated Big Willow as an option. For all the same reasons and more, please do not build mountain bike trails in high quality restoration areas like Lone Lake Park.

Please consider these options.

Adjacent Glen Lake Golf Course & the Home School is ideal for many reasons. This location is a win for everyone. There would be a collaboration of City of Minnetonka with Hennepin County and Three Rivers Park. I encourage you to look at Google Maps of this area and Lone Lake.

- It is a good location for bike trails from a riders perspective. There is a lot of possibility and less restrictions.
- Three Rivers already has Mountain Biking Expertise.
- There is access to Glen Lake Golf Course (managed by Three Rivers), which includes parking, restrooms, and a snack bar. It could include bike rental, bringing more people to the sport.
- It is within the Hopkins School District and near Minnetonka HS. It is also very easily accessed from Edina HS and Eden Prairie HS.
- It is very accessible by bike. It is on the LRT. There are bikable sidewalks along 62.
- Easy access from nearby Lifetime Fitness (62 & 494). Another terrific potential collaborator.
- The residence living at the Home School could be trained to monitor and repair trails, also learning Bike repair.
• This land has not been restored. Along with building biking trails a plan could be included to restore the land, including the removal of invasive species and inclusion of native plantings.
• Winter ski trails at Glen Lake Golf could be expanded. Or winter biking could be maintained.
• Potential added usage of Glen Lake area businesses by bikers and for after bike meet-ups. Dining, Drinking, Gas, Grocery and more within about a mile. [Google maps says it is an 8 min bike ride to Lunds, Unmapped Brewing, Gold Nugget, Copper Cow, and more]

There is parking at the Golf Course. It is a reasonable assumption that mountain bikers will have a bike for transportation. Parking could be made available at locations along the LRT or on the south side of 62 (there is an LRT underpass). The Land Manager survey noted that weekends were the busiest time. A collaboration could be conceived with nearby businesses that have empty lots on weekends (there are several). There is also an elementary school within a few minute ride (generally empty lot on weekends). Parking seems to be a driving criteria for past decisions. There are workable solutions. Preserving high quality restoration should override parking concern.

Victoria-Evergreen, Civic Center Park, I-494 corridor from Stone Road to I-394 is very similar to the configuration proposed by the ADVANTAGE students at the December 7, 2016 meeting, with Victoria-Evergreen replacing Big Willow. The main opposition to the original plan was the inclusion of Big Willow Park. Big Willow is a high quality restoration area valued by City residents, like Lone Lake Park and Purgatory Park. Victoria-Evergreen has not been restored. Along with building biking trails the land could be restored, including a plan for the removal of invasive species and inclusion of native plantings. There is parking at the Civic Center. We should not put parking before our natural resources. Especially for people with bikes for transportation allowing for other options.

Please work to unify our City. Find a solution that will work for the main stake holders, conservationists and bikers. Both of these locations will do that, Lone Lake will not. Reunify the outdoor enthusiasts!

Thank you.

Best regards,

Joan Carter

Oric Ave Minnetonka, MN 55345

From: Lori Sylvester
Sent: Monday, June 4, 2018 11:28 PM
To: Brad Wiersum; Christopher Walick; Madeline Seveland; Peggy Kvam; Cynthia Kist; Chris Gabler; Nelson Evenrud; James Durbin; Jack Acomb
Subject: Mountain Biking Trails at Lone Lake Park - Letter of Support

Greetings Mayor Wiersum and Park Board Members,

I am writing to express my support for mountain biking trails at Lone Lake Park. I live at 3716 Hilltop Road in Minnetonka. I attended the information session and have read through the study, plans, and heard the arguments for, and against the trails. Obviously, you are very well versed in these items and don’t need me to go through them with you again.
So, I will share with you the really important stuff - we are a family of 5, with 3 children ages 10 and under. We mountain bike together because it is a wonderful family bonding experience. Our kids regularly beg us to take them mountain biking, which is truly amazing considering all the technology at their disposal. The time we spend on the trails, in the woods together, is rich with learning. We talk about the beauty around us, how we can take care of the earth, how we can exercise to take care of our bodies, and how we can be good “neighbors” on the trail. They don’t even realize how much we are teaching them because they are having so much fun! Now they want to share it with all their friends - inviting neighbor kids to go mountain biking with them and talking about how they are going to start mountain biking “clubs” at their schools next year.

I believe mountain biking trails at Lone Lake Park are a smart investment in our families and our future.

Respectfully,

Lori Sylvester

---

From: Erik Saltvold  
Sent: Tuesday, June 5, 2018 8:56 AM  
To: Jack Acomb; James Durbin; Nelson Evenrud; Chris Gabler; Cynthia Kist; Peggy Kvam; Madeline Seveland; Christopher Walick; Kelly ODea; Sara Woeste; Jesse Izquierdo; Brad Wiersum;; Deborah Calvert; Patty Acomb; Bob Ellingson; Tony Wagner; Mike Happe; Tim Bergstedt  
Subject: Support for Minnetonka Trails

Hi-  
As a long term resident of Minnetonka (over 25 years, we live near Purgatory Park) and a business owner with a location in Minnetonka, I would like to express my support for the Lone Lake Mountain Bike trail project. My wife and I are avid users of the trail system throughout Minnetonka both for biking and other uses.

I think it is important that all users are able to enjoy our public resources. Off road cycling (Mountain Biking) is just another way to enjoy our fantastic parks. It can be done, as is suggested in the study, in a way that respects all users of the park system. There are several examples in the twin cities area of park systems that have incorporated off road cycling in their menu of activities (Theodore Wirth, Three Rivers to name just a couple). I think you would find that each of these systems have a high satisfaction rate amongst all trail users.

As the owner of ERIK’S, I can tell you that one of the biggest growth areas in the last few years has been young riders (Mountain Bikers and the new sport at High Schools) getting into the sport of Mountain Biking. Adding this activity to our trails in Minnetonka will encourage more youth to get out and enjoy. Perhaps encouraging new users and a demographic that have not been using the trails in great numbers. I think it is important to adapt the use of our parks as demographics and interests shift. The participation numbers in this sport show that there is a demand for trails.

The Tonka Trails organization will also be a great asset as the trail moves forward. Having passionate people advocating for trails combined with an organization that will support the activity is a big win for all.
Please support the Lone Lake Mountain Bike Trails!

Erik Saltvold

From: Richard Jahnke
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2018 9:13 PM
To: Jack Acomb <jacomb@eminnetonka.com>; James Durbin <jdurbin@eminnetonka.com>; Nelson Evenrud <nevenrud@eminnetonka.com>; Chris Gabler <cgabler@eminnetonka.com>; Cynthia Kist <ckist@eminnetonka.com>; Peggy Kvam <pkvam@eminnetonka.com>; Madeline Seveland <sevelandm@eminnetonka.com>; Christopher Walick <cwalick@eminnetonka.com>; Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Sara Woeste <swoeste@eminnetonka.com>; Jesse Izquierdo <jizquierdo@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Jo Colleran <jcolleran@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Tony Wagner <twagner@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: In support of MTB at Lone Lake

City Council and Park Board

I have been riding bike at Lone Lake for 7 years. There are very few cars in the parking lot.

The MTB trails will let more people and families enjoy the park and I support the trails. I have been to every MTB trail in the metro and the riders are all very considerate of other riders and walkers. Thank you!

From: Maureen Hackett, M.D.
Sent: Wednesday, June 6, 2018 10:11 PM
To: Jo Colleran <jcolleran@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Balance

The lone Lake Park Preserve portion is to provide balance. There is balance within the park and lone lake allows for nature of high quality. It is the balance.

From: Jon Rausch
Sent: Wednesday, June 6, 2018 7:22 AM
To: Jack Acomb; James Durbin; Nelson Evenrud; Chris Gabler; Cynthia Kist; Peggy Kvam; Madeline Seveland; Christopher Walick; Kelly ODea; Sara Woeste; Jesse Izquierdo; Brad Wiersum;; Deborah Calvert; Patty Acomb; Bob Ellingson; Tony Wagner; Mike Happe; Tim Bergstedt; Rob Martin
Subject: Support for trails

I would like to express the continued support for the mountain bike trails on behalf of myself and my family. We like the location (Close to our home and grandma’s).

The proposed design of the trails is very well-crafted so that it will not affect people walkin, like gramma who lives in the apartments adjacent to the park.
Additionally this will allow a number of local Minnetonka residence an opportunity for diversity in outdoor activities. It seems that mountain biking is a growing sport and I commend our Minnetonka leaders for taking an initiative to provide diverse outdoor activity options for its residents. I have visited a number of other mountain bike trails throughout the metropolitan area and Duluth. The breakers are very friendly, helpful and range in age.

You have the support of the Rausch family thank you,

Jon, Kelly, Maddie, Jack Rausch and Gramma Beverly Brand all Minnetonka residents

From: Byers, Glenn
Sent: Wednesday, June 6, 2018 8:59 AM
To: Jack Acomb; Jack Acomb; James Durbin; James Durbin; Nelson Evenrud; Nelson Evenrud; Chris Gabler; Chris Gabler; Cynthia Kist; Cynthia Kist; Peggy Kvam; Peggy Kvam; Madeline Seveland; Madeline Seveland; Christopher Walick; Christopher Walick; Kelly ODea; Kelly ODea; Sara Woeste; Sara Woeste; Jesse Izquierdo; Jesse Izquierdo; Brad Wiersum; Brad Wiersum; Deborah Calvert; Deborah Calvert; Patty Acomb; Patty Acomb; Bob Ellingson; Bob Ellingson; Tony Wagner; Tony Wagner; Mike Happe; Mike Happe; Tim Bergstedt; Tim Bergstedt
Subject: Support for trails at Lone Oak Park

I would like to reiterate my support for Mountain Bike trails in Lone Oak Park. I would like to attend the meeting tonight, but I won’t be able to make it. So, I wanted to share my thoughts with the park board and city staff.

Mountain Bike trials will be a benefit to the city and as a resident I will utilize the trails with my family.

I have listened to those who oppose mountain bike trails, and when you get past all of the phony concerns over the environment, all they want to do is to stop progress and selfishly keep the park the way they want it. A small group should not dictate the use and development of our city parks.

I want the Minnetonka to build a strong bicycle culture, healthier residents and fewer car trips is good for everyone.

I am looking forward to using the trails once they are built.

Best Regards,

Glenn Byers

4931 Birchwood lane

Minnetonka, MN

From: Thomas Stockert
Sent: Wednesday, June 6, 2018 12:00 PM
To: Brad Wiersum; Deborah Calvert; Patty Acomb; Bob Ellingson; Mike Happe; Tim Bergstedt
Subject: Lone Lake Mountain Bike Trail

Hello all,

I look forward to tonight's Park Board Meeting. I hope to get the chance to speak tonight (I don't know how long the comments from both sides will last).

I really don't believe there's been enough time for Public Input for this very important decision. It appears this was a Plan rather than a Study. Hopefully the Park Board will do the right thing and, at a minimum, table the vote pending further review.

In all likelihood it will be before the City Counsel in short order.

One thing I'd intended to ask the park board tonight was to individually discuss this proposal, privately and confidentially, with Arron Schwartz and Janet Van Sloun. Employees aren't often candid about their thoughts with their employer, so this might be useful. Since the board intends to vote tonight, I guess I didn't give them enough time to ask them.

I have no idea what they'd say, though if this moves forward, I encourage you to speak with them (again, off the record).

Here's what I hope to say to the Park Board tonight:

Hello, I’m Tom Stockert and I live at 5524 Dominick Drive
I support bike trails
My concerns arose when I saw the trail map
I’ve read a lot of information from all sides
My Chief Concern remains - Density
Mainly that the bike trail would greatly impact wildlife
The Shady Oak and Lone Lake area of Minnetonka is a rare urban setting where people can enjoy countless wildlife
Lone Lake Park is as close as you can get to the North Woods in the metro area

Please look at the lines on the Concept Plan and compare undisturbed areas to that of a single tennis court (visible on the same map)
That 4.7 miles is crammed into the park, there aren’t any significant areas left for wildlife.
Please compare the Lone Lake Map to a Theodore Worth Park map
7.86 Miles on 720 Acres and much lower percentage of water. 10.3 miles from Minnetonka City Hall via 394 - (just five more than Lone Lake).
The existing trail is similar in scale to Theodore Worth Park.
Finally, please look at Page 5 of the study where the focus group pie chart clearly appears the largest concern with the bike trails to be environmental
Minnetonka’s Mountain Bike Trail should be:
   Centrally located so residents can bike to it – requiring less parking (a sliver on the focus group charts)
   And
   Spread over more acreage so it has a lower impact on native plants and wildlife
Thank you
###
###
Hopefully they'll do the right thing. If this proceeds, I'll see you at a future Counsel Meeting.

I truly do support a bike trail. I even thought this was a good idea until I saw the trail map.

Thanks for your service.

Tom

From: Katherine Sandum
Sent: Thursday, June 7, 2018 3:40 PM
To: Mike Happe; Brad Wiersum; Bob Ellingson
Subject: Mountain Bike Trails - Yes!

Wasn't sure who to send this to but I wanted to pass on what I wrote on nextdcoor...

“The local paper mentions a "vote" for the Minnetonka mountain bike project. Does anyone know when this happens? We do not have mountain bikers in our family, but I am in support of healthy activities for youth and families. These trails would be an asset for our community. The parks are meant for everyone - not just a select few. There has been so much press from the other side I just thought it would be nice to show there is support for this project! We are just not so vocal. I love wildlife! Our State parks have balanced recreation with wildlife and walkers and I trust our city will do the same. Let's be welcoming to a new generation of park-goers. Good luck MORC!"

From: Rosie Norton
Sent: Thursday, June 07, 2018 7:12 AM
To: Kelly O'Dea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Re: Mountain Bike Trail at Lone Lake

Director O'Dea.

I attended the meeting last night. I listened to several refer to the “aging Minnetonka” and the need for something like mountain trails. I took offense to several of the statements since it is the “aging” population that has made Minnetonka parks/lakes/trails what they are today. Our tax money and support. Those representing mountain bike trails at the meeting are a small fraction of those who will help take away the solitude (for people and birds and wildlife) of Lone Lake Park. They may represent Minnetonka residents but are a fraction of the non-residents that will crowd into the park.

The small lot on Roland CANNOT support more than 6-8 cars at a time and, in any case, will cause parking overflow.

I was also surprised to see that only 2 or 3 Park Board members had actually walked throughout the park area involved. They should also walk behind the residents’ homes that are directly affected. See what this would be like for them.

I would also like to point out that Barb Malkerson (maybe 20 years ago) was killed on a two way trail. You have added 2 sections of two way trail to the plan. PLEASE keep this trail out of Lone Lake Park. Maybe you have voted and this is too late. I hope not. Thank you. Rosemary Norton
From: Rosie Norton
Sent: Thursday, June 07, 2018 3:26 PM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Re: Mountain Bike Trail at Lone Lake

Please pass on my emails to the City Council. This is a very disappointing outcome. Thank you.

> On Jun 7, 2018, at 11:30 AM, Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com> wrote:
> Hi Rosemary,
> The park board voted 7-0 last night to recommend approval to the city council of the concept plan. The city council is the final decision maker. The tentative date set for their review is July 9. I will add your email to the project page list to ensure you are aware of project updates.
> Kelly O’Dea | Recreation Director
> City of Minnetonka | eminnetonka.com
> Office: 952-939-8360

From: Nolan Beron
Sent: Friday, June 08, 2018 8:14 PM
To: Jack Acomb <jacomb@eminnetonka.com>; James Durbin <jdurbin@eminnetonka.com>; Nelson Evenrud <nevenrud@eminnetonka.com>; Chris Gabler <cgabler@eminnetonka.com>; Cynthia Kist <ckist@eminnetonka.com>; Peggy Kvam <pkvam@eminnetonka.com>; Madeline Seveland <sevelandm@eminnetonka.com>; Christopher Walick <cwalick@eminnetonka.com>; Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Sara Woeste <swoeste@eminnetonka.com>; Jesse Izquierdo <jizquierdo@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkamt@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Tony Wagner <twagner@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone lake single track

Hi all,
I’d like to voice my approval for a single track mountain bike trail at Lone Lake Park. I’m a Victoria resident now, but grew up in Minnetonka. I love to mountain bike, and would be grateful for a track near by. Mountain bikers are generally good folks.

PS - bring back the Lone Lake disc golf course!

Nolan Beron
From: Paul Lundgren  
Sent: Saturday, June 9, 2018 12:53 PM  
To: Brad Wiersum; Deborah Calvert; Patty Acomb; Bob Ellingson; Tony Wagner; Mike Happe; Tim Bergstedt  
Subject: Mountain bike trails in Lone Lake Park

I am writing in opposition to the proposed mountain bike trails in Lone Lake Park. Lone Lake Park is a preserve and is an oasis of peace and tranquility. In our increasingly busy and noisy suburban world there are few places like this where one can find solace and quiet. In addition, much work has been done restoring native plants and vegetation in this park. A certain degree of damage and erosion would inevitably occur by putting in mountain bike trails in this beautiful, natural habitat.

I attended the park board meeting on June 6 and could not escape the feeling that the park board's voting to recommend putting in mountain bike trails in Lone Lake Park was pretty much inevitable. As we heard, much time, effort, and expense had been expended developing the mountain bike trails proposal in coordination with MORC (Minnesota Off-Road Cycling) that the park board had a vested interest in putting forward this proposal. This proposal by the park board was expedited with minimal public input and was substantially different from the process used to determine if mountain bike trails were suitable for Big Willow Park. In my opinion, this was done to greatly increase the likelihood that the mountain bike trails proposal for Lone Lake Park would be approved.

People in opposition to this proposal of which there are many recognize that mountain biking is a growing sport and that mountain bikers should have places to pursue their sport. But they believe that Lone Lake Park is not the park for these trails and that alternative sites should be explored. I have talked to mountain bikers who want more mountain bike trails but do not want them in Lone Lake Park because of its unique environmental value and the inevitable damage and erosion that would occur.

The easiest decision for the city council to make is to follow the recommendation of the park board to put in mountain bike trails in Lone Lake Park. The RIGHT decision is to go back to the drawing board and explore alternative sites. Lone Lake Park has been described as the jewel of the Minnetonka park system. Developing mountain bike trails would change the nature of this park forever and there would be no going back. Please do the right thing and vote against mountain bike trails in Lone Lake Park. Thank you.

Paul Lundgren

5133 Lee Way

Minnetonka, MN

I have lived in Minnetonka for 31 years.

-------------------

From: Jean O'Keefe  
Sent: Saturday, June 9, 2018 11:42 AM  
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: Re: Bike trails at Lone Lake
Mr. Odea and all park board, city council members, Alarming what elected or appointed power does to the human mind.....
"FACT: in the last 25 years humans have destroyed one tenth of the earth’s remaining wilderness.”
As W. Shakespear said “The only flaw in nature is the human mind.”
I believe that the present gathering of less than perfect human beings in Minnetonka City Offices has by now sufficiently contributed their percentage to the destruction noted in above “FACT”.
Perhaps now you can pick up “The Tree Network” or The Hidden Life of Trees” go sit under a tree if you can find one and read it.
“DO NOT CUT ANOTHER TREE!” We who do not play Pickle Ball do have equal voice... “DO NOT CUT ANOTHER TREE!” We would have preserved it for future generations.
I want a reply from you and constituents........Jean O’Keefe These views and feelings are not mine alone................

> On May 9, 2018, at 1:55 PM, Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com> wrote:

> Hi Jean,

> Thank you for the email and feedback regarding Lone Lake Park.

> Kelly O’Dea | Recreation Director
> City of Minnetonka | eminnetonka.com
> Office: 952-939-8360

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Jean O'Keefe
> Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2018 1:43 PM
> To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
> Subject: Bike trails at Lone Lake
> 
> To All on the Minnetonka Park Board,
> 
> Resources such as unique parcels of wooded land are becoming increasingly rare in urban areas. As a result... these precious resources are growing in value for the outdoor experience they provide for “Green” starved city residents.
> 
> The acreage of Lone Lake “Does Not” accommodate what would be required for bike trails.
> What are now interesting quiet wooded walking paths will become muddy rutted scars.
> I can’t imagine how two bikers encountering one another would maneuver without further damage to the environment.
> 
> Individuals responsible for managing these important resources must consider the greater good and commit to a vision for the future. I have seen a priceless turn of the 20th century legacy disregarded and destroyed. It is imperative that you who are in a position to undo the past think about what you will leave the future.
> 
> If it is necessary to increase park participation and usage why not bring back “Frisbee Golf?”

>
A Lone Lake walker of nearly 30 years........Jean O'Keefe

From: Shirley Buehler  
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2018 12:30 PM  
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: Lone Lake Park Bike Trail

Hi Kelly: I am Shirley Buehler at 5928 Abbott Place, Minnetonka. I recently moved here from Cedar Lake Road where I lived for 40 years. I was opposed to Big Willow trail and for the same reasons, I am opposed to Lone Lake Park bike trail. Why can't we get them a park of their own? I liked the idea of Glen Lake location. I really feel what they want in a park is much different than what we walker, hiker, birders and nature loving people want. Why are we mixing the two? I know the idea of bringing in more young families to the area is one of the reasons bike advocates are using, but, Minnetonka is so populated with us older adults, so where are they coming from? All over, to use our parks!

Thanks for your consideration,

Shirley Buehler

From: Thomas Stockert  
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2018 4:26 PM  
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: Lone Lake Mountain Bike Trail Alternate Option

Hello Kelly,

I thought I sent this to you Friday, though while reviewing my outgoing email I could not locate it. I apologize if this is my second email.

I found the meeting, and staff presentation, to be quite informative.

Though I’m still against the trail because the impact on the high value restoration area and wildlife concerns my hunch is the City Council will follow the staff recommendation regarding the Mountain Bike Trail in Lone Lake Park.

There is one minor change that would make me feel much better about nesting grounds when this project proceeds.

Staff mentioned certain birds require 4 undisturbed acres to nest (I heard 5, then watched the meeting again on DVR to confirm 4). Apparently bikes would be a disturbance, while hikers are not.

My recommendation would be to replace the two one-way trails through the High Value Restoration Area with one two-way trail. The goal would be to preserve more acreage for nesting while potentially causing less disturbance to that area. This area appears to have the majority of the >45 percent slopes, so hopefully consolidating those trails will help eliminate exposure to those steep slopes (again in high value restoration area.
These are the two things I plan to cover in my three minutes of public comment at the City Council meeting. I thought I’d give you some time to contemplate this potential compromise ahead of their meeting.

Thanks again.

Tom Stockert
5524 Dominick Drive

From: Charlotte Knopp
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2018 1:53 PM
To: Brad Wiersum
Subject: Concerns regarding the proposed mountain biking trail in Lone Lake Park

Dear Mayor Wiersum,

I am writing in support of the motion against implementing a mountain bike trail in Minnetonka’s Lone Lake Park. There are several reasons why a mountain bike trail shouldn’t be built here, but I am most concerned about the damage this project would do to the efforts that have been made over the past twenty-one years by members of the community to restore and sustain the biodiversity and environmental integrity of the park. As a biology major away at school in an area where there isn’t a strong program for wilderness protection, I’ve seen firsthand the kind of deterioration that can be caused to an ecosystem where restoration isn’t a priority. Having grown up in Minnetonka and spent my childhood biking through Lone Lake Park’s existing trails, I hope that our community will instead stand for conservation and choose not to sacrifice Lone Lake’s wildlife for recreational mountain biking that could be implemented in other less biodiverse parks.

The efforts made over the past two decades by our community add up to a cost of around $300,000. To make irreversible changes to that ecosystem would be jeopardizing the effects of all of this time and taxpayer money. Members of our community have worked hard to restore this park over the years; it would be an irremediable and irresponsible decision to disturb that habitat.

The disruption I’m referring to is a well-documented one: many credible sources and scientific surveys have warned against the dangers of erosion, and the inevitability of bikers going off-trail and riding mountain bikes into other areas of the park (often trampling native plants). The impact study conducted by the City of Minnetonka was done in the wintertime, when native vegetation and wildlife were difficult to assess. Surveys done by the University of Minnesota’s Bee Lab have documented only five occurrences of Bombus affinis (a species of bumblebee) since 2015: one of those was in Lone Lake Park. The mountain biking trail would do more damage than can be easily repaired to the restoration and preservation of Lone Lake Park, a space which has been carefully maintained for so many years. I hope that you will keep these factors in mind when making your decision.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,

Charlotte Knopp

From: William Knopp
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2018 2:03 PM
To: Brad Wiersum
Subject: concerns about a mountain biking trail in Lone Lake Park

Dear Mayor Wiersum,

I am writing in from the position of both a father and a physician who encourages and enjoys outdoor recreational activities such as biking. While I believe providing space and opportunities for people to engage in biking is important and has many benefits for the well-being of a community, I do not believe that Lone Lake Park is an appropriate place to do so. Mountain biking can be done many places, but spending time in a pristine, well-kept, biodiverse natural environment can’t happen just anywhere. Lone Lake Park is one of the best places in the area to do this: the purpose that it holds now in our community is irreplaceable.

I sincerely hope that those making the decision on this issue bear in mind that there are many other ways and places where mountain biking can be promoted; the experience of spending time on a quiet afternoon immersed in the biodiversity that native plants bring us is more limited. Although the trail would provide an accessible place for people to be physically active, it would also without a doubt bring in people going off-trail, and allow more chances for invasive species to intrude upon the area. As someone who has frequented the park with my three children for over two decades, I appreciate all of the uses we already have for it. We have walked through the park, biked on the existing trails, enjoyed picnics, and gone on school field trips; adding a mountain bike trail would only have detrimental impacts on a very special place.

Sincerely,

William Knopp, MD

From: Mike Vandeman
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2018 8:00 PM
Subject: Mountain Biking in Our Parks

Re: https://www.hometownsource.com/sun_sailor/community/minnetonka/minnetonka-park-board-oks--mile-mountain-bike-trail-in/article_0e422942-6dba-11e8-86d9-afdf25a02704.html

What were you thinking??? Mountain biking and trail-building destroy wildlife habitat! We have already destroyed far too much, which is why we are in the Sixth Extinction crisis! There is no good reason to allow bicycles in any natural area. All mountain bikers are capable of walking; they would just like you to forget that inconvenient truth....
Bicycles should not be allowed in any natural area. They are inanimate objects and have no rights. There is also no right to mountain bike. That was settled in federal court in 1996: https://mjvande.info/mtb10.htm. It's dishonest of mountain bikers to say that they don't have access to trails closed to bikes. They have EXACTLY the same access as everyone else -- ON FOOT! Why isn't that good enough for mountain bikers? They are all capable of walking....

A favorite myth of mountain bikers is that mountain biking is no more harmful to wildlife, people, and the environment than hiking, and that science supports that view. Of course, it's not true. To settle the matter once and for all, I read all of the research they cited, and wrote a review of the research on mountain biking impacts (see https://mjvande.info/scb7.htm). I found that of the seven studies they cited, (1) all were written by mountain bikers, and (2) in every case, the authors misinterpreted their own data, in order to come to the conclusion that they favored. They also studiously avoided mentioning another scientific study (Wisdom et al) which did not favor mountain biking, and came to the opposite conclusions.

Mountain bikers also love to build new trails - legally or illegally. Of course, trail-building destroys wildlife habitat - not just in the trail bed, but in a wide swath to both sides of the trail! E.g. grizzlies can hear a human from one mile away, and smell us from 5 miles away. Thus, a 10-mile trail represents 100 square miles of destroyed or degraded habitat, that animals are inhibited from using. Mountain biking, trail building, and trail maintenance all increase the number of people in the park, thereby preventing the animals' full use of their habitat. See https://mjvande.info/scb9.htm for details.

Mountain biking accelerates erosion, creates V-shaped ruts, kills small animals and plants on and next to the trail, drives wildlife and other trail users out of the area, and, worst of all, teaches kids that the rough treatment of nature is okay (it's NOT!). What's good about THAT?

To see exactly what harm mountain biking does to the land, watch this 5-minute video: http://vimeo.com/48784297.

In addition to all of this, it is extremely dangerous: https://mjvande.info/mtb_dangerous.htm .

For more information: https://mjvande.info/mtbfaq.htm.
The common thread among those who want more recreation in our parks is total ignorance about and disinterest in the wildlife whose homes these parks are. Yes, if humans are the only beings that matter, it is simply a conflict among humans (but even then, allowing bikes on trails harms the MAJORITY of park users -- hikers and equestrians -- who can no longer safely and peacefully enjoy their parks).

The parks aren't gymnasiums or racetracks or even human playgrounds. They are WILDLIFE HABITAT, which is precisely why they are attractive to humans. Activities such as mountain biking, that destroy habitat, violate the charter of the parks.

Even kayaking and rafting, which give humans access to the entirety of a water body, prevent the wildlife that live there from making full use of their habitat, and should not be allowed. Of course those who think that only humans matter won't understand what I am talking about -- an indication of the sad state of our culture and educational system.

--

I am working on creating wildlife habitat that is off-limits to humans ("pure habitat"). Want to help? (I spent the previous 8 years fighting auto dependence and road construction.)

Wildlife must be given top priority, because they can't protect themselves from us.

Please don't put a cell phone next to any part of your body that you are fond of!

From:
Sent: Saturday, June 16, 2018 4:16 PM
To: Brad Wiersum; Geralyn Barone
Cc: Deborah Calvert; Patty Acomb
Subject: Lone Lake MTB

I saw Ed Hassler’s Nextdoor post, and wanted to let you all know that he does not speak for the majority of Hopkins and Minnetonka residents. Any true mountain biker or resident near the current mountain bike trails knows how courteous mountain bikers are, and how beneficial the trails are to the parks and areas around the parks. Please make the right decision for Minnetonka and don’t listen to a vocal, closed-minded, angry minority.

Thanks,
From: Comcast Mail  
Sent: Saturday, June 16, 2018 11:17 PM  
To: Brad Wiersum  
Subject: Please get involved in the Mountain Bike debate  

Brad,  

As someone who has always found Lone Lake Preserve a real treasure.. I am concerned in the decision by the Park Board to go ahead and allow Mountain Biking in this area that so many enjoy. The trees... birds, and trails are so amazing and disturbing this area would be upsetting for this wild life and all those folks who enjoy it. As more and more trees come down in residential areas due to smaller lots and bigger houses we especially need these type of Preserves. It is vital... and mountain bikers are not there to enjoy that beauty generally. There are many such places in the area. Minnetonka does not need that here.  

It feels like this is too delicate of a issue to be allowed this easily.  

Please get involved.  

You have the power... it should at least come before the City Council. I have seen 1st hand how the City Council works with our Park Valley battle several years ago.  

It will be examined in a entirely different way. Piece by Piece. I will always appreciate and admire our city government.  

Please Please get involved.  

Thank you so much  

Judy Sieps  

13717 Summit Lane  

Minnetonka, MN  

55305  

---

From: Diane Murphy  
Sent: Sunday, June 17, 2018 10:59 AM  
To: Brad Wiersum; Deborah Calvert; Patty Acomb; Bob Ellingson; Tony Wagner; Mike Happe; Tim Bergstedt; Kelly ODea  
Cc: Brill Laura; Brill Mark; Readus Fletcher; Crouch Jane; Crouch Bill  
Subject: Lone Lake Park Mountain Bike Trail  

Dear Council Members,  

Do the voices of Minnetonka residents matter? Those opposed to a mountain bike path in Lone Lake Park out-number those in favor by a substantial margin yet it appears the decision has already been made to proceed with the project.
Several very strong reasons* have been put forth as to why the project should not be undertaken but the only reason offered in favor of moving forward is it could be used in promotional materials to attract new residents.

We already live in the community and would like to stay in this “Tree City” enjoying the beautiful parks and nature trails. We pay high property taxes for the privilege of living near the park. Should the Mountain bike path become a reality this proximity would no longer be an attraction.

We respectfully request the needs and preferences of your current residents be given due consideration when making your decision regarding the future of Lone Lake Park.

Diane Murphy
Readus Fletcher
Bill and Jane Crouch
Laura and Mark Brill

*Damage to the environment, noise pollution, spread of invasive species, destruction of wildlife habitat, high cost/benefit ratio, monies better spent in ways to benefit larger numbers, safety concerns-including the water tower on the site, cost of maintenance

Recent photo of a deer in Lone Lake Park-what is the future for these animals?
Dear City of Minnetonka,

I find myself in the unusual position in that I am a mountain biker yet strongly oppose mountain bike trails at Lone Lake Park. I’ll leave the issues of noise, litter, liability, ecology and environmental
degradation to others more qualified and concentrate on a few other key issues. May I have half an hour of your time, either separately or as a group?

Thanks in advance...

Ed Hassler
5516 Sanibel Drive
Minnetonka, MN 55343

From: Marcia Hanson
Sent: Sunday, June 17, 2018 6:10 PM
To: Brad Wiersum; Deborah Calvert; Patty Acomb; Bob Ellingson; Tony Wagner; Mike Happe; Tim Bergstedt; Geralyn Barone
Subject: PRESERVE LONE LAKE PARK

Hello:

I have lived in the neighborhood of Lone Lake Park for twenty years, just 1 1/4 miles away. I have found solace and renewed energy every time I hike around the lake. It’s an opportunity to be immersed in nature in it’s natural habitat. Visiting Lone Lake is like finding a rare gem in a Minneapolis suburb that gives the feel of being up in northern Minnesota. I love the fact that there are hills to climb providing a fabulous aerobic workout. Hiking at Lone Lake in my mind is far superior to walking the lakes in Minneapolis. While the lakes are wonderful and I do enjoy them, they are flat and generally overcrowded in the spring and summer.

More than the fact that I personally enjoy Lone Lake Park, is the fact that the land, soil, wild life, (birds, insects, trees, turtles, deer, coyotes, fox and more I’m sure) don’t have an opportunity to SPEAK..... there is no do-over for them. The long range view is that other areas can be made accessible for the mountain bikers which we already have and will continue to build. Please don’t approve the building of a mountain biking trail at this precious park.

I don’t believe it would be wise or forward-thinking to infringe on this
small oasis tucked into our community for the many hikers of all ages. We see families with toddlers to teens and grandparents too. I know new construction is underway for a pickle ball court which is great. This new addition will bring more neighbors into the park. This new court will not interfere at all with the hiking.

My personal opinion is that adding a trail for Mountain Bikers will destroy the peaceful nature we experience which will impinge on the land, soil, trees, and wildlife that are currently available for all visitors to enjoy.

What seems to me is the obvious in that Lone Lake Park is simply not large enough to accommodate the inclusion of a Mountain Biking Trail. I am 100% in favor of Mountain Biking and Mountain Bikers, that has nothing to do with my analysis of this situation. I would like to try Mountain Biking myself at any of the other locations available for Mountain Bikers right here in the cities. IF we did have significantly more acreage I would be in favor for this trail, but the reality is this is not the case.

I LOVE LONE LAKE PARK and hope a reasonable decision is made towards keeping the park as it is with all its beauty.

Thank you.

Best regards,

Marcia Hanson
From: Gerry Leone  
Sent: Sunday, June 17, 2018 9:20 PM  
To: Brad Wiersum  
Subject: Please don't ruin Lone Lake Park

Mr. Mayor –

I’d like to register my displeasure at the idea of adding mountain bike trails to Lone Lake Park.

If you’ve ever walked through Lone Lake Park you know what a sanctuary of peace and quiet it is in the middle of a busy suburb like Minnetonka. Even though we’re close to two other parks – Kinsel and Purgatory – neither is as beautiful nor as peaceful as Lone Lake Park. We actually drive to it so we can walk our dog there every day.

It just doesn’t make sense to add the potential problems of mountain bike trails to the park. The Park Board is ignoring the wishes of the hundreds of Minnetonka residents who use the park daily, and pandering to the dozen of non-Minnetonka residents who want this because they can’t find another city willing to ruin one of its parks this way.

Who’ll be paying for the installation and maintenance? The residents of Minnetonka.

What about safety issues with bikes speeding through trails frequented by elderly residents? And should a biker fall because of a fault in the trail, it’ll be the City of Minnetonka that gets sued.

There are noise issues which will ruin the ambience of the park.

There are nature issues with bikers going off-trail, dropping trash, and harming wildlife.

And finally It’s folly to believe that the mountain bikers will stick to their own trails, regardless of how many signs are posted.

What is so wrong with Lone Lake Park now that the city wants to “improve” it with mountain bike trails?

I urge you – before you vote on this matter – to spend an hour in Lone Lake Park. Then ask yourself, “Is this what my constituents really want to change?”

Thank you for your time,

-Gerry Leone

5201 Mayview Road
Minnetonka, MN

From: Dannah Reiter
Sent: Sunday, June 17, 2018 10:06 PM
To: Brad Wiersum
Subject: Lone Lake Bike Trails

Dear Mr. Wiersum,

As a Minnetonka resident who lives less than a mile from Lone Lake, I support the mountain bike trail initiative. I've seen how trails like this work well in Duluth and support that everyone should be able to enjoy our parks in their own way. Please vote for the trails.

Thank you,

Dannah

From: Lonna Mosow
Sent: Sunday, June 17, 2018 5:40 AM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Mountain Bike Trails

Ms. O'Dea,
I urge you to vote NO regarding the Mountain Bike Trails. I use the Lone Lake Walking Trails 3-4 times per week not just for my own enjoyment, but I take a group of walkers to the park on a regular basis. If I wanted to walk a "flat" area I would go to the lakes, which of course are inconvenient. Please, the park is a one-of-a-kind park with the variety terrain and should not be disturbed with added trails and switchbacks. It would be a grave mistake to take away what the park currently offers. Please consider other areas that offer more land without taking away from those of us who enjoy the quiet and the wildlife.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lonna Mosow

From: Diane Murphy
Sent: Sunday, June 17, 2018 11:00 AM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Tony Wagner <twagner@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergsted@eminnetonka.com>; Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Cc: Brill Laura < >; Brill Mark < >; Readus Fletcher < >; Crouch Jane < Crouch Bill
Subject: Lone Lake Park Mountain Bike Trail

Dear Council Members,

Do the voices of Minnetonka residents matter? Those opposed to a mountain bike path in Lone Lake Park out-number those in favor by a substantial margin yet it appears the decision has already been made to proceed with the project.
Several very strong reasons* have been put forth as to why the project should not be undertaken but the only reason offered in favor of moving forward is it could be used in promotional materials to attract new residents.

We already live in the community and would like to stay in this “Tree City” enjoying the beautiful parks and nature trails. We pay high property taxes for the privilege of living near the park. Should the mountain bike path become a reality this proximity would no longer be an attraction.

We respectfully request the needs and preferences of your current residents be given due consideration when making your decision regarding the future of Lone Lake Park.

Diane Murphy
Readus Fletcher
Bill and Jane Crouch
Laura and Mark Brill

*Damage to the environment, noise pollution, spread of invasive species, destruction of wildlife habitat, high cost/benefit ratio, monies better spent in ways to benefit larger numbers, safety concerns-including the water tower on the site, cost of maintenance

Recent photo of a deer in Lone Lake Park-what is the future for these animals?
From: Richard Becchetti
Sent: Saturday, June 16, 2018 2:24 PM
To: Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Tony Wagner <twagner@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake Park
I am a resident of Mtka and I support having mtn bike trails at Lone Lake Park. Do not believe the unsubstantiated stories that the balance of nature will be disrupted or the generalizations that mtn bikers will "trash" the area. This plan makes sense. Thank you for your service.

From: Marcia Hanson  
Sent: Sunday, June 17, 2018 6:11 PM  
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Tony Wagner <twagner@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: PRESERVE LONE LAKE PARK  
Hello:  
I have lived in the neighborhood of Lone Lake Park for twenty years, just 1 1/4 miles away.  
I have found solace and renewed energy every time I hike around the lake.  
It’s an opportunity to be immersed in nature in it’s natural habitat.

Visiting Lone Lake is like finding a rare gem in a Minneapolis suburb that gives the feel of being up in northern Minnesota. I love the fact that there are hills to climb providing a fabulous aerobic workout. Hiking at Lone Lake in my mind is far superior to walking the lakes in Minneapolis.  
While the lakes are wonderful and I do enjoy them, they are flat and generally overcrowded in the spring and summer.

More than the fact that I personally enjoy Lone Lake Park, is the fact that the land, soil, wild life, (birds, insects, trees, turtles, deer, coyotes, fox and more I’m sure) don’t have an opportunity to SPEAK..... there is no do-over for them. The long range view is that other areas can be made accessible for the mountain bikers which we already have and will continue to build. Please don’t approve the building of a mountain biking trail at this precious park.

I don’t believe it would be wise or forward-thinking to infringe on this small oasis tucked into our community for the many hikers of all ages. We see families with toddlers to teens and grandparents too.
I know new construction is underway for a pickle ball court which is great. This new addition will bring more neighbors into the park. This new court will not interfere at all with the hiking.

My personal opinion is that adding a trail for Mountain Bikers will destroy the peaceful nature we experience which will impinge on the land, soil, trees, and wild life that are currently available for all visitors to enjoy.

What seems to me is the obvious in that Lone Lake Park is simply not large enough to accommodate the inclusion of a Mountain Biking Trail. I am 100% in favor of Mountain Biking and Mountain Bikers, that has nothing to do with my analysis of this situation. I would like to try Mountain Biking myself at any of the other locations available for Mountain Bikers right here in the cities. IF we did have significantly more acreage I would be in favor for this trail, but the reality is this is not the case.

I LOVE LONE LAKE PARK and hope a reasonable decision is made towards keeping the park as it is with all its beauty. Thank you.

Best regards,

Marcia Hanson

From: Jane Hess
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2018 9:45 AM
To: Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: LoneLake Park

Please leave Lone Lake Park in it’s natural beauty...we often walk the trails for its serene and quiet beauty...mountain biking would certainly not add to the beauty of the park!! We have been walking there the past 25 years and have seen the changes... however mountain biking seems a bit ridiculous! When the fad is over what will happen?? Please leave it as is! Thank-you... Jane Hess

5519Bristol Lane
Dear Mayor and members of the city council.

My name is Robert Buffin. I currently reside on Oakwood Road Extension and I have been a resident of Minnetonka for nearly ten years.

I enjoy biking and I try to bike to work everyday. Doing so, I notice the steady growth of bike traffic which, in my opinion, is both a symptom and factor of good quality of life. I also notice that most bikers are adults.

Through social media, I have recently noticed a debate surrounding the development of mountain biking trails in Minnetonka Parks. It seems to me that few points of view dominate the discussion but do not represent my sensitivity.

I consequently want to express my support for the development of mountain biking trails. I believe that such amenities will help develop younger bikers and ultimately initiate them to a lifelong healthy practice of biking. I see that as a reason on its own.

Best regards,

Robert Buffin  

From: Petra Marquart, Petra Marquart and Associates
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2018 11:41 AM
Subject: Lone Lake

Dear City Council Representative -

I'm writing to plead with you not to change the use of the Lone Lake Park to mountain bike paths. We have so few true natural areas in Minnetonka where one can go to refresh and recharge in peace. As a community, few of us are mountain bike enthusiasts but many of us are seekers of nature and tranquility. Lone Lake offers both. I have seen areas in the western part of this country that cater to this kind of recreation and the natural beauty is ruined by speed demons wanting only the thrill with a complete disregard for the other living things - plants, trees, wildlife - around them. I'm asking you to seek another option for the thrill seekers and keep this pristine and lovely park just as it is. It's one of Minnetonka's true treasures!

Petra Marquart  
18523 Covington Rd.,  
Minnetonka, 55345

From: linda goecke
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2018 10:13 AM
To: Brad Wiersum  
Subject: opposed to mountain bike trail in Long Lake  

To: Mayor Brad Wiersum  
From: Mrs. Linda Goecke  

My husband and I are very opposed to the proposed mountain bike trail in Lone Lake Park. We see value in mountain biking -- HOWEVER, Lone Lake is NOT the right spot. It is a very special park -- we have lived in Minnetonka for many years and have walked there frequently.

I have been to the meetings, read the studies, listened to the views of proponents and staff and opponents. Nothing I read in the studies or heard from staff at the June 6 meeting reassured me in the least that this project could be done without great harm to the land. And, as has been learned in other projects, once environmental damage is done to land and animals and plants, it is often impossible to go back in time and "fix" something.

What I did NOT hear from staff is whether a collaboration with the County about another possible site at the "Home School" area was ever investigated.

We understand that this issue will be on the Council agenda on July 9. We believe that the staff gave the wrong recommendation to approve this trail and that the Parks and Rec Board was wrong to approve the recommendation. We understand that this issue will be on the Council agenda for your July 9 meeting. Please do NOT approve this trail.

Thank you,

Linda Goecke  
6085 Rowland Road #111  
Minnetonka, MN 55343  

From: Ed Hassler  
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2018 12:57 PM  
To: Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacombe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Tony Wagner <twagner@eminnetonka.com>  
Cc: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: Fwd: LONE LAKE PARK  

Dear City of Minnetonka,

I bought my first mountain bike in 1985 but have been riding all my life. I’m a member of the Twin Cities Bicycling Club since 2007, a ride leader with the club since 2008, and except for the past few years have averaged over six thousand miles per year in the saddle. I’m a member of the Minnesota Randonneurs and have completed what most call insanely long rides, twice completing RUSA’s Super Randonneur Series. I’ve ridden the 100-mile Minnesota Ironman since 2008 (once as a ride marshal), the Saint Paul Classic (once as a ride marshal), volunteered as a BAM sag driver, and have ridden numerous out-of-state rides in South Dakota, Iowa and Wisconsin. Everyone should experience the indescribable carnival-
on-wheels atmosphere of RAGBRAI at least once in their life! I did, in 2010. From 2012 to 2013 I volunteered with Midtown Greenway Trail Watch.

I’m familiar with the mountain bike trails along the Mississippi and Minnesota River bottoms and most of the metro mountain bike parks including Salem Hills and Battle Creek. Cycling is a huge part of my life. I find myself in the unusual position in that I am an avid cyclist, yet strongly oppose mountain bike trails at Lone Lake Park. I’ll leave the issues of noise, litter, liability, ecology and environmental degradation to others more qualified and concentrate on three: 1) The specious claims of the Minnetonka Mountain Bike Trail Advocates, 2) The inaccuracies of the City of Minnetonka’s Mountain Biking Report, and 3) The intrinsic value of the undeveloped sections of Lone Lake Park.

1) SPECIOUS CLAIMS OF MINNETONKA MOUNTAIN BIKE TRAIL ADVOCATES

The Minnetonka Mountain Bike Trail Advocates website says, “If you’re not certain how mountain biking fits into a shared-use park system, we encourage you to visit one of the local success stories around town. You’ll be surprised at the lack of user conflict and dedication to these sustainable trail systems.” What they do not tell you is that, except for Carver Lake, all of these parks are huge, many times larger — five to thirty-six times larger! — than Lone Lake. What they do not tell you is that the mountain bike areas are walled off from the rest of the parks, often by roads. For example, Lebanon Hills is bordered on the west by Galaxie Ave, on the east by Johnny Cake Ridge Rd, on the south by the Minnesota Zoo, and on much of the north by a large community park. Furthermore, it’s encircled by a cross-country ski trail. So of course there is no user conflict. There is no user conflict because walkers, birders and nature lovers occupy an entirely different section of the park. Lebanon Hills is an example of a park done right and is a credit to the city of Eagan.

Lack of user conflict at Lebanon Hills is in no small part due to the fact that Lebanon Hills is fourteen times larger than Lone Lake Park. All of Lone Lake including the lake itself could easily fit in the aforementioned mountain bike area. The mountain bikers will object and say that almost all metro mountain bike trails are multi-use. True, only because it’s easier to convince park boards and cities to fund mountain bike trails if they’re designated “multi-use,” otherwise, mountain biking would be considered a special interest group. No one other than the bravest or foolish of trail runners would risk getting hit by a mountain bike on these trails. (Remember, the trails are no more than twenty-four inches wide, roughly the width of handlebars.) Especially not little Alice Saewert a seven-year-old girl who has been shamelessly offered up as propaganda fodder in an article in the Lakeshore Weekly News.

Relative sizes of some metro parks that incorporate mountain bike trails:

- Elm Creek Park 5315 acres 36 times larger than Lone Lake
- Murphy-Hanrehan 2786 acres

20 times larger than Lone Lake

- Lake Rebecca 2577 acres 18 times larger than Lone Lake
- Lebanon Hills 2000 acres 14 times larger than Lone Lake
- Theodore Wirth 759 acres 5 times larger than Lone Lake
• Carver Lake 150 acres
• Lone Lake Park   146 acres

A pro-biking letter to the editor published in the Lakeshore Weekly News reads: “Trails are not dangerous, nor are they for the exclusive use of a small number of privileged users. In addition to being used by mountain bikers, trails throughout the metro and the state are widely used by hikers, runners and joggers — and nature enthusiasts like bird watchers. As a public amenity, trails are open to all.” Once again, the safety claim is absolutely untrue for the type of singletrack proposed for Lone Lake. Exceptions can be found, for example, at Elm Creek where the trailhead starts out about ten feet wide and can safely accommodate bikers and runners. And once again, only brave or defiant trail runners run busy singletrack.

Mountain bikers love the term “sustainable.” Sustainable. Sustainable trails. Sustainable trail systems. Sounds warm and environmentally friendly, sort of like “renewable energy,” but as we all know sustainable simply means that the trails are constructed using native soils where possible and that they are sloped and pitched to minimize erosion. That’s it. Sustainable does not mean the trails heal themselves and require no maintenance. Our various city, state and federal highway departments build roads with the same concerns and yet we don’t hear them touting sustainable Excelsior Boulevard or sustainable Highway 7 or sustainable Interstate I-494.

Mountain bikers like to make the distinction that their sport is “passive,” just like walking. It isn’t. Anyone who has been hit by a bike knows the difference. Pedaling a trainer in the basement is passive.

Mountain bikers claim the local economy would benefit from local trails. Most of us take our car to a shop or dealer we trust, not the one down the street simply because it’s nearby. If the bikers really want to support local restaurants they can stop at their favorite local Minnetonka brew pub on the way home after the ride.

Mountain bikers love to portray themselves as law-abiding, helpful, eco-friendly super dads. Some are, but most want to “go where no dude has gone before” and they’ll never admit it. Witness Jeep TV ads touting rugged go-anywhere capabilities. Rain or shine, 365 days a year, I walk the park twice a day with my dogs, picking up their poop (and picking up other dogs’ poop because I feel a close stewardship toward this park). In the past three years I’ve encountered perhaps twenty bikers on the maintained trails. Not one of them — not one — has uttered the words “on your left.” Extrapolate that number to reflect the hundreds of bikers descending on Lone Lake each week and it’s still zero. This smug arrogance is not surprising. Only about half the TCBC bikers observe proper cycling etiquette. The stronger and faster a cyclist, the less likely they are to communicate with the mere mortals they must endure on the road or trail.

On Facebook, the Minnetonka Mountain Bike Trail Advocates call those opposed to trails “haters and NIMBYs.” On another social media site, the bikers complain that they have to drive to a mountain bike park and want the convenience of hopping on their bikes, peddling to a park, and peddling home again. If I and other Minnetonka residents wanted to walk out our doors and snowshoe to a downhill ski slope, would the city consider building a ski run? This is Minnesota, is it not, and is not skiing in our DNA?
How do I know the heart and soul of a mountain biker? I am a mountain biker.

2) INACCURACIES OF THE CITY OF MINNETONKA’S MOUNTAIN BIKING REPORT

Page 30 of the Minnetonka Mountain Bike Study, (6.8 Existing Formal and Informal Trails), shows a map of existing formal and informal footpaths at Lone Lake Park and claims the informal footpaths “were created and are used by hikers, dog walkers, and bird watchers.” I believe many were originally created not by humans but by deer. The map, while mostly accurate, shows an informal footpath (accented red, below) from the water tower to the playground. This is not a footpath. A longtime Minnetonka resident says this gully was originally created by a downhill ski rope tow and later used by motorized
dirt bikers for hill climbing. I have never seen anyone hiking this gully — ever — but I have seen fat tire bike tracks in the snow.
Page 31 contains two unidentified photos claiming to be informal trails and cites “erosion issues.” The photo on the left is the same gully shown on the map. The photo on the right purports to show another
“eroded footpath.” Again, a Minnetonka old-timer says it was a dirt road originally created by the Bren family, later used by cross-country skiers, and yes, later used by walkers. And again, I routinely see bike tire tracks in the dirt and snow. (When park board member Peggy Kvam walked this trail with us in March, we witnessed two fat tire bikers passing us in the opposite direction from the tennis courts and, sure enough, the fat tire tracks in the snow led up this trail, beyond the then-vandalized BIKING PROHIBITED sign on the east side of the tennis courts.)

Both photos were published in the Minnetonka Mountain Bike Study without, it seems, the Park Board’s
or the Recreation Services Director’s checking the facts. And since no one had previously set foot in those areas of Lone Lake Park, they would not recognize the photos as bogus.

At the June 6 Park Board meeting we were not allowed to ask questions, but I’m hoping someone will take responsibility for these misleading entries.

From a subsequent version of the draft,

here’s another photo of the gully in winter claiming to be erosion by hikers:

![Photo of gully in winter](image)

Vertical trail from water tower to playground, with severe erosion.

The original Trail Concept Plan map lists the length of the trail as 4.7 miles, the width as 18 to 24 inches, and total area of trail as 0.9 acres (later updated to 1.2 acres). The area of the trail appears to be calculated by multiplying the length of the trail times its width but looking at the map the trails cover approximately 80 acres, over half the entire acreage of the park. Isn’t this math as disingenuous as calculating the area of a cemetery by adding up the dimensions of the headstones? The study seems to have been skewed with information from the mountain biking community and has lost objectivity.
3) INTRINSIC VALUE OF THE UNDEVELOPED SECTIONS OF LONE LAKE PARK
Adding mountain bike trails to Lone Lake Park would effectively transform this small community park and preserve into a mountain biking mecca with a soccer field, tennis courts, a basketball court, and now pickleball courts. As the Twin Cities metro expands, there are few pristine undeveloped tracts of wooded hills remaining. The hills on the south side of Lone Lake Park are the best example.

Will this be the year the City of Minnetonka sells off Lone Lake Park to a small but highly organized special interest group known as mountain bikers? What happened to the original proposal to improve connectivity within the city so that all bicyclists — not just mountain bikers — would benefit? Considering Minnetonka’s above average investment in park amenities, can it be said that the city’s youth are deprived of recreational opportunities?

I find it sad that the mountain bikers have little or no appreciation for the natural, undeveloped beauty of Minnetonka parks and would be willing to destroy them for their... convenience. Sadder still is that the current Minnetonka Park Board has sold out to this special interest group.

Don’t it always seem to go
You don’t know what you’ve got till it’s gone
They paved paradise and put up a parking lot
—Joni Mitchell

SUMMARY

• “Multi-use” mountain bike trails are multi-use in name only. For all but beginners and novices, the object of a mountain bike course is to navigate it as quickly as possible. Once again, imagine walkers or joggers on the same winding twenty-four-inch-wide trail as cyclists trying to see how fast they can go.

• Regardless of the comparison to Carver in Woodbury, Lone Lake Park is too small to accommodate mountain bike trails. Had the city fathers purchased land extending to what is now Highway 62 to the south and Baker Road to the west, there might be ample acreage for such trails.

• City officials responsible for publishing the Minnetonka Mountain Bike Study have ignored certain facts, presented false photos, and seem to have created a report skewed in favor of the mountain bike advocates. I therefor strongly suggest that the City postpone a decision to install mountain bike trails until these misleading claims are cleared up.

PROPOSAL

If we truly want amenities available to everyone, I propose that a single walking/nature trail be built in the southern section of Lone Lake Park following much the terrain as the proposed bike trails, connected by stairways similar to those connecting the existing maintained trails, so that everyone can enjoy the pristine beauty of the park.

Sincerely,

Ed Hassler
5516 Sanibel Drive
Minnetonka, MN 55343
From: Lonna Mosow  
Sent: Friday, June 22, 2018 11:29 AM  
Cc: Brad Wiersum; Deborah Calvert; Patty Acomb; Bob Ellingson; Tony Wagner; Mike Happe; Tim Bergstedt  
Subject: Lone Lake Park  

Council member:  
I urge you to leave Lone Lake Park "alone!" I walk there weekly all seasons and a favorite for my walking club.  

Unlike the lakes with the noise, screams, bike whistles and chaos, the Lone Lake Park offers a recluse to those of us who seek the quiet of nature. Mountain Biking has a place in our Twin Cities, but not at this park!  

Our lives are already too full with traffic noise, media blitz and daily stress. PLEASE consider some of the other options that would offer more land, less disturbance and that would placate those that desire the bike trails.  

Thank you for your consideration.  

Lonna  
18523 Covington Road, 55345  

----------------------------------------  

From: John Mirocha  
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2018 2:25 PM  
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Tony Wagner <twagner@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>  
Cc: Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: Vote No on The Lone Lake Mountain Biking Trails  

All, I am opposed to the construction of mountain biking trails in Lone Lake Park. Upon reading the various documents, attending the open house and the most recent Park Board meeting, I have not seen any specific information on the goals and metrics for the project; hallmarks of effective program and project management. I am also concerned about your apparent abdication of the responsibility for monitoring the project and giving that responsibility to MORC which has little investment in our community. Please review the attached document. Can you explain to me how a controversial plan like this can get passed by the Park Board and put into your hands without clearly articulated goals and a process for measuring progress?  

John Mirocha  
----------------------------------------  

On Jun 27, 2018, at 3:41 PM, Linda Russell wrote:  

Hello Council Members:
I am writing to share my deep concerns about the proposed mountain bike trails in Lone Lake Park. I will start by listing some the agreed-upon criteria that appear in the proposal that **are not met.** Questions that I would like answered are in yellow highlight.

**Criteria for MBT, per the city’s plan:**

**Adequate Space**

1. The park must support 4 miles of trail.

**Minimal user conflict**

2. Trails should be built to minimally intersect maintained or high traffic footpaths.
3. New mountain bike trails should not displace maintained or high traffic footpaths.
4. Adequate parking should be available.

**Questions and Concerns: Questions are highlighted.**

- Minimum trail length (see #1). The planned loop on the west side of the park near the Rowland Rd entrance is only there because otherwise the plan would not meet the 4 mile minimum. **But, having that loop requires a common stretch of trail (MBT + regional trail+ trail going into Lone Lake Park) that everyone/anyone will be using.**

- Displacing maintained trails (see # 2 and 3) and increasing the city’s liability. The **200 foot crossover area** (see p. 34 of the Park Board agenda from June 6 for reference) to get to the above loop is at a **busy intersection.** This occurs at one of just two entrances to this park.
  - The 200 foot crossover stretch is on a part of the regional trail on which bicyclists, walkers, dog walkers, families, runners, etc will meet, whether they are headed into Lone Lake Park or headed to Bryant Lake Park. This will be a problem area.
  - Even though it was claimed to be “not a very long stretch of trail,“ (per Jesse Izquierdo at the Park Board meeting) it is, in fact, about 2/3 of a football field in length, at 66 yards, and it is at one of the places one is most likely to meet other trail users. It is **bad design** to do this.
  - Since there really is no other way to make the MBT fit the minimum mileage and there isn’t another place to gain access to the extra loop because of the creek and wetlands, the **conclusion** I draw is that **this park does not have suitable space** to meet the minimum criteria of 4 miles, and creating this dangerous crossover just to fit that criteria is not only poorly planned, it is also completely **disregarding of the safety of current trail users as well as any bikers.**

- The city basically claims to have no liability in matters of safety, but creating a crossover area **knowing that it is dangerous** would seem to be testing this “no liability” claim.
- How will the city’s plan ensure that bikers will not enter the shared trail at higher speeds than are safe?
- How many trail users are likely to be on that stretch of trail? The proposed plan has no information about current or projected use.
• Parking (see #4). The plan reports that the park has 140 paved parking spots. (It should be noted that there are no unpaved parking spots.) However, the plan does not provide any sort of parking use study. There are many unanswered questions that a study should provide:
  o How many soccer matches and/or tournaments are played each season at Lone Lake Park and on what days? How many parking spaces do they typically use?
  o What is the projection for how many pickle ball players will be using the courts on various days and times? (8 courts with 4 players per court = 32 players)
  o If it is expected that there could be high use of the park for MBT use on weekends, this could cause a shortage of parking. Where will overflow parking be? How will it be monitored or controlled? What if people park in the Sundial center lot, displacing customers at those establishments? There is no stoplight on Shady Oak Road and Sanibel Drive, or at the park entrance, so crossing the busy street would be dangerous.
  o If bikers park in the lower lot, how will they access the trailhead—cut through the grass or woods, or ride up the road, which is steep and curving? There is no other way to get there.
  o Will bikers displace parking for tennis players?
  o Will there be enough parking to accommodate pickle ball players, soccer families, playground users, tennis players and bikers, all at one time?
  o What if the parking lot on Rowland Road is full (it has only 8 parking spaces). Will people park on Rowland Road? How will that be monitored?

• Restrooms (a topic not mentioned anywhere in this plan). How will a mountain biker access the restrooms without riding on a regional trail where there are many walkers, dogs, children, etc.? I and others do not support Port-a-Potties that are visible or near regular park users, such as in the small parking lot on Rowland Road. They are unsightly and should not be the first thing you see when you enter the park. We are concerned that bikers who are away from the Port-a-Potty near the tennis courts (which is virtually all of the proposed trail) will just ride across the grass between the trail and the lower parking lot to access the restrooms. What or who will stop them?

I look forward to your answers to my questions.

Thank you,

Linda Russell

5423 Maple Ridge Ct.

Minnetonka resident for 30 years

From: Rosann Fischer
Sent: Thursday, June 28, 2018 11:39 PM
To: Brad Wiersum
Subject: Against Mountain Biking at Lone Lake Park

I am forwarding this email from Peg Kaplan who is out of town on business.

Dear Minnetonka Park Board and Minnetonka City Council—
In 1991, my husband and I built a home on Bristol Lane in Minnetonka. Though I had lived in Minneapolis or very close to the city for decades, we decided to make a change. As a Realtor, I knew that Minnetonka was a lovely suburb. We fell in love with Bristol Lane and adjacent Lone Lake Park. The beauty of the area, the wildlife, the peaceful trails and nature all appealed to us greatly.

Unfortunately, however, now we are deeply concerned about the impact that proposed Mountain Biking could have on our slice of serenity. We’ve read that the biking could negatively impact the natural living creatures in our area. The bikers and their trails will disrupt the quiet of the current parkland. And the proposed trails will be very close to the homes in our area, bringing noise, disruption and potentially even danger to our homes and families.

Additionally, as a real estate professional, I worry about the impact that this disruption and noise will have on home values. Homeowners in our area pay high taxes to live in an excellent community. We are very concerned that the impact of mountain biking will both lower housing values and make our area much less attractive to future homeowners.

The Twin Cities is blessed with large areas of parkland. Other areas could accommodate biking paths without being so very close to homes, damaging quiet neighborhoods and harming home values.

Please help us preserve the natural beauty and tranquility of Lone Lake Park. We would hate to see the park and settings that have given us much joy for years be irrevocably damaged.

Sincerely,

Peggy Kaplan

5592 Bristol Lane

On Jun 29, 2018, at 5:32 PM, mark blomquist wrote:

Good Evening. I am a home owner with a house that borders the park. Our address is 5587 Bristol Lane and I fear that if this is allowed it will negatively impact our quality of life as well as the wildlife that we enjoy seeing. This park is a precious green area and should not be turned into a playground.

Thank you. Sincerely, Mark Blomquist

From: Polly Bayrd
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2018 4:01 PM
To: bweirsum@eminnetonka.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: re Lone Lake Park and mountain bike proposal
To Mayor Wiersum, Geralyn Barone and City Council Members,

This is my third time communicating with you regarding mountain bike trails in Lone Lake Park. I hope to have the opportunity to express my views at the July 9 City Council Meeting.

It saddens me that the good conservation work we have done there will be set back if the mountain bike trails are allowed. I have been involved in trying to preserve Lone Lake for over thirty years –even before my Park Board time when a number of us convinced the City Council to find another location for lit adult ball fields. Lone Lake is our most ecologically diverse park and it is a lovely and peaceful area. I like mountain biking and agree that it would be wonderful to provide a mountain biking experience in our city. Yes, maybe Lone Lake most closely meets all criteria of MORC and mountain biking groups. However, maybe we need to look at an option that is slightly less “ideal” for them but less impactful on Minnetonka’s most ecologically diverse park.

I do not think that it is valid to compare the impact of biking there with the impact at places like Theodore Wirth or Elm Creek. Those are huge parks where the mountain biking is in separate areas. I believe that mountain biking in Lone Lake will negatively impact wildlife (the trails take up virtually all natural areas left in the park with the exception of wetlands). I also believe that despite the “Share the Park” push of MORC, mountain bikers will in fact push out others. I am not convinced that the “multiple use” concept works with mountain bikes. Even if mountain bikers are polite in approaching from the rear, it is not a pleasant experience to walk where you worry about a bike behind you and where you constantly have to step aside. So I remain opposed to disrupting Lone Lake with trails and increased traffic of all types. I feel we are not being good stewards of our most pristine natural area. I feel we should slow down and re-review other options.

_Having said all that, I want to plan for the possibility that I and my neighbors and fellow environmentalists will lose this fight. So the rest of this letter relates to what I will label “damage control” or “compromise”._

We have no way yet of actually knowing all impacts and no way of knowing use patterns. Many of us fear that there will be very intense use of the park with negative issues related to traffic and safety and peaceful enjoyment of nature. I am aware of Centennial Cone Park in Jefferson County, Colorado that has devised an alternating use program as a compromise. See below or check their website:

_Centennial Cone Park offers a near-backcountry experience, with a 12-mile trail loop that challenges stamina, offers sweeping views of Clear Creek and provides the opportunity to see elk and other wildlife over wide expanses._

**Alternating Use**

On weekends, hike and horseback ride on odd-numbered dates; bike on even-numbered dates.

[See schedule.](#)
Another option would be designating hours for each group. Perhaps walkers have the trail from 10-2 and bikers before and after.

I also worry about winter mountain biking use – especially the impact on wildlife. We are winter hikers and snowshoers in the proposed area of the park and know where the deer bed and the fox and coyote have dens. This would give them no peace and place to retreat. So I think winter mountain biking use should not happen or be very limited.

I think that, if trails go in, there should be an ongoing process in place to evaluate use as well as a more official summary evaluation after a year. Hopefully erosion and danger problems can be remedied swiftly. Feedback from all user groups could help with fine-tuning the plan. And if a worst-case scenario happens where there is abuse or overuse or trails are problematic, the option of trail closure to bikers should be considered.

I think that some members of the pro-preservation anti-trail group should be on a committee with the mountain bike trail advocates so that both points of view can be heard and accommodated. There are a number of reasonable and committed environmentalists and scientists who oppose the park who might ultimately agree to participate if it meant possibly mitigating damage.

Sincerely yours,

Polly Bayrd

Former Park Board Member and Chair

On Jun 30, 2018, at 1:32 PM, Steven Faber wrote:

Council Member,

I am against mountain bikes in Lone Lake Park and if you want me to not campaign against you next election, you’ll not support them either.

Steven Faber

5353 Maple Ridge Court

From: Jack Barbier
Sent: Saturday, June 30, 2018 1:17 PM
To: Patty Acomb; Bob Ellingson; Deborah Calvert; Mike Happe; Tim Bergstedt; Brad Wiersum
Subject: Mountain Bikes in our parks

Well.... so the Park Board votes UNANIMOUSLY to allow mountain bike trails to be sited in Lone Lake Park.

This despite the passionate and well-reasoned pushback from MANY MANY who use to use the park for its peace, quiet, and serenity.

Count me as one who DISAGREES with the Park Board's decision. I urge you to vote NO to trails in Lone Lake.... not until ALL other possible sites for these disruptive trails are thoroughly examined. Advocates
for the park have pointed to at least two other potential sites where bike trails would not be so intrusive.

Make no mistake.... this is an important voting issue for residents like me. I, like many others who enjoy the parks, do NOT support introduction of mountain bike trails. Bikers now have their choice of hundreds of miles of developed trails in Minnetonka. Please don't wreck the only last places that residents can go in the city to get some peace and quiet.

Thanks.

Jack Barbier, ChFC

St.David's Road

---------------------------------------------

From: Jane C. Lenz
Sent: Saturday, June 30, 2018 2:18 PM
To: Brad Wiersum
Subject: Minnetonka resident re Bike Trail

I am against the development of a mountain bike trail in Lone Lake Park. Please do not destroy the beauty of this wonderful park!

---------------------------------------------

From:
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2018 3:40 PM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Tony Wagner <twagner@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Cc: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Mtn Biking in Mtka

Dear Mayor and City Council Persons:

I urge you to proceed with cautious consideration. The report generated by the Parks Dept includes factual inaccuracies (I will list a few of these). There are false narratives being propagated. I encourage you to look at the facts presented you, the source of the facts, and ensure they are indeed facts and not “facts”. I assume the best in people and take this as not knowing better. I am an engineering professor and always look for the teachable moment. However, as I tell my students, “easily verifiable facts that turn out not to be true are lies. Lies call into question your integrity.”

Given that what is prepose at Lone Lake is a single track, sustainably design, 18-24 inch final width, multi-use, beginner trail with some intermediate portions where trails meet. The trails will be 20 feet apart or about the width of a residential street.

The majority of the damage to the park preserve will occur from building of the trail system. This is true for both walking and biking. Regarding building the trail the damage and degradation is on par no matter the use.
As the trails are used however, this is no longer true. The greatest degradation is from starting, stopping, skidding, turning, passing, and the weight of the user. A person on a bike will always weigh more than a person walking. There is a reference cited by the city report that notes that straight downhill, walking can degrade more than biking. This is in the context of downhill mountain biking - think straight down a ski hill. Also unconsolidated soils (think sand dune) walkers punch through. These two cases are not valid in Lone Lake.

Continuing to say that walking and biking are on par is incorrect. [My references are the City’s reference. There main source is a blog post aimed at convincing people into Mountain Biking].

The surface area of a bike tire and two feet are only the same if the bike is stationary. There is approximately 2 feet between steps walking while a bike is continuous.

The statement that shocks on the bike serve to absorb “the bike’s impact with the trail”. Is unequivocally false. Under no circumstances is this true. They isolate the rider from impact not the trail. Junior High science is enough of an education to understand this violates all laws of physics. However, consider if this was true than cars and trucks, all fitted with shocks, would have no impact on the roads.

I have pointed this out to the Park’s department but the errors were not corrected.

Again, I urge you to be smart and sift through the information. Don’t let false narratives such as comparing rarely used informal foot paths, with trails that will be used for racing by young, athletic people (up to 4 HS teams will have this as their closest location). At the same time as walkers. The trails will be most used on weekends over a few hours. Walkers at 3 mph (20 min/mile) and bikers up to 10 mph (6 min/mile). Think of the starting, stopping, skidding, turning and passing that will happen. Biking will certainly have more degradation.

Lone Lake is a Gem, our best natural resource. Biking will degrade the park. Preserve this land. Find an alternate location. Whatever you do, do it for Minnetonka, for the future and not your personal interest. It is so much harder to restore what is damaged than it is to preserve what we have.

Sincerely,

Joan Carter
15500 Oric Ave
Minnetonka, MN 55345

From: Ryan Bayse
Sent: Sunday, July 01, 2018 8:12 PM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Tony Wagner <twagner@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Conserve Lone Lake Park

Hello Mayor Wiersum, Minnetonka City Council Members,
I am writing to you today as a citizen of Minnetonka to share my opposition to the proposed mountain bike trail at Lone Lake Park.

I am a hiker, walker, cyclist and nature lover. I live across Shady Oak Road from Lone Lake Park in Beachside. I walk the trails around Lone Lake Park three to four times per week. I also hike at Murphy-Hanrehan in Savage each weekend, where I park in the mountain bike lot. A few years back a friend and I rode mountain bikes 1000 miles from Rock Springs, Wyoming to Flagstaff, Arizona absent a support vehicle. I am a friend to cyclists.

Lone Lake is small but exceptional park with outstanding character. A credit to the vision of those who set the land aside, good city planning and the park department's care of the park. It's one of my favorite places: anywhere, ever. I feel very lucky to live so close to it. What lends the park its character is the fact that not every square inch of the park is developed with trails, as it would be if this project moves forward. Currently, there are woods, wetlands and open spaces. It's a place you can walk and commune with nature in silence. It's not unusual to see barred owls, mallards, wood ducks, egrets, herons, deer, muskrats and other wildlife. Great effort and wisdom has been exercised in conservation of this wildlife and these areas by your predecessors and past park boards have previously concluded that Lone Lake Park is not the right place for mountain bike trails. Don't be the city council to reverse course on that decision and crowd this park.

When I visit Murphy-Hanrehan in Savage where there are both walking and mountain biking trails, two things strike me. First, the park area is gigantic in relation to tiny-by-comparison Lone Lake Park. There is plenty of room for the two trail types to be in completely separate areas of the park and there are still massive amounts of undeveloped natural acreage. Second is just how busy the parking lot is with cyclists during my visits. Because the lot is large and the areas are separate at Murphy, this is tolerable in that park, however I've reviewed the proposed plans for Lone Lake and I simply cannot imagine how busy the park will become if yet another activity type is added to what is a relatively small park area and the impact it will have on nature and wildlife.

As I understand it, this was simply the best option for a mountain bike trail out of the available options in the existing Minnetonka park system, however that doesn't necessarily translate to it being the right place or this the right decision. Take additional time to expand the search to locate another larger site, the best site, not simply the best site out of available options. This is not a process which should be rushed. Also, consider the plethora of good mountain bike trails already in the Twin Cities. Minnetonka does not necessarily need to have a mountain bike trail to be a great city in which to live.

In addition to hearing arguments from both sides and reviewing the proposal, please, each of you, walk through Lone Lake park in deep reflection on this decision before you vote on this issue on July 9. I am convinced being in the park will represent the most powerful argument you will hear and it will convince you this isn't the right move.

Then, vote in favor of not overdeveloping this small and special park, and erring on the side of being thoughtful and measured about finding the right place to put mountain bike trails in Minnetonka. Don't put them in Lone Lake Park.

Sincerely,

Ryan Bayse
5534 Pompano Drive  
Minnetonka

From: Kimberly Oleson  
Sent: Sunday, July 1, 2018 11:04 AM  
To: Brad Wiersum; Deborah Calvert; Patty Acomb; Bob Ellingson; Tony Wagner; Mike Happe; Tim Bergstedt  
Subject: Minnetonka Citizens Against the Proposed Lone Lake Park Mountain Bike Trails

Dear Mayor Wiersum and the Minnetonka City Council:

I am a Friend of Lone Lake Park and felt it important to document my concerns with the proposed mountain bike paths at Lone Lake Park. In particular, I am concerned with the proposal to procure services from the Minnesota Off-Road Cyclist (MORC) organization to monitor/maintain the Lone Lake Park mountain bike trails.

As outlined in the attachment, the Minnesota Off-Road Cyclist organization is a small, non-profit organization that is simply not yet stable enough from a financial and sustainable volunteer base to be able to meet its ongoing commitments for existing bike paths across the city.

Consistent with fiduciary best practices, I strongly advise the Minnetonka City Council to identify a more reliable, scalable solution to maintain the proposed Lone Lake Park mountain bike trails. I am against proposed mountain bike trails and particularly the procurement of services from a small sole supplier such as the Minnesota Off-Road Cyclist organization.

Thank you, Mayor Wiersum and the Minnetonka City Council, for your valued service to our beautiful city and for considering this citizen concern.

Kimberly Oleson  
5432 Maple Ridge Court  
Minnetonka, MN 55343

From: Marianne Wexler  
Sent: Sunday, July 1, 2018 2:41 PM  
To: Brad Wiersum; Patty Acomb; Bob Ellingson; Tony Wagner; Mike Happe; Tim Bergstedt; Kelly ODea  
Subject: Lone Lake Mtn Bike Trails

I don’t usually get politically involved, but there is a topic that I feel is important because I and most of my neighbors use the Lone Lake Park walking trails just down the road from us. I am an avid walker and use the beautiful walking trails there in the spring, summer and fall as well as snowshoeing in the winter. The natural untouched beauty of this park with its mature trees and steep hills provides a convenient place for exercise and a quiet opportunity to convene with nature.

My concern is that the installation of the mountain bike trails would disturb the pristine nature of the park. These bike trails will be in close proximity to the walking trails no matter what you say or what
was presented at the last meeting that I attended. The Lone Lake Park area consists of only 136 acres and other parks such as Lebanon Hills Park and Theodore Wirth Park that have added mountain bike trails are well over 2,000+ acres. This is the main reason why most are opposing the installation - the two activities should have enough room to be able to be enjoyed by itself without impacting each other physically or otherwise.

In addition, the mountain bike trails will attract more users from outside the Minnetonka area, increase traffic and will complicate the already limited parking availability that we already experience. It also goes without saying that the environmental impact for the plants, trees, and wildlife will be affected more than just having pedestrians or hikers.

As a parent of 3 boys who were highly involved in high school and college athletics, I do understand the importance of having a "practice" area somewhat in close proximity to the high school but 2 of my boys were downhill ski racers and becoming involved with a non-traditional high school sport such as this, we knew that we would have to travel distances for practices and races. For the high school mountain bike athletes, although it would be more convenient to have a "practice" area nearby, it seems to me that to change the "nature" of a park for their own use without considering the needs of those already using and enjoying the park, is selfish.

I left that meeting feeling as if I was let down by the City of Minnetonka. Over and over I heard comments from the supporters of the mountain bike trails that Minnetonka is a suburb of "older" people and that it was imperative to add features such as the mountain bike trails in order to attract younger families. I am aware that the Minnetonka schools are popular and in demand by many young families currently. School systems that excel like Minnetonka are supported by voting tax payers who are committed to building a strong tax base. Lots of the "older" folks are the ones contributing to this tax base.

I have been a resident of Minnetonka for over 35 years and own a business in the Opus Industrial Park of Minnetonka for the same amount of time. As a taxpayer and loyal supporter of the life in Minnetonka, I am opposed to the proposed Mountain Bike Trails at Lone Lake Park. I am hoping that you have not already made your decision and will take into consideration the feelings, concerns and needs of the

Marianne Wexler
6003 Clarion Pass

On Jul 1, 2018, at 8:12 PM, Rosann Fischer < > wrote:

Dear Council and Mayor,

We have lived in Minnetonka for the past 25 years. We are against Mountain Biking in Lone Lake Park. I want to bring to your attention MORC'S Facebook pages. For your convenience, I have attached the Facebook page posts.

MORC's Battle Creek Mountain Bike Trail Facebook page:

1. Posted on May 8, 2018 "The MORC leadership at Battle Creek Mountain Bike Trail is going through a transition right now. Pending the announcement of a new Trail Steward all work sessions and group rides are on hold."
2. Posted on Oct 7, 2017 "We've had quite a few people riding wet trails lately as evidenced by the big tire ruts."

3. Posted on July 11, 2017 "We did a little trail widening on the return from the overlook (aka Travis's Trail)."

4. Posted on June 20, 2017 "Trail is reported as "tacky" and good to ride as of Tue evening."

5. Posted on June 18, 2017 "As of 10:30 the trail is damp but rideable."

6. Posted on June 2, 2017 "We do have one trouble spot "The Luge". A major erosion rut has opened up and is even undermining the trail on one spot. Use EXTREME caution at the bottom of the luge for both the rut itself and the bomb hole that is forming in the trail tread."

7. Posted on May 25, 2017 "I'm calling it damp but it's a really mixed bag at BC right now. For the most part is is fine and probably tacky. But we've had so much rain over the last week that we have water accumulating at the bottom of the hills. The bottom of the "Drop into Pine" is pretty much a swamp. Please ride straight through the mud rather than making the trail wider. Otherwise enjoy the ride and watch for a couple of greasy turns and climbs."

MORC'S Lebanon Hills Mountain Bike Trail Facebook Page:

8. Posted on June 12, 2018 "so the trail is likely still sloppy. If you do attempt to ride, please turn around if it gets to slick/muddy."

Back in 2003, the Minnetonka City Council decided to close down the Frisbee Golf because it was damaging the grass [our son enjoyed the sport immensely]. Now in 2018, you are considering Mountain Biking in Lone Lake Park which will have a significantly more long-term impact on the park than the ruining grass. In the Mountain Bikers OWN WORDS THEY STATED "their organization is going through a transition, people are riding wet trails as evidenced by the big tire ruts, they do trail widening, ride when the soil is tacky, ride when trail is damp, have major erosion and have a bomb hole, ride through the mud and watch for greasy turns, the trail is sloppy and if you ride turn around if it's slick."

Please vote NO.

Rosann Fischer & Michael Urbanos

5512 Bristol Lane

Minnetonka

On Jul 1, 2018, at 1:57 PM, BILL STEINBICKER <t> wrote:

As a Minnetonka resident, I have three questions about the mountain biking proposal in Lone Lake Park, under consideration at your July 9th city council meeting:

1. Will the proposed 4-mile mountain biking trail enhance or detract from the city's reputation for natural beauty and a legacy landscape?

Minnetonka has remarkable support for its parks, wetlands and other open areas. Talented natural resource staff and hundreds of volunteers have worked tirelessly to restore natural areas and remnant
landscapes. Have you visited other city’s parks? Centennial Lakes in Edina is nice – if you like concrete. Richfield has two wonderful birding areas – right along the expressway.

2. **What measures will the city take prevent the spread of invasive species, especially garlic mustard, in Lone Lake Park, if mountain bike trails win approval?**

The spread of invasive species is a real threat to Minnetonka (and the state’s) open areas, causing destruction of prized landscapes so critical to native wildlife, pollinators and birds. Again, Minnetonka’s natural resources department has trained many volunteers to remove invasives from their property and the parks. Research suggests that mountain bikers wash their bikes after riding thru sensitive areas, to prevent the spread of invasives. All residents and non-residents must be encouraged and empowered to preserve and protect community assets.

3. **Will the city listen to ALL its constituents before making a decision on this issue?** The last time that happened, the city developed a beloved park – Purgatory – and the Glen Lake Golf Course.

Please think about what will be gained by this mountain biking proposal, but more importantly, what will be lost. Thank you for your consideration.

Mary H. Steinbicker

15702 Woodgate Rd. South

Minnetonka, MN  55345

On Jul 2, 2018, at 4:10 AM, Luke Van Santen wrote:

Councilmember Wagner -

Greetings! My name is Luke Van Santen. My family and I have lived in Minnetonka (2148 Sheridan Hills Road) for the last 15+ years.

I’m writing this message to you in regards to the proposed mountain bike (singletrack) trail in Lone Lake Park that the Park Board recently voted unanimously to recommend to the Council for approval. As I am sure you are aware, the Park Board underwent a relatively lengthy process to assess the pros and cons of the trail, engaging the public in numerous open houses, Board meetings, and through other communications. City staff also conducted a relatively intensive investigation, design, and evaluation process that resulted in their creation of a plan and report that clearly indicated the proposed trail would serve as a strong benefit to City and regional residents and would do so with a minimum of (largely mitigateable) adverse impacts.

People opposed to the trail presented several concerns, a couple of which have some degree of merit (many of the other concerns they presented seemed to rely on their willful lack of knowledge about construction, maintenance, and operation of singletrack trails and a seemingly willing mischaracterization of mountain bikers). The items where opponents were justifiably concerned were disruption of habitat for the rusty patched bumblebee (a Federally listed Endangered species) and erosion of areas where the trail is proposed to be constructed. As the City’s report and citizen testimony
regarding the proposed trail clearly state, both of these concerns can be easily addressed through mitigation measures (avoidance of winter nesting sites and planting of additional food sources for bumblebees and best-practice management of the trail once constructed through a Memorandum of Understanding for maintenance with the Minnesota Off Road Cyclists (MORC) organization). I hope that the communications I feel certain you have received from people opposed can be viewed in light of these truths.

People who supported the creation of the proposed trails recognized several of the same concerns (and recognized they could be mitigated) but more importantly recognized numerous benefits associated with the proposed trail. A primary benefit to having this trail in Minnetonka is that it would be easier for kids (and their families) to be more active outdoors - this has long been an area where Minnetonka has been head and shoulders above neighboring cities. Another primary benefit would be that members of middle and high school mountain bike teams could practice their sport without being required to drive 25 minutes or more to access singletrack trails. Some secondary benefits include: increased public interest in, and support for maintenance of, Minnetonka's parks; some level of increased patronage of local businesses; increased desirability of Minnetonka to potential (and existing!) residents; and environmental sustainability from people being able to bike to recreation instead of having to drive. I hope these benefits can be in the front of your mind as you consider the proposed trail.

In addition to the many benefits identified by proponents, and because the concerns put forward by opponents can be mitigated, and based on my involvement in and knowledge of mountain biking, and the strong and complete effort put forth by City staff in evaluating the proposed trail, and with the transparency of the public engagement process overseen by the Park Board and City staff, I would like to express my strong support for this trail (and hopefully more, in the near future!). I would also like to respectfully ask that you support this proposal and, when it is before you for your consideration, that you vote in favor of building this singletrack trail in Lone Lake Park.

Cordially,

Luke Van Santen

2148 Sheridan Hills Road (55391)

From: Alina Emmers
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2018 2:51 PM
To: Corrine Heine <cheine@emminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake Park - proposed mountain bike trail

Ms. Heine;

Attached is correspondence from Marshall Tanick. The original will follow via US mail.
Thank you,

Alina Emmers
Paralegal
Meyer Njus Tanick
330 Second Avenue South
Suite 350
Minneapolis, MN 55401
July 2, 2018

Corryn Heine
City Attorney
City of Minnetonka
14600 Minnetonka Boulevard
Minnetonka, Minnesota 55345-1597
Email—cheine@minnetonka.com

Re: Lone Lake Park—Proposed Mountain Bike Trail

Dear Ms. Heine:

I am writing to follow-up my call to you regarding the above matter.

This letter is written on behalf of Protect Our Minnetonka Park (POMP), an organization consisting of a number of residents of the City of Minnetonka.

They are very concerned about the proposal, which I understand may come before the City Council at its next meeting, Monday July 9, 2018.

I recognize that the creation of the proposed 4.7 mile bike trail through portions of the Park has been the matter of considerable concern, comment, and controversy, and as a relatively belated newcomer to the matter I do not have definitive views or conclusions as I get up to speed.

However, my preliminary review and analysis suggests that adoption of the proposal in its current state or any close similarity to it would have material adverse impact on natural resources of the City, including degradation of land, air, and water, and the multitude of these negative effects would be violative of the rights of POMP and others under the Minnesota Environmental Rights Act, Minn. Stat. Section 116B.01, et. seq.

At least seven of those detrimental "environmental impacts" are reflected in the Biological Assessment prepared by SEH. In order to avoid redundancy, I will not recount them. However, the steps suggested in the SEH report to avoid or minimize those detrimental effects will not wholly or even substantially allay the concerns recited in the Assessment.

Lone Lake Park is very biodiverse; creating such a lengthy trail through its heart will attack that biodiversity in a number of unfavorable ways, including but not limited to the following:

• it will threaten the existence of endangered species, such as the rusty patch bumble bee;
• it will further impair activities that need intact nature areas;
• it will degrade biodiversity in ways that are harmful to the public health, welfare, and safety, including increasing the presence of West Nile virus and Lyme disease carriers, along with nuisances bugs like black flies;
• it will result in an increase in other invasive species;
• it will reduce safety of patrons of the Park;
• it will create increased noise;
• it will create undue traffic and parking problems in the area;
• it will contribute to increased dust and other pollutants;
• it will, by coming as close as some three feet from private property lines, create disturbances for those homeowners and residents; and
• it will result in erosion of wetland areas.

In addition to those discernible effects, the trail would irreversibly change the character of the Park while also limiting other activities and age ranges of patrons who have enjoyed the Park for years.

These detrimental effects will undermine the large investment the City and community have made in the Park, dating back to the substantial monetary upgrade in excess of $200,000 several years ago, along with untold hours and resources devoted by volunteers to improve, upgrade, and preserve the Park in its natural state.

Because of these concerns, POMP respectfully requests that any action on the mountain bike proposal be rejected or, at minimum, deferred pending further consideration.

POMP is prepared to take appropriate legal action to protect and preserve its rights and those of its members, supporters, and others in the community—and those from outside of it as well.

POMP hopes, as do I, that such legal action is made unnecessary by thoughtful deliberations and decision-making concerning this matter that means so much to so many.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or I can provide any further information.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Yours Very Truly,

Meyer Nick Tanick

Marshall H. Tanick
Mayor Wiersum and Mr. Maeda,

Please see the attached letter, which is also being sent to you via U.S. Mail. Thank you.

Jason
July 3, 2018

VIA U.S. MAIL AND EMAIL

David Maeda  Brad Wiersum
City Clerk  Mayor
City of Minnetonka  City of Minnetonka
14600 Minnetonka Boulevard  14600 Minnetonka Boulevard
Minnetonka, MN 55345  Minnetonka, MN 55345
dmaeda@eminnetonka.com  bwiersum@eminnetonka.com

Re:  Minn. R. 4410.1100 Citizens' Petition for the Preparation of an EAW for the Proposed Mountain Biking Trail in Lone Lake Park, Minnetonka, Minnesota

Dear Mayor Wiersum and Mr. Maeda:

The purpose of this letter is to provide notice to the City of Minnetonka that a Petition for the Preparation of an Environmental Assessment Worksheet has been submitted to the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board with respect to the proposed mountain biking trail project at Lone Lake Park.

Sincerely,

Jason R. Asmus

Briggs and Morgan, Professional Association
Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity Employer
-----Original Message-----
From: Rosie Norton
Sent: Thursday, July 5, 2018 8:09 AM
To: Merrill King <mking@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Funds for trails

I oppose any funds that will be used for the mountain bike trail if it goes through for Lone Lake. I think this franchise fee “with 85% of residents supporting” did not mean for any mountain bike trail but for those proposed walking, biking trails that were proposed prior to the June 6 meeting.

I am so disappointed that Minnetonka Park Board passed on the mountain bike trail to the City Council. I have sent Mr. Ellingson my letter. Thank you. Rosemary Norton, 11324 Clarion Way***

-----Original Message-----
From: Barb Stabno
Sent: Thursday, July 05, 2018 11:42 AM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake Park

Hello

I have learned that a privately held company will be managing the mountain bike trail if approved.

Can you please share with me the name of the company? I would be interested in learning about their experience and more importantly, their expectations for the growth with the influx of traffic/people to the area and the economic impact. Crosby MN added mountain bike trails and the town has exploded with visitors. Does the city have any other privately held companies managing any part of the park and rec system? My concern is that this is no longer a recreational mountain bike trail for the residence of Minnetonka. It will become a profit center for the privately held company and a destination for many from miles around.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Barb Stabno
5338 Dominick Drive
Minnetonka, MN 55343

-----Original Message-----
From: Andy Shea
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 10:50 AM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone lake

I oppose the mountain bike trail proposed for Lone Lake. My reasons are conservation of beautiful wild space and threat to wildlife.
Andy Shea

Sent from my iPhone

From: Andy Shea  
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; DebCalvert@; AtLarge@; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; AtLarge@; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; BobEllingson@; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; TonyWagner@; Tony Wagner <twagner@eminnetonka.com>; MikeHappe@; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; TimBergstedt@; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: Proposed Mountain Bike Trails at Lone Lake Park  

Dear Mayor, Council Members and City Recreation Director--

I live on Bristol Lane, on the edge of Lone Lake Park. 27 years ago, we built our home in this lovely area of Minnetonka to enjoy the serene and natural beauty it provided. Since then, we have enjoyed the natural setting, the trails, the wildlife and more that surround us.

Now, however, we have deep concerns about the proposed mountain bike trails.

First and foremost, we worry about noise, privacy and safety. Part of what is so special about our area is the quiet and peaceful surroundings. Walking on current trails, we can enjoy the seasons and serenity. Allowing mountain biking, literally steps from some of the homes and trails, will destroy the peaceful and quiet nature of our area. Additionally, we worry about having many who will come from areas outside of our neighborhood and Minnetonka disrupting our home life and perhaps our safety. Ll oud and fast moving mountain bikes steps from our homes can endanger both people and property.

Secondly, we have concern for the beautiful settings and wildlife in Lone Lake Park. It will be impossible for the mountain bikes to not have a negative effect on both. Again, harming the trees, plants, shrubs and various animals and birds that we cherish will be tragic for our area.

Finally, as a Realtor since 1981, I have deep concern about the impact of mountain bikes on home values. Residents who live here in large part chose this area because of the benefits of beauty, nature, quiet and privacy. Damage these aspects of our neighborhood - not to mention potential damage to the homes themselves with the bikes so near - cannot help but have a deleterious on home values. Needless to say, this will not only harm the neighborhoods themselves, it will impact tax revenue as home values go down.

In the years that I have enjoyed our neighborhood and Lone Lake Park, many walk our paths and ride bikes. I welcome others being able to come to Lone Lake Park and share this special area.

Please reject the plan to allow mountain bike trails in Lone Lake Park. Other areas are far more conducive for such an activity; this is not the location for it.
I, my neighbors and the many people who currently enjoy our area as it is thank you so much for your consideration and for helping us to preserve a slice of nature, beauty and quiet in beautiful Minnetonka!

Sincerely,

Peggy Kaplan

5592 Bristol Lane

Minnetonka

From: Tony Wagner
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 6:12 PM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Fwd: Lone Lake

For the record

Tony Wagner

Minnetonka City Council, Ward 2

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Joan Ungar, Minnetonka resident

To: Tony Wagner

Sent: Monday, July 09, 2018 8:29 AM
To: ; Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Re: Lone Lake Park
Kelly — Per our dialogue below, can you add Helen’s comment to any upcoming council packet on the Mountain Biking proposal

Tony Wagner
Minnetonka City Council, Ward 2

On Jul 7, 2018, at 5:05 PM, Helen Strand > wrote:

Hello Tony,

Thanks for getting back to me. You wanted me to "Let me know if you would like me to forward your comments to city staff so that they will be captured for the record and future council packets."

Please do, here is the e-mail I sent you while I was out of town on July 4th.

Hello Tony,

Apparently the park board recently approved a mountain bike trail plan to be implemented immediately in Lone Lake Park. This park was designated a preserve 18 years ago; this park has been in restoration for decades and should not host a 5 mile Mountain bike trail in it’s very limited space. Apparently, the city of Minnetonka has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in restoring this park.

There is a petition that will be turned into the city of Minnetonka Thursday morning asking many important questions that have gone unanswered about the best usage of this park. As my representative, please look at this petition carefully before making any decisions on the use of Lone Lake park as a new place for a 5 mile mountain biking trail.

Thank you,

Helen Strand
10412 Crestridge Dr.

Minnetonka, Minnesota

-----------------------------------------------

On Jul 4, 2018, at 11:03 AM, Jerrold Gershone < wrote:

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I am in opposition to the proposed mountain biking trails at Lone Lake Park.

Having volunteered many hours in restoration/invasive species removal in Minnetonka parks, I know the uniqueness and importance of what we have in Lone Lake Park. The city showed great foresight when it designated parts of Lone Lake Park a community preserve for passive use.

The proposed mountain biking trails would cause irreparable harm to the park. One only has to look at the proposed map to see how the trails would slice and dice the park. Anytime there is that much fragmentation it damages a natural area - loss of vegetation, invasive species spread, erosion, compaction of soil affecting trees, disturbance of wildlife. I heard the hired biologist present at the park
board meeting. He said his assessment of environmental impacts was based on his opinion and had not
been quantified. I believe the impacts need to be quantified before such a drastic decision is made. I’ve
heard the argument that there are already informal walking trails in the park. The intensity and
frequency of use of the mountain biking trails would dwarf the current usage and drastically change the
character and ecology of the park. The proposed mountain biking trails are certainly not consistent with
the preserve designation and passive use.

Other concerns include the trails being designated multi-use. I don’t see how an 18-24 inch trail could be
safe for use by mountain bikers and hikers/walkers. Another concern is the long term maintenance of
the trails. Relying on volunteers that are increasingly spread thin by the number of mountain biking trails
may not be a good long term option. If and when the interest in this sport peaks then relying on
volunteers would get more difficult.

The city of Minnetonka has invested 20 years and close to a quarter of a million dollars making the
majority of Lone Lake Park the amazing natural area it is today. It is a respite for humans and provides a
refuge for animals and native plants in a city that will only get more populated and dense as time goes
by. Let’s not squander the foresight and investment the city has made. Allowing the mountain biking
trails would turn this park into a course primarily for a single use.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jerrold Gershone

13111 April Lane
Minnetonka

On Jul 9, 2018, at 4:29 PM, Diana Norris wrote:

“Compaction decreases water infiltration. Less infiltration combined with the removal of duff and fallen
leaves result in increased surface runoff and erosion.” This is from the Mn DNR about earthworms
which are not native and are invasive to our forests. The U of Mn is doing studies on this.
We are not against mountain biking per se, but biking at a small area with homes all around and an
important, unique ecosystem that could be impulsively and permanently damaged for a short season
sport.
We don’t believe that enough studies have been done, or larger , alternative spots have been sought
out. No soil samples have been taken, nor consultations with the army corps of engineers , or
naturalists, or the DNR. The problem with the earthworms is not that the large trees are in danger, but
the seedlings and new growth of wildflowers are by compaction and erosion. There will be compaction
with mountain bikes, too.

Lone Lake is such a small area , that a friend said his mountain biking son would never mountain bike
there when there are many larger areas to choose from.

Parking has not been considered, since there are other activities using the park already.

There are groups that enjoy the park as it is: families, dog walkers, hikers, pleasure bikers, picnickers,
nature lovers, bird watchers and photographers. If there are rare bees, please protect them, as well as
possible nesting eagles.
I respectfully ask you to reconsider the park boards recommendations, at least until more impact studies have been done and other larger alternative sites, such as the boys school have been explored. 

Diana, Sent from my iPad

From: Sherri Quick  
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2018 9:43 AM  
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: Mountain biking vs endangered species

Good morning,

How can you justify risking the endangered rusty bumblebee in favor of bikes?

If you don’t know where the nests are how can you be certain you’re not going to push them out? If the mountain bikers are truly “environmentally friendly” they wouldn’t consider this risk.

Where do you stand?

Thanks for listening.

Sherri

Greetings!

As someone who spent 20 years among road builders on a natural resources team, I know the many unintended consequences road disturbances cause. Trails are just smaller versions of roads, but with similar impacts.

Roads and trails divide communities, in Lone Lake Park - communities of plants and animals, changing their future course. Roads and trails displace/kill plants and animals.

This will decrease diversity within Minnetonka’s proud natural resource mission. Roads and trails increase plant invasion.

Invasive plants become noxious weeds and will increase the City’s control costs. Roads and trails increase erosion.

People do not stay on the road or trail, causing more damage.

To think mountain bikers WILL NOT disturb more than the defined trail is naive!

The riders’ fun will not end at the edge of the trail. And the above consequences will be exacerbated.

All this will lead to the unintended consequences of increased costs to Minnetonka’s budget and lost diversity of plants and animals that cannot be restored.

You need to focus on protecting our plant communities and controlling invasive plants.

I don’t think Minnetonka can afford the consequences of bike disturbance within the City. Please do not allow mountain biking in Lone Lake park. Please take your time to locate an already disturbed area like a sand/gravel pit, or partner with an adjacent city to share such a place. Engage bikers and the neighborhood in planting pollinator habitat and trees for a future biking forest. Let’s take a longer view of what the future could look like in terms of both economic and ecological costs.
Sincerely,
Bonnie L. Harper-Lore
Restoration Ecologist, Ret.
July 6, 2018

Hello Kelly,

You asked if I would send you my letter in another form. Here it is in the form that I most prefer.

"This morning I had the opportunity to walk a trail in Lone Lake Park with a friend. The trail was one that I had never been on before today.

However, prior to reaching the trail-head, we found ourselves picking up litter (particularly cigarette butts) that had been strewn carelessly though out the parking lot behind the tennis courts. As a water steward, I am often flabbergasted at the lack of awareness of my fellow species regarding the damage litter & cigarette butts, in particular, cause our environment.

Moving on, my friend and I began walking uphill along a path that led us into an area of larger trees (some he estimated to be over 80 years old). At one point, I noticed a large boulder and asked my friend about its presence there. He communicated that the area was once glacial, as is much of our lake-filled state. There was something about the "long ago" that touched me."
Walking in the light rain, we saw many native plants, e.g., Solomon’s Seal, Jack-In-The-Pulpit, Baneberry, Wood Lilies, Maidenhair ferns and a variety of mushrooms that were colored bright red, orange, shades of brown and cream. Ones that I had never seen before.

As we reached the top of the hill and looked down, facing us was a young doe. She stayed watching us for a time as we walked slowly along the trail with the open woodlands on either side of us. This area, my friend pointed out, had been restored by many people over many years. And, without the invasives choking the Life out of the area, I felt like I was breathing the Earth’s breath!

The sound of an Indigo Bunting followed us as we walked out of Lone Lake Park.

Please protect this Preserve and find another place to give the mountain bikers what they want!”

Thank you.

Carol Weber
5223 Silver Maple Circle
Minnetonka, Mn. 55343

Kelly, thank you for your time and consideration.
On Jul 9, 2018, at 4:29 PM, Diana Norris wrote:

“Compaction decreases water infiltration. Less infiltration combined with the removal of duff and fallen leaves result in increased surface runoff and erosion.” This is from the Mn DNR about earthworms which are not native and are invasive to our forests. The U of Mn is doing studies on this. We are not against mountain biking per se, but biking at a small area with homes all around and an important, unique ecosystem that could be impulsively and permanently damaged for a short season sport.

We don’t believe that enough studies have been done, or larger, alternative spots have been sought out. No soil samples have been taken, nor consultations with the army corps of engineers, or naturalists, or the DNR. The problem with the earthworms is not that the large trees are in danger, but the seedlings and new growth of wildflowers are by compaction and erosion. There will be compaction with mountain bikes, too.

Lone Lake is such a small area, that a friend said his mountain biking son would never mountain bike there when there are many larger areas to choose from.

Parking has not been considered, since there are other activities using the park already.

There are groups that enjoy the park as it is: families, dog walkers, hikers, pleasure bikers, picnickers, nature lovers, bird watchers and photographers. If there are rare bees, please protect them, as well as possible nesting eagles.

I respectfully ask you to reconsider the park boards recommendations, at least until more impact studies have been done and other larger alternative sites, such as the boys school have been explored.

Diana, Sent from my iPad

---

From: Oestenstad's
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2018 7:26 AM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacom@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Tony Wagner <twagner@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Cc: Kelly O'Dea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Opposed to mountain biking in Lone Lake Park!

To: Minnetonka City Council:

I am writing to urge you to reject the proposal for Mountain Biking at Lone Lake park.

Much of the appeal of Minnetonka in my opinion are the mature trees and nature areas. But every time you turn around there are houses getting torn down, beautiful trees or small pockets of woods removed, with large mansions or high density housing or commercial buildings being built. Once you destroy nature, it may be gone forever, or take many years to build it back up again while losing important natives. Please please I deplore you to not destroy one of the few remaining many acres of nature areas in our city that is enjoyed by a large number of hikers, bird watchers, dog walkers, nature lovers, joggers, and neighbors who relish being able to get away to a quiet peaceful area and commune with nature. In addition, it is home to much wildlife and flora and fauna that will potentially be displaced and/or lost. I have frequently enjoyed hiking, bird watching, observing the beautiful wild flowers, etc in
this park. We once had a perfect view of a barred owl not far off the path. Many of these wonderful amenities will possibly be jeopardized by all the proposed disruption of added trails.

This park is a beautiful natural area that was designated a “community preserve” several years ago by the city itself. As the study stated, there has been significant effort to restore it and eradicate invasive species. Why potentially ruin or damage such a gem? There will be loss of many trees and natives during the trail building and possibly long-term root damage of any trees left close to the trail, as well as displacement of wildlife (including possibly some threatened species). And more invasive species will likely be brought in by the bikers. I am quite concerned about the biological study distributed at the open house of all the possible negative impacts. These include: loss of vegetation, removal of trees and shrubs, spread of invasives, soil erosion and compaction, disturbance to wildlife, increase in noise and dust from more traffic, disruption of solitude for other park users, & possible impact to wetland areas. While I think the plan tries to minimize these effects, by building 4+ miles of trails with possible high usage, they are going to happen, and this is a huge negative in my mind that makes the plan unfeasible and is reason enough to reject the plan. In addition, much of the trail crosses the high value restoration areas where many have worked hard to restore. The trail connections in these areas, while tried to keep to a minimum, will still have a huge negative impact, virtually undoing a lot of the hard work that has been done to restore the areas over the years.

I feel that this is all being driven by a very vocal special interest group, perhaps few of which actually reside in Minnetonka. (How do we know this is not a fad that will fade down the road, like skateboard parks?) It was pointed out by the Conserve Lone Lake group that only 51 actually requests were made during the Imagine Minnetonka campaign, and not all were local residents. And I have heard that there will be trails built in Braemer park which is relatively close. I am guessing if you have the real facts, that the aforementioned existing park users would greatly outnumber the prospective “local” mountain bikers. And, while the MORC group says they will maintain it, how do we know this will happen long term? What’s to keep bikers from crossing the “closed” signs during wet conditions and ruining the trails, other than the honor system? In addition, do we have adequate parking in the park people that drive to the new trails?

I also don’t see the trails being multi-use, which is supposed to be one of the plusses to the trail. It is too narrow. I for one would not like to be on a trail always fearing that a biker was coming around the corner, and having to get off the trail for them to pass. It seems it could be very dangerous and not a pleasant hike for foot traffic. So while you are advertising that it will be multi-use I would doubt that will be the case. So in effect we have lost a lot of informal trail use at the park for those on foot.

Also from the literature:

"...it is the City Forester's opinion that mountain biking activity is not compatible with natural resources restoration efforts currently in place. Lone Lake park was chosen as one of the first restoration areas because it has a diverse natural area that needs protection. Development of the proposed mountain bike trail would prevent vegetation from becoming established and create erosion problems and would not seem to be an appropriate use for the site."

From the April 4, 2001 Park Board Memorandum
...Why cave now to pressure primarily from a special interest group spearheaded by a high school biking clubs and a metro wide bike group? We already have many wonderful biking trails in the city. Is it to attract more residents? I feel that residents are more attracted to beautiful preserves and wild areas in our community! Please don’t spoil this one for the pleasure of a few. And please preserve this wonderful park for future generations to enjoy. **I don’t feel that city staff has been listening to the group that opposes the trail, but that their minds were already made up to proceed when they did the study. Are there no other areas that could support such a trail without possibly ruining, or severely impacting prime existing space? It seems there could be a compromise reached here. What about where the home school was or along the i494 corridor? I am very disappointed that our opinions are being seemingly ignored, and our questions aren’t being addressed.**

Thanks for your consideration.

Betty Oestenstad

p.s. I also agree with all the concerns expressed on the Conserve Lone Lake website and all the letters to the editor of local papers in opposition to this proposal, expressed more eloquently than I am capable of!

---

**From:** Jack Culbertson  
**Sent:** Monday, July 16, 2018 11:07 AM  
**To:** Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>  
**Subject:** Mountain Bike Proposal for Lone Lake

Hello Kelly,

I wanted to extend my thanks for the Minnetonka Parks and Rec for proposing and hopefully continuing with the approval and installation of a mountain bike trail at Lone Lake.

Adding a mountain bike trail will provide a designated location for mountain bike enthusiasts to enjoy our beautiful city and park. I have traveled to other parts of the greater Metro area and having a permanent designated mountain bike trail here in Minnetonka is welcomed and exciting news. This opens up usage to our park in an area that is not currently enjoyed by anyone.

Keep up the good work. I'm sure you will take into consideration the necessary requirements for erosion abatement and other environmental needs. Having a designated path prevents unauthorized and "informal" trails from developing and those can do harm. A well planned and maintained path protects the environment and enables outdoor enthusiasts and conservationists to use and enjoy our city safely!

---

Regards,

Jack Culbertson
From: Sarah Routman  
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 4:43 PM  
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: Feedback on Mountain Biking Trails at Lone Lake Park

I am not in favor of adding Mountain Biking Trails to Lone Lake Park. I walk there frequently and do not feel it would add to my experience, but would, instead, take away from the tranquility I enjoy walking in the park almost daily.

Please let me know where you stand on this issue.

Thank you.
Sarah Routman

From: Lucinda Medina  
Sent: Tuesday, July 24, 2018 1:36 PM  
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; dcalvert@eminnetonka.com; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Tony Wagner <twagner@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: PROTECT LONE LAKE PARK

I have lived across the street from Lone Lake Park for over 20 years. I always feel such gratitude to have this sanctuary in my back yard--a place to escape the day-to-day grind. I have enjoyed seeing close up wild life and birds that took my breath away.

This beautiful park must be protected and preserved!

I strongly oppose mountain bike trails that will be detrimental to all the dollars and resources expended to maintain this natural refuge.

Lucinda Medina

5538 Sanibel Drive

From: Betty Wentworth  
Sent: Tuesday, July 24, 2018 4:32 PM  
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn
Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: To people who represent me in Mtk

Hi

I have lived on Bimini drive not far from Long Lake park for 21 years.

A few times I volunteered there to pull garlic mustard. And I regularly hear about the wildlife that lives there.

While I am sure that many mountain bikers are responsible folks, I wish that the animals, birds and native plants would not have to deal with the bikers speeding through

and disturbing the natural environment.

I oppose the montain bike trails. In my 50 years as a Mtk resident, I have been impressed with the dedication to keeping things natural

This just does not fit!!

Please vote against.

Thank you

Betty Wentworth

5516 Bimini Drive, 55343

From: Craig
Sent: Saturday, July 14, 2018 2:35 PM
To: Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake Park

The first time I visited Lone Lake Park I was awestruck. It was a place of serene beauty, as though God had plucked a bit of the north woods and set in middle of the city. As a citizen of Minnetonka I am against carving up this park for the sake of replacing its serenity with the rough and tumble of mountain biking.

From: Dennis HENSCHE
Date: July 25, 2018 at 3:17:36 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, twagner@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com, gbarone@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com,
Dear Madams and Sirs,

I am writing about the proposal to build a mountain bike trail in Lone Lake Park. I think the trail should be built. I live across Shady Oak Road from the park and hike in the park weekly. I think I have hiked every unmarked trail in the park and know that the vast majority of the park cannot be seen by people walking on the established walk ways. I am a mountain biker myself and believe that mountain bikers are not loud and obnoxious people. They are mostly just interested in riding. Except for when people crash mountain biking is not a noisy sport. I understand that there is an organized effort to block the building of the trail. I think they are being selfish. I love the park every bit as much as they do. As is, the park is under utilized and I don’t think mountain bikers are going to cause many problems.

Thank you,

Dennis Hensche

5642 Pompano Dr.

From: Bev Erickson
Sent: Thursday, July 26, 2018 12:06 PM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Tony Wagner <twagner@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>; Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Protect Lone lake Park

I strongly oppose mountain biking at Lone Lake Park.

I have lived across Shady Oak Road from Lone Lake Park for 26 years.

Since I moved here, traffic and noise on Shady Oak Road has increased tenfold. I can only imagine that getting even worse with mountain biking, a draw for mountain bikers from all over, not just in our local community. Also parking within the park would become a problem for other park users.
One of the reasons I’ve stayed for 26 years is that Lone Lake Park provides a respite from the fast pace we live today, with a natural and tranquil environment which is getting harder to find in today's world. It is our duty and responsibility and in our best interest as humans, to protect our natural environment for the future of the environment, wildlife and humans. To turn our beautiful park and preserve into a venue for mountain bikers sole entertainment would be the end of our natural and serene park as we know it.

Lone lake Park is not compatible to the "sport" of mountain biking. A mountain bike is specifically designed for riding on mountainous terrain and other challenging surfaces and obstacles. It promotes aggressive thrill-taking, exciting, competitive actions capable of reckless high speeds from 20 to 40 miles per hour, which is a prerequisite for mountain bikers and a safety issue for others who frequent the park; Mountain biking is considered a dangerous sport, something we do not want and should not want to incorporate into our park.

There is no doubt mountain biking would greatly increase trail traffic, noise and disruption and have an impact on safety in an otherwise tranquil environment, which is rapidly becoming extinct in many other venues in our country with proposals and other human interventions.

Mountain biking, provided solely for a special interest group, would discourage residents who live here and pay the taxes from using the park and would create a negative affect overall. As a concerned longtime Minnetonka resident and taxpayer, I am not in favor of making the changes to provide mountain biking in Lone Lake Park, which would alter the landscape and destroy the ambience of the park forever!!.

Beverly Erickson
5514 Sanibel Drive
Minnetonka, MN 55343

From: Mark Bauer
Sent: Saturday, July 28, 2018 3:06 PM
To: Bob Ellingson; Brad Wiersum
Subject: Re: City bike trail Franchise Fee

Once again, I am emailing you about decisions that you make for all of us in Minnetonka.

........The "MOUNTAIN" biking decision delayed.............

I have been riding the streets and alleys and byways of the "URBAN" biking system for more
than 40 years and have never felt the need to ask the city to grant me special access to biking trails at the tax payers expense.

Note the word..."Mountain "..not urban trail.

Please go on record apposing both the mountain bike trail at Lone Lake and the franchise fee for added special interest trails.

It would be nice to hear back from you in regard to this matter this time so that I know where you stand....as I haven't so far.

Mark

PS
Still looking for the project location plans.

On Sun, Jul 8, 2018 at 10:17 AM, Mark Bauer wrote:

Dear Mr. Bob Ellington,

I live in Ward 1 and I opposed the franchise fee to fund additional bike trails in the city. Hers is why.

Hennepin count has over 650 miles of existing bike trail.
We are all paying for these trails one way or the other.

Take a look at the interactive bike map to see how well developed and extensive it is all ready.

https://www.hennepin.us/ridehennepin

For people that do not use the bike tails this seems
like an unfair tax, I mean fee.

People on fixed incomes ...another $66.00 a year.

I think 2.25 million dollars per trail is excessive.

Where can I see the projected location plan?

Thanks you,

Mark Bauer

-----Original Message-----
From: Faber, Michael J.
Sent: Thursday, August 02, 2018 8:09 AM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkamtb@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Mtn biking trails

I support the mountain biking trails. Please vote in favor of this project!

Thank you!

Sent from my iPhone

From: Marsi Antolik
Sent: Thursday, August 02, 2018 3:35 PM
To: Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake Park: Mountain Biking Trails

City Manager Geralyn Barone,

I am opposed to the City of Minnetonka turning Lone Lake Park into a labyrinth of mountain bike trails. I oppose all mountain biking in this pristine nature park. We must protect and preserve our increasingly rare undeveloped woodland parks. As an alternative the city could build a nature walking path in the Lone Lake Park hills, something everyone could enjoy.
Sincerely,

Marsi Antolik

Sanibel Drive, Minnetonka, MN

August 3, 2018

From: Chad Anderson
Sent: Friday, August 03, 2018 7:45 AM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Mountain Bike Trails at Lone Lake

I am a life-long resident of Minnetonka as well as an avid cyclist. I am opposed to creating mountain bike trails at Lone Lake. I live across the street from Lone Lake and walk these trails every night. You are already expanding Lone Lake with a Pickle Ball Court (that won’t get used) and to expand the trail system for use of mountain bikes would ruin the tranquility of the park. There are AMPLE mountain bike trails in the twin cities to use and enjoy. We don’t need more, especially at Lone Lake. Please do not allow the trails to be created. The Minnetonka city council in the past has identified Lone Lake with critical habitat, so why would you allow more trails to be created when the walking/biking trails that are already there are enough? If you move forward with the mountain bike trails at Lone Lake, I will personally hold each and every one of you accountable for your decision. Thank you for your time.

Regards,

Chad Anderson

Chad Anderson, GISP | State Government

From: Rocky DiGiacomo
Sent: Saturday, August 04, 2018 1:55 PM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake trails

Dear Mtka Staff,

I’m another Mtka resident (11655 Ridgemount Ave W) very much in favor of the proposed trails at Lone Lk. Park. This is a rapidly growing sport for all ages and abilities that deserves facilities. And, unlike so much other infrastructure (too much?) added to our parks over the decades, if this sport should fade the trails would fade away to nothing as well. Two or three years of non-use and these dirt trails would be overgrown to invisibility.
Please don’t let a few (overly angry?) NIMBY folks ruin a good idea.

Thanks,

Rocky DiGiacomo
DiGiacomo Homes and Renovation

From: Luke Rudnick
Sent: Saturday, August 04, 2018 6:30 PM
To: Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Minnetonka Mountain Bike Trails

Hello-

I’m writing as a resident of Minnetonka to voice my support for the development of mountain bike trails in our hometown. I believe this project will help improve what's already a great city! I have two teenage sons, and we'd love to have trails like those proposed so close to home.

Thanks for your consideration.

Luke Rudnick

Powderhorn Dr. Minnetonka

From: Laura Ammon
Sent: Saturday, August 04, 2018 6:36 PM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkamtb@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Minnetonka Trails

Hello, I am a Minnetonka resident and would like to support the Tonka Vantage kids’ idea of mountain bike trails. I am a rider and often go to other cities to trip ride. Let’s show our kids their work has not been lost and that it pays to push for what you strongly believe in.

Approve the trails!!

Laura
Sent from my iPhone
From: Jon Rausch  
Sent: Sunday, August 05, 2018 11:29 AM  
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkamtb@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>  
Cc: Kelly Rausch  
Subject: Tonka bike trails support

I really want to thank you all again for your efforts in reviewing the info in regards to the mountain bike trails at lone Lake. My family and I feel this will be a wonderful amenity for the community. This Will be a wonderful healthy place for community members together. I also understand a number of schools now have mountain bike teams. What an opportunity for our youth to experience another healthy outdoor activity. You have the support of the rausch family and gramma who all love in Minnetonka

Jon, Kelly, Maddie, Jack Rausch and Beverly Brand

Jon Rausch

From: Brad Honey  
Sent: Sunday, August 05, 2018 12:55 PM  
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkamtb@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>  
Cc: Christopher Walick <cwalick@eminnetonka.com>; Jack Acomb <jacomb@eminnetonka.com>; James Durbin <jdurbin@eminnetonka.com>; Chris Gabler <cgabler@eminnetonka.com>; Cynthia Kist <ckist@eminnetonka.com>; Peggy Kvam <pkvam@eminnetonka.com>; Madeline Seveland <sevelandm@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: Please support Local Mountain Biking

Hello,

Please support alternative exercise and recreation in Minnetonka by approving MTB (mountain biking) in Minnetonka Parks.

Consider the time, fuel and energy residents consume when driving to alternative trails in other cities. We're following the same concept of the big-box stores when we push MTB to centralized venues. Wouldn't a longer viewpoint support local activities like we support local businesses?

I feel the opposition's arguments are based on fear: "Not In My Backyard!"; "Non-Residents will use this park too" and "MTB's will trash 'Our' park". These arguments rely on biases that non-residents and Mountain Bikers can be equated as less desirable than residents near the park. Aren't we asking Minnetonka residents to use other people's parks and trails by opposing a trail in one of our parks? Should these be the starting points for decisions in a city that embraces the natural resources around us? -I don't think so.
In fact, bicyclists and mountain bikers are a strong community of people across a dispersed demographic who will help care for the trails and park. I hope you will welcome new ideas and encourage alternative activities in our community.

Let’s find a way to introduce something new to our city and show residents that we are forward thinking but mindful of our surroundings. After all, aren’t we trying to attract new generations of families and individuals to ultimately move to this community? I trust we are...

Thanks for listening,

Brad Honey
17800 Powderhorn Drive
Minnetonka, MN

-----------------------------------------------------------

From: Ben Marks
Sent: Sunday, August 05, 2018 7:14 PM
To: Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>
Cc: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkamt@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergestd@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lots of support for the proposed MTB trails at Lone Lake Park

Hi Mike,

This past weekend several of us MTB Trail Advocates volunteered to work in the MORC booth at the Tour de Tonka event. We were in the HS gym all day on Friday as riders picked up their registration packets. Our purpose was to encourage residents to become MORC members and to increase awareness of the proposed MTB trails at Lone Lake Park. We, by far, had the most visitors of any booth. People were interested and excited about the new trails. Since everyone there was a bicyclist, it’s not surprising that they support the project.

Unfortunately, on Saturday the Tour de Tonka ride was canceled due to severe weather concerns. We went to Plan B and set up the booth at the Glen Lake neighborhood festival in the Unmapped Brewery parking lot. The interest and support we received from visitors was overwhelmingly positive. There was not a single person that expressed opposition to the proposed trails. The attendees of the Glen Lake event represents a good cross-section of our community. We visited with everyone from young families to retired couples.

Most residents had some knowledge of the project and had heard about the controversy it has created. A common question was “Why would anyone be opposed to this project?” Another frequent comment was “What a great way for more residents to enjoy an under-utilized park.” Many folks were impressed that the youth in our community made the initial presentation to the Park Board and continue to be involved in the project.
Please don’t allow a group of residents that are opposed to sharing “their park” to derail, or further delay this valuable amenity for our community.

Thank you for your public service.

Regards,

Ben

---Original Message---
From: Molly Ekstrand
Sent: Sunday, August 05, 2018 8:34 PM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; <minnetonkamtb@gmail.com> <minnetonkamtb@gmail.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Support for Mountain Bike Trails in Minnetonka

Dear Esteemed Council Members,

I’m Molly Ekstrand, 15508 Highwood Drive, 55345, Ward 3. I’m writing in support of the MORC/IMBA sponsored proposed Mountain Bike Trails at Lone Lake Park. Our family loves our city. The lifestyle it affords and the amenities it provides are second to none in the metro area. We thank you for this. One reason we chose Minnetonka over other metro cities is the proximity and versatility of the Three Rivers Trail system to promote active lifestyles that include bicycling.

One of the few amenities Minnetonka does not currently provide is single track mountain bike trails. For the nearly 30 years I have been together with my husband, his first passion has been mountain biking. He has traveled all over the US Mountain biking, and frequently travels over MN to single track mountain bike trails. He volunteers with MORC/IMBA to build and maintain mountain bike trails. As mentioned by other peer city managers, I also know the MORC/IMBA group is genuine and committed. Now our boys, 11 and 13, have become mountain bike enthusiasts as well.

Without rambling... we also have a beautiful bee and butterfly friendly garden. I’m on my deck now watching 4 hummingbirds fight over their two feeders, amongst my 6 total feeders. We love nature too. Please vote to support the 4.7 miles of trails in less than 10% of one of Minnetonka’s 50+ parks.

Thank you, Molly & Eric, Jacob & Nate
<p>This is good. My family looks forward to riding on the trail.</p>

Shepard family
16823 Patricia Lane
Minnetonka

-----Original Message-----
From: Trish Gardiner
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2018 11:47 AM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkamtbgmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacombe@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Mountain bike trail

Minnetonka has a reputation for being a senior focused community. It offers dozens of opportunities for seniors and it’s time we offer something that not only seniors (I’m considered a senior) can use but something that our children and grandchildren can also use. Unlike other programs in our community that are directed at 55 and older, the proposed mountain bike trails will be used by people of all ages. I’ve seen 4 year olds mountain biking with their parents and I’ve talked to people in their 70s.

I can’t skate board, play baseball, tennis, or basketball with my grandchildren but I can go mountain biking with them. Not only is mountain biking a great exercise, it’s also something grandparents (like me) can do with their grandchildren. I was filled with joy yesterday when I heard, “Oma, when can you take me mountain biking,” from my oldest grandson, Torsten. Torsten and his younger brother, Henrik, just got new mountain bikes and I can’t wait to take them mountain biking. Unfortunately, the closest beginner single track mountain bike trail is 30 minutes away. My grandson’s schedule is as busy as other kids their age in our community which means drive time matters. If approved, the proposed trail is less than a 10 minute drive for us. This means my grandsons and I, as well as others in the community, will be driving less and riding more often. It also means if families are out biking, they are not binge watching television or playing video games.

Thank you for your time. I know it’s not an easy decision but the community survey results said people in Minnetonka want a mountain bike trail, we’ve collected names, letters, and emails to back that up, the City Park Board did an excellent job researching and educating the public, and they passed the proposal—Let’s share the park and build a trail.

Trish Gardiner
14409 Orchard Road
Minnetonka, MN

P.S. There’s been a lot of talk about a trail disturbing birds, bees, and butterflies. I support the environment, I compost, recycle, and volunteer with other mountain bikers to remove invasive spices, I like listening and watching birds, butterflies, and bees. With Bryant Lake Regional Park only a short
distance away from Lone Lake Park how worried do we need to be about birds, bees, and butterflies? After all, Bryant Lake is 170 acres of beautiful acres and rolling hills, woodlands, wetlands, and grasslands.

From: Michael Lack
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2018 1:04 PM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkamtb@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake MTB Trail

Hello,

Just wanted to send an email in favor of the proposed trail at Lone Lake Park. Thank you for voting this through.

Thank You

Michael Lack
5827 Louis Ave.

From: KA Ness
Date: Mon, Aug 6, 2018, 6:01 PM
Subject: Lone Lake
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>, Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>, <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>, <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>
Cc: <kodea@eminntonka.com>

Good Evening:

Please say no to mountain bike trails in Lone Lake Park. The west metro area only has a handful of high quality wilderness preserves and we must preserve Lone Lake. There are many "lower value" locations that would be suitable for mountain bike trails in Minnetonka or a neighboring community. We must think regionally with this issue and protect the limited amount of high quality woodlands that we have left. I'm sure that folks don't care if the trails are in Minnetonka, Hopkins, Eden Prairie, Plymouth, etc., as long as the west metro has an option nearby.

I'm a millennial who hopes to stay in Minnetonka with my wife and son for a long time but we must not sacrifice what makes Minnetonka great.
Thanks for your time and your service.

Sincerely,

Kyle Nessen
14326 Bellevue Drive
Minnetonka

From: Julie Dale
Sent: Tuesday, August 07, 2018 8:59 AM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Tony Wagner <twagner@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake Park

I am a resident of Minnetonka. I live in the Beachside Townhomes - directly across from Lone Lake Park. Please do not allow mountain bikes in the park. It is now a tranquil beautiful natural park. Please do not allow a small vocal group of mountain bikers convince you to disrupt the beautiful natural setting of this lovely park. There are many mountain bike trails in the Twin Cities area. There is no need to ruin our small beautiful park!

I respectfully ask that you reconsider the decision to put in mountain bike trails. The silent majority wants to leave Lone Lake Park as it is now - a beautiful tranquil natural area perfect for a peaceful quite walk.

Sincerely,

Julie Dale

From: Thomas Stockert
Sent: Thursday, August 09, 2018 9:06 AM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Cc: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake Park - Density

Hello Kelly,
The one hangup I have with the Mountain Bike Trail Concept (the only reason I started to questions the bike trail) has been density. Not all opponents share the same concerns. You'll never have 90 percent of the chamber supporting the idea, though I still think (and have kind of been begging for) robust community outreach could build consensus.

I had the concern about the moment I saw the concept plan in relation to the tennis courts. However, saying the word density 100 times has proven ineffective.

City staff has said, many times, that the trails in Lone Lake Park have similar density to other parks. I have two (very rough) maps. One of Lone Lake Park, where I colored a tennis court, copied it and pasted it at various parts of the map for scale. Please see attached.

There is no scale on the concept plan, though I estimated the tennis court to be 40 feet wide (there's closer to 36, so my courts are actually larger than reality on the second map). I then pasted the tennis courts at various parts of the Theodore Wirth map...again for scale.

I considered making scale maps and tennis court sized magnets to present to the Mayor and Council to "play with", though that would likely not be a productive use of resources. However, it might be quite helpful for the City to Create similar visuals of various parks to include in the next presentation.

Thanks again.

Tom Stockert
5524 Dominick Drive
Lone Lake Park Mountain Bike Trail Concept Plan

- Lone Lake Park – 146 ac.
- MTB trail – 4.7 miles
- Width of trail – 18” - 24”
- Total area of trail – 1.2 ac.
- Avg. trail slope – 5%
- Designed to support beginner and intermediate level biking
- Final layout to be field sited with Natural Resources staff
- Utilizes sustainable trail building techniques
- To be closed during wet conditions
- Intersects with maintained trail one time at trailhead
On Aug 7, 2018, at 11:30 AM, Larry Wade < wrote:

Rebecca: I was at the council meeting last night and appreciate your comment that the EAW may not add more information than we already know.

I am a local naturalist and teacher. I would like to show you where the proposed trails will be and why I am so concerned about the loss of trees and habitat on the East side of the park.

I would also like to show you how to age the trees. In July, Mike Happe went out with me for a brief tour of the park. The entire hike is nature based, I can point out native plants and identify bird songs. If you have family or friends who would be interested in coming, that would be great. The entire hike will be less than an hour of your time. Thank you for your consideration.

Congratulations on your appointment to the City Council. Good luck. Larry Wade

From: Joanne STRATE
Sent: Saturday, August 11, 2018 1:11 PM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake Park Mtn Bike Proposal
Importance: High
This is definitely a wolf in sheep's clothing! The select few mtn bikers & some high school kids want this...NO ONE ELSE!

There should be an EAW study!

Answer the following questions and I'm sure you'd agree our postage stamp park isn't the place for this trail for so many obvious reasons....

1) **Environmental impacts.** Why has the city decided to damage high value restoration areas in which we all have a significant historical and financial investment? Made way for machine-made bike trails in the part of the park with “preserve” status? Risked potential alteration of the habitat of the rusty patched bumble bee, a federally endangered species?

2) **Park infrastructure.** Why is there no parking analysis, beyond the number of spots available, that shows peak usage times by soccer teams, pickle ball players, bikers, etc. in the concept plan? Where will overflow parkers go? How does the city anticipate that bikers will get to and from the only permanent restrooms, which are far from the trails? Why is there no explanation of how to avoid overdevelopment of the park?

3) **Safety.** How will the park ensure safety on the 200-foot overlap of the proposed trail and existing regional trail? Why does the plan violate the park board’s agreed-upon core criteria and include intersections of the proposed trail with existing footpaths?

4) **Resident involvement.** Why was this process for Lone Lake Park expedited with no neighborhood focus groups, unlike the Big Willow Park process?

5) **Minnesota Off-Road Cyclists’ financial stability and volunteer capacity.** According to MORC’s board meeting minutes, the group is operating at a deficit and does not have enough volunteers to work at one of the existing trail areas. Should the city enter into a maintenance and repair agreement with this possibly overextended group, since the city admits they could not manage a trail with their own staff or budget?

Thanks for your consideration to do the right thing!

Joanne Strate

5417 Pompano Drive

Minnetonka

---

**From:** Larry Rose  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 12, 2018 7:09 AM  
**To:** Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Tony Wagner <twagner@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe
Subject: Protect Lone Lake Park

I am opposed to the addition of mountain biking at Lone Lake Park.

How many things does one park need to offer? Already, soccer field, playground, basketball court, tennis courts, pickle ball & a beautiful nature trail.

Let’s not take away from what the nature trail is. A home to wildlife; deer, rabbits, birds, butterflies & bees. It is also the backyard for the many Minnetonka residents that have selected that area to live because of its beauty.

The nature trail also gives us a place to walk, reflect & enjoy the tranquility away from everyday hustle & bustle. It is one of the few places that is untouched & gives us a chance to enjoy nature at its finest.

Reading an article in Friday’s StarTribune, “Another World”, the story by Melanie Radzicki McManus, it adds even more to the choice of keeping the nature trails the way they are.

I have added a few quotes that will hopefully give you more to think about:

“Getting into nature can bring a feeling of wholeness not felt in modern life. The trail’s beauty offered moments of transcendence.”

“Not the kind of tranquil feeling you get after a massage or that dreamy limbo you drift into just before you fall asleep. No, this is an all-encompassing bliss that fills your mind, body & soul.”

“Researching the Nature Effect ............. Studies & studies of studies support what many health care professionals, scientists, outdoors people & others believe: Time in nature is good for our overall wellbeing.”

“Scientists have long talked about the healing power of nature. How it can lower blood pressure & cholesterol, combat depression, stress & anxiety; decrease anger & symptoms of attention deficit disorder & even boost longevity.”

Doesn’t this seem like a lot to give up, just for the addition of a biking trail ????

Shari Rose

From: Laura Brill
Sent: Sunday, August 12, 2018 11:03 AM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacombe@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake Mountain Bike Trail

Needless to say, as a resident whose yard abuts Lone Lake Park, I was disappointed at the vote to forego the EAW at the last council meeting. Many thanks to council members Ellingson and Acomb who actually listened to our requests for the EAW.
Jo Colleran seemed extremely confident in her presentation on how all environmental concerns could be effectively mitigated until Emmons and Oliver Resources, Inc. (EOR) made theirs. After that, any question asked of her was hesitatingly answered in an extremely unconfident manner. That the facts presented in EOR's presentation were totally ignored, gives me the feeling that the council is afraid of what an EAW would bring to light.

Council member Calvert expressed her disappointment that none of those who asked for the EAW stated if they would support a bike trail if an EAW came back positive. For those council members who chose to ignore the findings of the presenter from EOR, I want to know if an EAW were done that came back negative, would YOU still support a mountain bike trail? What is fair for one side is fair for another. Of course, we will never know, because the majority safely voted to avoid any such findings, whether they be positive or negative.

Then there is the elephant in the room: the fact that NO council member, mountain biker or 'staff' person has answered our question as to why a second mountain bike trail is needed in a HIGH VALUE RESTORATION AREA when a LONGER trail is being constructed at Braemar, which is only 3 miles away. Something fishy is going on here. I am losing trust in my local government.

Laura Brill
11700 Vista Drive
Minnnetonka, MN 55343

From: Larry Rose
Sent: Friday, August 10, 2018 11:16 AM
To: 'bwiersum@eminnetonka.com'; 'dcalvert@eminnetonka.com'; 'pacomb@eminnetonka.com'; Bob Ellingson; 'mhappe@eminnetonka.com'; 'tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com'; 'rschack@eminnetonka.com'; 'gbaron@eminnetonka.com'
Subject: MOUNTAIN BIKE TRAIL

I am totally opposed to this Mountain Bike Trail Proposal.

Why would any City leadership expose the quiet pristine neighborhood to a group of bike riders cruising through and very near the homes of an established base of taxpayers? In the readings prepared by the City, the Consultants, the Neighbors and the Proponents, I don’t see any acceptable plan to handle the Biker parking, the Restroom facilities, the Trash accumulation, the Security of the Riders and the Homeowners, and the on-going Maintenance of the Trail. To me, these are HUGE problems that have been glossed over by any discussions. These taxpaying Homeowners need to be the major consideration for the Council. It sure doesn’t appear that the majority of the Council or Staff care about these people.

Potential Riders will NOT just be Minnetonka residents. What ownership will these non-resident Riders take for proper parking, trash disposal, care for the neighborhood, and care for the trail? I have talked with several potential local riders who could be using this proposed trail. While they would love to have a trail near them, they do agree with my thoughts and are concerned about similar issues, especially the riders who live near these proposed trails.
AND, I don’t think any of the Council Members live near this trail. Out of site, out of mind. The current homeowners would be subjected to this long term disruption, caused by this trail. Once approved, I can’t see the City closing it down to admit they made a terrible mistake. AND if the Council thinks we taxpayers don’t see an impact on the future budget, You are only kidding yourself.

As I recall when the expansion of Shady Oak Road was going through the approval process, the City Environment Staff Members had tears over the removal of scruff shrubs and trees. To me this trail has a much deeper environmental impact, yet the City Staff approves the plan. WHY?

Please continue intelligent and thoughtful discussions, and certainly have as your major concern: The impact on the local neighborhood tax-paying Homeowners.

Larry Rose
5651 Sanibel Drive
Minnetonka, MN 55343

From:
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2018 3:12 PM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Re: EAW vote at August 6 Council Meeting

To All:

I presumed that your denial of an EAW means that you have concluded to vote against establishment of any mountain biking trail in Lone Lake as you have no basis to vote yes on this project. It also sounds like there are MN as well as Federal implications to this proposal that need evaluation, consideration and answers. A yes vote could expose Minnetonka to ongoing legal problems and possible maintenance issues with lots of costs and no clear answers. It is always better to be cautious acting proactively rather than reactively in the future. Doing things right in the first place is always the best answer. I have heard second or third hand that the DNR is not concerned with this proposed trail. That sounds questionable based on their interest in protecting of our environment. And with an endangered species also potentially impacted, it seems irresponsible to not want a full and complete evaluation of the impact so as to avoid future issues.

Thus, based on the information available, I encourage a no vote on this trail as the only responsible avenue at this time.

Bob Klemenhagen

-----Original Message-----
From: rklemenhag
Dear Major Wiersum, Council member Tim Bergstedt and Kelly O'Dea

I am not sure that I will be back in time to attend the Monday, August 6 Council Meeting and wanted to express my comments on the critical need for an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) prior to voting on the establishment of a proposed mountain biking trail in Lone Lake Park. I have done some reading about such studies and when they are appropriate or required. An EAW certainly seem appropriate and wise for the mountain biking trail proposal. Without such a study, I fail to see how anyone could conclude one way or the other, as to whether or not this proposal is wise and should be approved. We have all seen the damage done to Purgatory Park that mountain biking has done. The establishment of any trail must preserve the Park not creating long-term damage and harm. There are appropriate places for such trails; the question is whether or not Lone Lake Park is appropriate. Have the EAW done by a qualified party to assess this project. Be proactive and not reactive.

Below is a quote I copied from the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board (https://www.eqb.state.mn.us/content/eaw-process) that says:

"The EAW is a brief document designed to lay out the basic facts of a project necessary to determine if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required for the proposed project. In addition to the legal purpose of the EAW in determining the need for an EIS, the EAW also provides permit information, informs the public about the project, and helps identify ways to protect the environment. The EAW is not meant to approve or deny a project, but instead act as a source of information to guide other approvals and permitting decisions. The EAW is completed by the Responsible Governmental Unit (RGU) designated according to Minnesota Rules 4410."

I find the EAW to be compelling and essential information required to voting on this project. I hope you do too and vote to require this EAW prior to any decision on this project.

Bob Klemenhagen

16501 Elm Drive

Minnetonka, MN 55345
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; MICHAEL HAPPE <mhappe11@msn.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Mt. Biking OP Ed in Strib Aug. 13

Dear Council members I don’t know if you saw the Op-Ed today in the Strib today, but I thought it summarizes my feelings about the process so far.

Thanks,

Larry Wade, 15524 Day Place, Minnetonka
PARKS AND MOUNTAIN BIKING

Not just about bees, but about a realistic balance of activities.

I am not a resident of Minnetonka, but found Lone Lake Park in large part because of road construction on Hwy 169 last year. I am saddened by the possibility of another beautiful mountain bike trail being forever changed for the worse by mountain bikers.

I'm not a resident of Minneapolis, either, but since I love nature I feel I need to speak up. Lone Lake Park is unique in that it has a soccer field, tennis courts and baseball field. It is a rare area with hills and wetlands. I admired the balance that the park has - activities on one side, peaceful and diverse nature area on the other. This balance would be destroyed by mountain-bike trails.

LARRY MILLER, St. Louis Park
From: larry wade
Sent: Friday, August 17, 2018 7:20 AM
To: Sara Woeste <swoeste@eminnetonka.com>; Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Jo Colleran <jcolleran@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Location of mountain biking trail at Lone Lake

Using the map of the proposed mountain biking trail, it is very difficult to determine where the trail will actually go. I would like to meet with any of you and be shown where the trail will be. I am most familiar with the area on the east side of the park near the tennis courts. I was up there last night with councilperson Schack and could not determine where the trail will be. I believe it is imperative that the council sees where this trail will be going before they vote on it.

The meet-up will take no more than an hour. Please bring some flagging, so we can have a visual reference. After I meet with you, I will invite the council up there, so they will have a visual reference to where the trail will be. I can meet you at the tennis courts. I am available all day today (Friday) and all of next week. I can work with your timing.

Larry Wade

From: Dale Antonson
Sent: Friday, August 24, 2018 7:11 AM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Thanks for your Help

Hi Brad,

Thanks for voting not to require an Environmental Assessment for the new bike trails at Lone Lake! Obviously, all those long hours of hard work by staff and volunteers to keep this place a valuable resource are meaningless to you. Now we can trash this place, just like we did at Wirth Park! I can't wait to “Rip It” through those woods at Lone Lake as fast as I can!

Regards,

Dale Antonson
Dear Kelly,

I’m writing today concerning conservation, an issue I feel strongly about.

When considering the prospect of installing mountain bike trails at Lone Lake Park, please be mindful of the particularly vulnerable state of our nation’s remaining natural spaces and the incessant pressures to surrender them to various self-serving interests. I hope you can see the addition of these trails as yet another invasion of one of our community’s irreplaceable natural assets. This issue provides an opportunity to defend, on our behalf, a piece of the most precious and privileged assets Minnetonka affords residents like you and me. And to do the right thing by our patch of America’s landscape.

Many thanks for your consideration,

Mary

On Aug 31, 2018, at 3:46 PM, Linda Russell wrote:

Hello Ms. Shack,
I am a member of the group concerned with the MBT proposal for environmental as well as other reasons. Larry Wade, also a member of this group, asked me if I would send you some “scholarly” articles regarding mountain bike trails.

What you find if you search this are a number of articles that are sponsored by the IMBA, that is, the International Mountain Bike Association. It is harder to find neutral sources of information…and I feel that research done by the people who want the trails should be viewed with some skepticism.

That said, here are two articles. The first one is, indeed, originally from the IMBA. You can find it here:


One problem with research like this is that they are comparing “apples to apples” and the Lone Lake situation is not an “apples to apples” comparison. Their research compared equal amounts of foot traffic and bike traffic (and also horses), and in Lone Lake, we are comparing VERY FEW feet to an estimated hundreds of bikes per week. So folks who claim that the footpaths are eroded (in only one main location near the tennis courts, by the way), and who seem to conclude that those footpaths are actually a problem that bike trails will somehow fix, are kidding themselves. Five or ten people per week on those footpaths does not equal hundreds of bikes.

The second article is 10 years old, but is a decent review of the literature that was available in 2010. It is from the University of Calgary. You can find it here:


They point out both what the literature said, as well as knowledge gaps—unknowns. I find the curvilinear graph on p. 14-15 to be very illuminating. And very disturbing. The graph on p. 14 has to do with the damage people do to campsites in the BWCA in only 10 camping nights in a year. The graph on p. 15 is a generalized graph.

Both graphs show that damage to the environment occurs immediately, and here is the significant part—it never goes back to the original condition. NEVER. The line of the graph goes up only a little over a longer time, but does not curve back down.

This is important because the mountain bike plan quotes the mountain bikers themselves when they talk about “revegetation” of the trails after the initial buildout. But this research shows that “revegetation” does not mean “return to an undamaged condition.” When opponents to this plan say
that the park will never be the same from an environmental point of view, we are correct. The damage will be a permanent condition.

One other thing, because you are new to the council. Our group has submitted some 30+ questions that are unanswered in all of the reports and plans thus far. Only a few of those questions are about the environment. We keep getting no answers at all from city council members, and we hope that at some point we will get some. If you’d like those questions, let me know and I will send them to you. I realize that council may not know the answers, but surely the city employees should. They are not frivolous questions; they are genuine queries that deserve to be fully addressed.

Thank you for your service to our city. I look forward to future encounters.

Linda Russell
5423 Maple Ridge Ct.

From: Jane Ball  
Sent: Monday, September 03, 2018 10:53 AM  
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>  
Cc: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: Opinion re Proposed Mountain Bike Trail at Lone Lake Park

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing in opposition to the mountain bike trail that is proposed for Lone Lake Park. I have done a little research on the subject, including listening to a Singletracks podcast on the environmental impact of mountain biking and taking a walk on a multi-use trail in Theodore Wirth Park. I also have a lot of experience with bikers on the Luce Line Trail where I walk my dog almost daily. In addition, I watched a recording of the Aug. 6, 2018 City Council meeting where the proposed EAW was discussed.

I mentioned this proposal to someone I had just met who later admitted he was an avid mountain biker, and his first words were that there would be many people coming to the park from all over the region to use the trails, and parking would probably be a problem. In addition to grown-up mountain bikers, I believe this proposal is marketed as being a place for school kids to practice and compete. I imagine that Minnetonka schools will not be the only schools to take their students to the park. In addition, their parents will likely drive their children to the park to practice. I believe the use of the trails will be much higher than predicted.
In all the mountain biking videos I have watched, the emphasis is on technique and equipment, and how fast a course can be ridden. Nobody stops to smell the roses. In a visit to Wirth Park, I listened to the riders, and most were loudly talking to one another. One yelled to her fellow biker, “How should I take this turn without slowing down?” Another rode by with music blaring. And all of them were going as fast as they could. My opinion is that for mountain bikers, Nature is basically a series of obstacles to be navigated. Meanwhile, there were deep ruts carved into the hillsides, plenty of weeds, and a little wildlife that consisted of a few birds and one squirrel.

In several sources, I have read that bikers are supposed to yield to walkers. They are supposed to announce their approach, pass carefully, and obey a speed limit, if any. In my experience walking on the Luce Line, usually none of that happens. Over the past 10 years or so, the Luce Line has gone from being a peaceful place to walk to being a place to dodge bicycles, which in my experience now outnumber walkers, sometimes 10 to one. On the Wirth Park walking/biking trail, the trailhead sign says that walkers must yield to bikers. At least that is honest.

The healing benefits of being in Nature are already difficult to find. If the mountain bike trail is put into Lone Lake Park, the serenity of being able to look and listen in a wild setting will be lost. The hundreds of students that come to the park every year to learn about Nature will lose their subject--Nature. Basically, I fear that substantial segments of the local population who have historically relied on the park as their oasis in the suburbs will be forced out because what they have traditionally come to the park to enjoy will be taken over by something they don’t enjoy. The bike trails are designed to cover almost the entire park, which leaves nowhere for anybody else to go. The idea that the total impact will be limited to an 18” wide trail is not reasonable. The environment will certainly suffer, not to mention the rusty patch bumblebee.

There are already 111 places in Minnesota with mountain bike trails, many of them in the Twin Cities west metro. I am not in favor of destroying a Minnetonka park designated as a preserve in order to create one more mountain bike trail.

Thank you for listening.

Jane Ball

3422 Meadow Lane

Minnetonka

From:
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2018 3:44 PM
To: Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; bellingson@eminnetonka.c; Tony Wagner <twagner@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>; dcalvert@eminnetonka.com
I hope each and everyone of you will take the time to read this. From what I read in focus groups it seems more are against this decision. What would make you decide for mountain bikers.

Linda
September 12, 2018

RE: Protect Lone Lake Park

I am writing this letter to oppose mountain bike trails at our beautiful park. I am a cyclist myself and am thankful for all the trails throughout out city and state for biking. I put my bike on my car and travel to the many trails our city and state provide. I am not a mountain biker. mountain bikers can do the same thing and not take the peace, nature and tranquility out of Lone Lake Park

Lone Lake Park is not a place for mountain bike trails. It is a serene beautiful park with beautiful walking trails. I have lived in Beachside for the past 30 years and go walking on their walking paths thru nature and quiet in the morning when I get up and many times also in the evening I walk and see owls and deer. There are so few parks and walking trails that invite this peace and tranquility that we all need.

Please don't desecrate Lone Lake Park for the convenience of Mountain Bikers and take away from myself and so many others this peace and tranquility.

Sincerely

Linda Sidwell
5570 Bimini Drive

From: Glenn Byers
Sent: Monday, September 17, 2018 3:08 PM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkamtb@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe


I of bike

As

Subject:

park

Cc:

<tpark@eminnetonka.com>

 Tucson,

4931

Thank

Glenn

gladly

Minnetonka

To:

<rschack@eminnetonka.com>

Sent:

I

From:

<mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>

Subject: Lone Oak Trails

It is with disappointment that I saw that the city was being sued by some of the opponents of mountain bike trails in Lone Oak Park. While I respect the rights of the group to redress grievances by way of the courts, I don’t think this law suit has be undertaken in good faith. I believe the point is too prolong the process and increase the cost to the point where the city if forced to abandon the project.

So I have a proposal that I am sure will satisfy the concerns of the opponents of mountain bike trails that are concerned about the environmental impact of the project. I think that the city should close Lone Oak Park until this matter is resolved. This seems like a prudent course of action given the fragile nature of the eco system at Lone Oak Park as purported by the opponents of mountain bike trails. Moreover, if it is found that the presence of humans is detrimental to endangered bees or other species in the park, I think the city should consider permanently closing the park and returning it to nature.

I am certainly not suggesting that just because I can’t mountain bike in the park, that I want to limit the use of the park to others. An environmental concern has been raised and it seems reasonable that the park should be closed as to limit any further environmental damage until this gets sorted out.

I am not sure of the process, but if there is a formal process for raising this proposal to the city I would gladly do so.

Thank you,

Glenn Byers

4931 Birchwood Lane,

Minnetonka, MN 55343

---

From: Jeff Swanson

Sent: Wednesday, October 03, 2018 6:22 PM

To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>

Cc: Ben Marks

Subject: Lone Lake Trails

As an advocate for the trails at Loan lake I encourage the City Counsel to stay on track with the vote to approve the trails on October 22nd.

This process has taken two and a half years to get to this point. The pressure from the other side to delay the vote should not deter you from voting on the 22nd.

We appreciate your support and look forward to the meeting.
Sincerely,

Jeff Swanson
35 year Minnetonka Resident
Minnetonka Mountain Bike Trail Advocate Member

From: Jerod Pekuri
Sent: Thursday, October 04, 2018 8:49 AM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkaamtb@eminnetonka.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Minnetonka MTB Trails

Hello,

I just wanted to write to voice my support for the proposed mountain bike trails in Lone Lake Park. My wife and I have been residents and (first time) homeowners in Minnetonka for 5 years. When choosing Minnetonka, we were originally looking for good neighborhoods, spacious lots, and a location close to our places of employment. What we didn't specifically seek out at the time, which I now realize is equally important for my wife and me, were larger parks and great trail systems. We are both very active individuals who enjoy participating in a wide variety of outdoor activities. If we were to move, we'd look for a location close to as many of our favorite outdoor activities as possible. As it currently stands, I'm not sure Minnetonka would be in the running.

As a mountain biker living in the southwest metro, I need to drive at least 20 minutes to get to the nearest trail system. Similarly, as a trail runner, there are very few places close by where I can enjoy a run of more than a few miles off-road without running laps. Purgatory Park is great, if you can get through without being chased by off-lease dogs. We do make extensive use of the various bike and walking trails throughout the city, but many are on old railroad grades and most tend to be exclusively flat. This is great for getting from point A to point B quickly, but is not very interesting.

Having nearly 5 miles of largely uninterrupted singletrack close to home would be a definite step in the right direction. I'd still drive to get to longer destinations on the weekends, but I'd have somewhere to call my home trail. It would be somewhere to practice my skills, build strength, and be active. I'd also finally live close enough to be able to give back to the mountain biking and trail running community by joining the trail maintenance crew through MORC.
I think it is clear the proper environmental review has been performed. Also, having been on many different trails locally and abroad, I know that it is certainly possible to maintain a sustainable trail system that minimizes its impact on its surroundings.

I am a regular voter, but I've never been one to play an active role in local government. I have, however, been moved by this proposal. I attended and provided my input at the open house and attended the Park Board meeting which voted to recommend this project. I am also planning to attend the City Council meeting on the 22nd to show my support for the trails. Please consider voting in favor of the proposed mountain bike trail system in Lone Lake Park.

Thank you for your time and public service,

Jerod Pekuri

5748 Cedar Lane

Minnetonka, MN 55345

From: dana.kromer
Sent: Thursday, October 04, 2018 11:36 AM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkamtbg@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacombofminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Please vote on October 22nd for Mountain Bike Trails at Lone Lake Park

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

Minnetonka city staff and the Park Board under your leadership have done an incredible job in conducting an open process over these past two years. No amount of time will convince everyone that the trails are a good idea and further delays keep a large number of Minnetonka residents and the city staff in limbo. Please do not delay the decision any longer, vote to build the trails at your October 22nd meeting.

The study conducted earlier this year helped to clarify the nature of sustainable, low impact mountain bike trails and the positive impact they have had at other parks in the region. The mountain biking community cares deeply about the environment and is inclusive and every-generational.
If the fate of the Rusty Patch Bumble Bee rests on whether or not mountain bike trails are built at Lone Lake Park, we need to stop all activities there and in every other park in the city. I don’t believe this is the case and in fact, what we need is more people to care about the environment and make good decisions about what they do in their own back yards! We accomplish this by getting more people in our parks, not by excluding them!

Regards,
Dana Kromer
3725 Elmwood Place
Minnetonka

From: David Gartner
Sent: Friday, October 26, 2018 7:56 AM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkamt@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Patty Acomb <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Park Mountain Bike Trails

Hello,

I just learned about the proposed trail system at Lone Park. The trails at Elm Creek, Murphy Hannerhan and Lebanon Hills are all great places to mountain bike with very little disruption to the community or the environment. On the contrary, it would provide another venue to promote a healthy life style in Minnetonka!

Best regards,

David Gartner

From: Thomas Stockert
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 5:13 PM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Mountain Bike Trail Compromise Options
Hello all,

I watched the January 7 City Council meeting from home. The general sentiment that Minnetonka does not need a single-issue voter on the Council is quite wise. I respect everyone’s position taken during the meeting. The Lone Lake Park Bike Trail is not my single issue. I will not begrudge a Council Member for a thoughtful vote on the issue.

During the Council Meeting discussion, it was mentioned the possibility of the Lone Lake Park bike trails coming back on the agenda this spring. I know it could be unwise to confirm that information while the EAW appeal is ongoing, and I don’t expect a response.

Shortly after the EAW was appealed, I took all signs that were on display on my property down. I reached out to Ben Marks to see if we could collaborate on some compromises while the appeal was in process. This could assist in community buy-in and not further delay the project once the EAW issue is settled. It could also prevent me from erecting the signs again if a recommendation to approve shows up on a future agenda.

I have ridden a mountain bike trail with Ben Marks and spent time discussing some of the issues. I will volunteer with his group if this trail is built. The key ones I would, personally, like addressed are:

Ben believes a lot of the people against the trail are dog owners (of which I’m not) who don’t want to lose substantial off-leash areas. Council Member Calvert has referred to off-leash dogs spreading seeds on multiple occasions, which leads some to believe there will be limits to such activity (surely within 15 feet of any trail). I’ve seen concept plans with a specified off-leash area at the park. Would it not make sense to do something appealing and meaningful for the dog owners who might be displaced by the trail?

City staff was kind enough to walk the park with several members of Conserve Lone Lake Park (CLLP) last fall. They were quite patient with several residents who confused them as decision makers (your group), and I was impressed with their professionalism. From my discussion with Staff, they believe the loss of nesting area for several songbirds will be a net positive for the city as illegal mountain biking will cease at other parks, a point reiterated by Mr. Marks during our Mountain Bike trip. As I’ve previously stated, this park is remote and near the Southeast most point in Minnetonka. As part of this process, I recommend the City pass an ordinance with meaningful penalties for illegal biking at other City Parks, and meaningful penalties for off-trail infractions at Lone Lake Park (several of the CLLP members are adamantly this will occur). The City would only need to enforce it three weekends a year to get the message out.

When I met with former Council Member Patty Acomb, she was surprised to learn this proposal won’t be handled in the same way as a building proposal (she confirmed this with City Manager, Geralyn Barone, after our meeting). Her email included “When the item is on the agenda it will be for a vote. That isn’t to say that the Council can’t table it and ask for more information or changes.” Please let this email serve as a request for the Council consider such changes ahead of any meeting with a resolution to approve the trail.
My last request, which Ben Marks will disagree with, relates to the trail density. My trouble with it is that the design is essentially a dumbbell with a bar going through the high value restoration area and each side essentially dense weights. During the fall visit, City staff confirmed many of the trails are under twenty feet apart, which is rare at most other metro area mountain bike trails. The focus group’s own criteria is four miles minimum length. Could a loop be removed from each end, eliminating no more than a half mile? The resulting trail would still be over four miles in length and perhaps disturb less nesting habitat for song birds.

If I speak at a future meeting, those four bullets will likely be my focus (though at times, my message changed based on preceding discussion).

Many people are passionate about the positive or negative impact on City Residents. From the start, and to this day, my sole focus is wildlife. With new town homes abutting the park and high-density housing going in across Shady Oak isn’t it essential we preserve what little natural areas we have to the greatest possible extent?

I know what restoration, with training from City staff, (on our own property) has done to better the pond in our very own back yard over the last five years. The water quality is better every year. I am a NIMBY, though only through thoroughly appreciating the countless wildlife Lone Lake Park supports and shares with the surrounding area. Do the apartment residents in Opus Park not deserve the chance to see a diverse group of songbirds visiting from the park while out on their balcony?

I’ve left everyone alone the last few months. I still plan to request sit-down meetings with the Mayor, Council Member Ellingson and the At-Large appointee ahead of the vote. Please don’t hesitate to contact me if you prefer to engage sooner rather than later.

On a final note, I’ve read a large number and sampling of City Emails obtained through my data request. My conclusion will likely not be a surprise to any of you. City Staff was quite professional in all the emails I read, with very little personal commentary. As a resident, I’m pleased with their work and that I didn’t find what I’d feared.

In the event you’ve read this far, thank you for your time.
All the Best
Tom Stockert
5524 Dominick Drive

From: Tom Schmidt
Sent: Thursday, May 09, 2019 1:46 PM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkamtb@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Susan Carter <scarter@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Mountain Biking at Lone Lake

Hello,
I am a resident of Eden Prairie, just south of Minnetonka, right along Lake Bryant. The community is really like the red headed step child of Eden Prairie. If the community were a child, we would be the child that spends more time at its Aunt's house (Minnetonka) then at home (Eden Priarie). You might as well just absorb us and be done with it.

That being said, our family, and many in the area, are bikers and would love to see trails at Lone Lake. We often hop on the trails at Lake Bryant and ride them up through the greenway trail. There is some access to Lone Lake from here, but not great. Having a local option for trail riding would be wonderful. There is nothing in the area, the closest being Murphy-Hanrehan but I don't want to drive 20 minutes to go biking. That seems silly.

I also am on the ISLA ABC Board which is engaged in discussions about our property off of Shady Oak and redevelopment plans in that area. This area is very close to Lone Lake. From my knowledge of the proposed plans for that area, having a nice local mountain bike trail that also connects or is close to the greenway trail would be very attractive in this area in the future.

Also, if the trails were easily to get too from Lake Bryant, there is a lot of parking there and people could use that as the staging area, since I know Lone Lake lacks parking (especially during the kids soccer games). I am sure the group already thought of that though.

Thank you for your time. I look forward to seeing this topic move forward again with the city, hopefully sooner rather than later. I think the correct biking terminology is "I am stoked!", or something like that.

Tom Schmidt
Area Resident

From: cg
Sent: Sunday, May 12, 2019 5:32 PM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkamtb@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Susan Carter <scarter@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone lake park mountain bike
I think bringing more trails to Minnetonka would bring lots of benefits to the community in a way of mental health and physical health. I have seen the nicest people ever on the trails at Theodore Wirth. Why not bring those nice people to Lone Lake.

-charles

From: Phillip Gary Smith
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 7:07 AM
To: Kelly O'Dea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Mtn Bike Trail Lone Lake

Dear Ms. O'Dea,

I'm happy to hear this project is making progress. I spend a lot of times on trails whether hot or cold, snow or no, though I do not bike, it's all on foot or snowshoes.

However, I've been in competitions where bikes competed simultaneously or I have trained on trails while the bikers were out for a trail ride; I do not recall any time whereas a group trail or mountain bike riders were not friendly, good at sharing the trails, along with being pleasant.

I have not seen any activity on designated trails when the conditions are wet and muddy, which would create ruts. As a group bike riders care about their trails.

Though I won't be riding a bike on the proposed trails, I support your efforts in getting this done.

Best on the Trails,
Phillip Gary Smith

From: Geralyn Barone
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2019 1:26 PM
To: Kelly O'Dea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: FW: Regarding Mountain Bike Trails at Lone Lake Park

FYI.

> On Jun 29, 2019, at 9:12 PM, Brian John wrote:

> Good evening Mayor Wiersum and members of the City Council, I wanted
> to send a message to ask that you vote for the Mountain Bike Trails at Lone Lake Park. As a Minnetonka resident and father of 2, and after reading through the plan for the trails, I'm very excited for our family to be able to enjoy our city's natural beauty while getting physical activity outdoors through the great sport of biking. I appreciate the city's concern and effort to mitigate environmental impact to the park, and look forward to our family joining others in volunteering to preserve it.
Thank you and have a great rest of your weekend!

Brian John
> 16526 Temple Cir,
> Minnetonka, MN 55345

---

From: Geralyn Barone
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2019 1:27 PM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: FW: protect Lone Lake Park

FYI.

From: Katherine Johnson
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2019 9:40 AM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>
Cc: Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Re: protect Lone Lake Park

Brad,

My address is 17736 96th Ave N, Maple Grove.

Thanks,

Katherine Johnson

On Jun 28, 2019, at 2:48 PM, Katherine Johnson < wrote:

Please protect Lone Lake Park preserving this Big Woods remnant. Big Woods are unique and once damaged can’t be grown again. The ecosystem there needs good stewardship.

Thanks for your time,

Katherine Johnson

---

All, I write you in preparation for your upcoming discussion and vote on the proposed mountain biking trails in Lone Lake Park. My wife and I are 30 year residents of the city and moved here because of the quality of life including great schools, abundant green space and a reputation for environmental leadership.

Many of us in the community are against building these trails in the park as we feel that our community needs space which is for passive use only. The construction of trails and mountain biking are not passive uses. A year ago we outlined our concerns and composed a set of questions for the mayor, council and the city manager to answer. Unfortunately, these questions have not been answered and many of them
You were elected to represent your citizens and that means responding to our questions. We have attempted to engage you in a dialogue about the proposal via the questions but that has not been possible because you, or staff, have not responded. I, and many others, look forward to your answers prior to the vote. Without answering these questions how can you make a reasoned choice?

John Mirocha, Ph.D.

From: linda goecke
Sent: Sunday, July 14, 2019 3:09 PM
To: Brad Wiersum
Subject: Oppose mountain bike trail in Lone Lake Park

To: Mayor Brad Wiersum

From: Linda Goecke 6085 Rowland Road #111 Minnetonka

Once again, my husband and I are expressing our opposition to the proposed mountain bike trail in Lone Lake Park.

My philosophy, which hasn't changed since last summer when I wrote to you is:

**NOT ALL PARKS CAN BE ALL THINGS TO ALL PEOPLE.** Even though many officials and constituents want the parks to be for all people -- there are places where good stewardship of the land and plants and animals is far more important than providing a mountain bike trail in a special and unique park.

My husband and I are not against mountain biking -- but another place must be found. NOT Lone Lake.

Thank you.

From: Hatice Gagne
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2019 12:33 PM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Susan Carter <scarter@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn Barone
<gbarone@eminnetonka.com>

Subject: Minnetonka Mountain Bike Trail

We are a young family that lives in Minnetonka and are active in off road cycling. We use the single track trails around the Metro, but we would really love to have a trail close to home. This trail would allow us to stay in our community and participate in a sport we enjoy.

Please support the trail in your vote on August 26th.

Thank you,
Aaron and Hatice Gagne
16409 Hidden Valley Road
Minnetonka, MN 55345

From: Mary Mckee
Date: August 3, 2019 at 1:15:32 PM CDT
To: Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: For your consideration....

August 5, 2019

Minnetonka City Council Member Tim Bergstedt:

Minnetonka residents are proud of our lakes, trails and parks.

Besides our regular property taxes, we recently showed our support with a 2018 franchise fee on our gas and electric bill for new trails, a quarterly $70 tax on our water bills and now a 2019 additional property tax increase to go towards sidewalk and trail upkeep and maintenance. (See Minnetonka Memo July & November 2018 issues)

The Minnetonka City Council is now being asked by the City Manager and staff, to vote on a mountain bike trail in Lone Lake Park to serve a small exclusive group - most who are non-residents. (2019 MORC member list)

The price and SOURCE of funding to build this trail and its upkeep has not been addressed. The estimated cost has doubled since it was first introduced and the trail upkeep has been casually, unrealistically, assigned to an outside volunteer mountain biking group.

A final all inclusive financial cost and funding source for the purposed Lone Lake Park mountain bike trail, and it’s on-going maintenance, needs to be presented to the Minnetonka City council and Minnetonka tax payers before a responsible vote is done

I respectfully ask that the Mtka City Council receive a final, total cost and funding source for building and the on-going maintenance of a mountain bike trail at Lone Lake Park by the City Manager before the Council members vote on this.
Respectfully,
Mary Mckee, 3842 Baker Road, Mtka, MN 55305

From: Laura Brill
Date: August 6, 2019 at 6:19:19 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com
Subject: 8/26 Vote on Mountain Bike Trail

How can the city council vote on the proposed mountain bike trail without holding any neighborhood meetings with those residents directly impacted by this? As a resident of the Vista Townhome Association, I want my voice heard. Please let me know when a neighborhood feedback session will be held.

Laura Brill

From: Thomas Stockert
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2019 11:03 AM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>
Cc: Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>; Corrine Heine <cheine@eminnetonka.com>; Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake Bike Trail Vote - August 26

Greetings Mayor,

Thank you for being so generous with your time to discuss the August 26 agenda item relating to bike trails in Lone Lake Park.

Per your request, I’m attaching the Planning Process exhibits we reviewed this morning. I had planned on having these blown up for the August 26 City Council meeting, though just recently learned I’ll be in Toronto on business that day. As such, I’ll include my planned comments below as well. As discussed, this is essentially the same message I planned to deliver over a year ago before the litigation delayed this process (at the very least hopefully you’ll appreciate the goal was to keep it under two minutes).

#
#
#
#
#

Good evening, I’m Tom Stockert 5524 Dominick Drive.

Shortly after moving into our home my boss paid a summer dinner visit. Having enjoyed our wildlife, he gave me this book on Minnesota birds the next day (I planned to hold it up). I’ve seen the vast majority of these birds from my deck. Not because they’re nesting on our land, but because mainly they’re nesting in Lone Lake Park.

The scarlet tanager, for instance, requires four undisturbed acres to nest and prefers eight acres.
There are ten Climate Endangered birds and 32 Climate Threatened birds documented in the trail study, including the scarlet tanager (endangered). In the interest of time, I’ll not comment on each species.

I pulled this planning process document off eMinnetonka over a year ago. It details a process I’ve enjoyed watching over the years on public access tv. However, I’ve modified it to reflect this expedited process whereby neighborhood input is documented but only factored as yes or no action, the Park Board does not provide feedback to the developer (city staff), nor does the City Council provide feedback. The concept plan is the final plan and is heading straight for an up or down vote.

The planning process is not an insult to the developer or architect, and requesting the same of city staff should not be interpreted as an insult to Minnetonka’s competent staff. This process enables all interested parties to know a thoughtful approach was taken whether or not they like the outcome.

With these quick points in mind I have two questions for tonight:

How many scarlet tanager nesting sites will be lost to this bike trail?

Can and will the City Council send this concept plan back to the park board to integrate community feedback into a formal plan which will then go through the Formal Application Review Process? I’m willing to help in any way I can.

Thank you.

# # # # # # #

I would appreciate this email being included in the Meeting Packet in my absence. My spouse Terri has agreed to deliver these comments on my behalf, though I’ve given her permission to back out if she gets cold feet. I had also planned to publish these exhibits online and in the Sun Sailor, though since you seemed open to investigating this option I’m rethinking my message.

Outreach relating to robust community engagement and encouraging questions to be answered will remain my focus between now and August 26.

Thanks again taking the time to speak with me in person.

Respectfully,

Tom Stockert
Step 1: Concept Plan Review Process

1. Concept submitted to city
2. Developer hosts neighborhood meeting to gather feedback
3. Planning Commission reviews concept and provides feedback
4. City Council reviews concept and provides feedback

Step 2: Formal Application Review Process

1. Developer submits formal application and plan to city
2. Planning Commission makes recommendation to City Council
3. City Council votes to approve or deny application
From: William O'Reilly  
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2019 9:09 PM  
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkanmtb@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Susan Carter <scarter@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: Off road cycling trails

As the first steward for the Minneapolis Theodore Wirth off road cycling trails, I can only hope that you look favorably on this project before you in Lone Lake Park. We were the first City to place an off road trail within a city park 16 years ago, and the City was wary of the new activity, which hadn’t been tried anywhere else except remote regional parks.

The best compliment we received from the MPRB was when they said we were the 'poster child' of user groups. The volunteers for these trails are the most diligent, hardest working group of all users of parks, and I learned that firsthand.

Since their creation the Theo trails have expanded to underused strips of land that are accessible to all users (walkers, birders, runners). Cyclists love to share their hard work with others and welcome them.

A big side benefit of the project was the elimination of bad behavior (drinking, drugs, vandalism), because I learned from my 16 years as a Park and Rec commissioner, good activity displaces bad activity.

A visit to Theo today will find families, kids, women, athletes, all enjoying the outside and getting physically fit.

A off road trail at Lone Lake Park will be a great asset to the community.

If you have any questions about trail creation please contact me.

Bill O’Reilly

From: Ian McIntosh  
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2019 10:15 AM  
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkanmtb@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Susan Carter <scarter@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: MTN Bike Trails in Minnetonka

Hello-
I hope you all are having a great week! I am emailing in regards to the proposed Minnetonka MTN Bike trails. I was just at Lebanon yesterday and was in awe at how awesome the community is there. There are families all hanging out, kids from 4 years old barely able to bike all the way to 60+ aged folks riding trails together. The Southwest suburbs do not have ANYTHING like this, despite having a plethora of land to build single track trails on.

Please bring mountain biking to Minnetonka! You will have support from everyone living on this side of the river!

-Ian

From: Wes Kuhnley
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2019 10:32 AM
To: Kelly O'Dea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkamtb@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Susan Carter <scarter@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Minnetonka Mtb trails

Hello!
My name is Wes Kuhnley, and I’m writing to you in support of building mountain bike trails Lone Lake Park. I’m a Minneapolis resident, work in Eden Prairie, and I travel quite often to various trails to ride and race. When I do, I always try to support a local business of some kind, be it restaurant, brewery, coffee shop, bike shop etc. Having a trail system close to my place of work would be fantastic, and I’m sure it would provide economic stimulation for those kinds of businesses. This, as well as being beneficial for the High School mtb league, attracting families like mine to your city, and other reasons I’m sure you’re all very much aware of. I hope to be riding trails in your town soon!
Thanks very much for your time,

WES KUHNLEY

From: Robert Chose
Date: August 12, 2019 at 11:28:29 AM CDT
To: "dcalvert@eminnetonka.com" <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Single track support

Hello,
I don’t even know if someone will read this but here it goes:

I am the father of three children and my two youngest (6th grade girl & 7th grade boy) attend MMW. As a family we are new (started a year ago) to mountain biking. My kids and I would like to ride a lot more single track, but at this time we are forced to drive 25-30 minutes one way to the closest single track which is not easy. I force my kids to get outside and play. They have asked repeatedly to go mountain biking, but I have to say no just because of the time it would take. This is the first time I have ever
written a government official so I hope this tells you how important this issue is to me. If we want our youth to get of computers/game systems this is one great way to do that. My kids feel tired but also fantastic after they get done riding. I know the mountain bike community to be respectful to nature and thoughtful to others while riding. I also think about the additional spending that will occur on the community because of this park. I ask for your vote to approve this new mountain bike park.

Thank you,

Rob chose

19775 near mountain blvd

From: Paul Pasko
Date: August 12, 2019 at 11:10:53 AM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Cc: Michele Pasko
Subject: Please Vote YES to bring sustainably-built mountain bike trails to Lone Lake Park!!!!!!!!!

As a 23-year property owner on Muriel Road in the City, this is an amenity I REALLY want the City to provide for my family and I.

Respectfully submitted

Paul J. Pasko III

13024 Muriel Road

Minnetonka, MN 55305

From: Kirk King
Date: August 11, 2019 at 6:31:45 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Yes to MTB trails!!!

Kirk King

4838 Carleton Rd.

Minnetonka, MN 55343

From: stephanie wittleder
Date: August 11, 2019 at 6:48:56 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com

Subject: I support mountain bike trails

I support mountain bike trails
Please support the trails for minnetonka

Sent from my iPhone

> On Aug 11, 2019, at 7:32 PM, Deb Paulson < wrote:
> My husband and I fully support a mountain bike trail in Lone Lake Park. We are avid bikers on the Lake Minnetonka Regional trail and support also having this alternative for community members to enjoy.
> Our address is 4212 Williston Road.
> Thank you!
> Sent from my iPhone

From: Jena Reisinger
Date: August 11, 2019 at 7:35:16 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com

Subject: MTB Minnetonka

Hello All! As a young resident of Minnetonka we are happy to hear of a new active opportunity for our family! We are in full support of the Mountain biking project at Lone Lake Park. Especially that the park is so near our home it makes it convenient for several times per week use. I couldn’t be happier to see a project to support active and healthy lifestyles for our kids and ourselves!

I hope that you choose to support the development of the project!

~Jena Ziegler

From: Anne Hooton
Date: August 11, 2019 at 7:37:14 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com

Subject: Minnetonka mountain biking @ Lone Lake

I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for the proposed mountain bike trails at Lone Lake. I regularly use trails maintained by MORC around the cities and have always been impressed by their stewardship. It can be frustrating when wet trails are closed but I think it shows their genuine
concern for keeping the environmental footprint to a minimum. Thank you for the continued support for this project. This type of forward thinking makes me glad I chose Minnetonka as a place to raise my family. Brett Hooton. 4040 Highland Rd.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Denise
Date: August 11, 2019 at 7:50:27 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergestedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Mtn bike trail

Hi Mr mayor and city council

I am emailing in support of the Lone Lake mountain bike trail. This would be a wonderful addition to our community
Thank you
Denise DeBoer-Stutelberg
Mtka MN

From: Mark Lowder
Date: August 11, 2019 at 8:11:00 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergestedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Vote for Mountain Bike Trails

I request your vote for the mountain bike trails. Mountain biking is a silent sport which is great exercise. Mountain bikers are respective of their environment and usually leave the trail in better shape then when they started by removing sticks, rocks, etc., which may be on the trails. MTB is fast growing and done by all ages.
Sent from my iPad

From: Rowan DeBold
Date: August 11, 2019 at 9:03:11 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergestedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Mountain bike trails in Lone Lake Park

My wife and I both fully support developing mountain bike trails in Long Lake Park. We walk in Lone Lake Park with our dog and do not expect the biking to disrupt our walks. It is a large park and there is room for a lot of activities.
Hi,
I support MTB trails at Lone Lake. I'm a resident of the city with two young kids. We all like to mountain bike, it would be great to have a local option rather than having to drive up to elm creek to ride.

Thanks
Sven Kohlmyer
16633 Bywood Ln
Minnetonka Mn 55345

Hi,
I support MTB trails at Lone Lake. I'm a resident of the city with two young kids. We all like to mountain bike, it would be great to have a local option rather than having to drive up to elm creek to ride.

Thanks
Sven Kohlmyer
16633 Bywood Ln
Minnetonka Mn 55345

Dear City Officials and Neighbors,

I have lived in Minnetonka for several years and am an enthusiastic outdoor recreation proponent. I am an environmentally conscious consumer and someone who tries hard to enrich my life and my families life through nature. I am also an avid cyclist who both pedals and drives to communities outside of my own to use mountain bike trails. I am not only spending my time but money to leave my own community. I strongly support the addition of well managed and well built mountain biking trails in Minnetonka.

IMBA and the MORC communities are both respectful and well trained on how to maximize land resources and conserve natural function and beauty when building trails. They will be a great partner to help our city add an amazing and local cycling destination.

I would love to take my children mountain biking at trails in Minnetonka. They have loved cycling at elm creek, Murphy and up in Cuyuna. Having a place to go near our own neighborhood would be amazing.

Please consider voting YES for the mountain bike trails in Lone Lake park.
Fellow Resident,

Christian Oestreich
6108 Scenic Rd
Minnetonka, MN 55345

From: Paul Lorinser
Date: August 11, 2019 at 10:34:13 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Lone Lake Single Track

Hello...

I’m emailing to ask you all to approve the development of single track trails at Lone Lake Park. I believe the trails will be a great addition to the park experience for hikers and bikers!

Thanks...
Paul, Jenny, Anna and Gavin Lorinser
4839 Winterset Drive
Minnetonka, MN 55343

From: John Mette
Date: August 12, 2019 at 5:59:34 AM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Lone Lake MTB Trail

Hello,
I am writing to express my support for the LL MTB trail.

Thank you,
John Mette
308 Lombardy Ln
Minnetonka MN

From: dale engquist
Date: August 11, 2019 at 11:19:29 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: sending along our support for the mountain bike trails at Lone Lake Park
Hi to all and thanks for your service to our great community!
We are urging you all to support the idea of mountain bike trails at Lone Lake Park.
I’m a 25 year resident and neighbor of Lone Lake Park and have spent countless hours exploring every single trail throughout the park.
The park in my opinion is ideally suited for the mountain bike trail system, the terrain is perfect, the access to the park is wonderful, there is ample parking throughout the park, and I believe it would be a great addition to our park system!
These trails would be almost entirely hidden from view of the average park user due to being mostly in the woods where I would estimate 99% of all park users have never set foot. This I know from hundreds of dog walks through the woods on the foot trails over the years and I could likely count on 1 hand the number of folks I’ve ever encountered off the regular paved pathways.

One thing our family has always been proud of is how Minnetonka has managed it’s green spaces and its infrastructure in general, our park system and expanding trails systems is very exciting! Biking is more and more popular and this would really be a great use of a small amount of funds that would affect a large number of athletic members of our community in a positive way. I certainly would be a huge fan of the trails and would personally use them often and have great confidence in our park boards capacity to oversee such a project responsibly and in an environmentally friendly way.

Thanks for your consideration to my view point and mostly to your commitment to our great city!
Please feel free to contact me anytime if you’d like to discuss the subject further.

Sincerely,

Dale Engquist

Dale Engquist and Sheri Fine
11904 Douglynn Dr
Minnetonka MN 55343

From: Ian McIntosh
Date: August 12, 2019 at 10:15:15 AM CDT
To: kodea@eminnetonka.com, bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, minnetonkamtb@gmail.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, gbarone@eminnetonka.com
Subject: MTN Bike Trails in Minnetonka

Hello-

I hope you all are having a great week! I am emailing in regards to the proposed Minnetonka MTN Bike trails. I was just at Lebanon yesterday and was in awe at how awesome the community is there. There are families all hanging out, kids from 4 years old barely able to bike all the way to 60+ aged folks riding
trails together. The Southwest suburbs do not have ANYTHING like this, despite having a plethora of land to build single track trails on.

Please bring mountain biking to Minnetonka! You will have support from everyone living on this side of the river!

-Ian

From: Chris Haar
Date: August 12, 2019 at 10:19:47 AM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: In Support of Lone Lake Mountain Bike Trails!

Hello Council Members-

Please consider voting in favor of mountain bike trails at Lone Lake Park! As a Minnetonka resident near Lone Lake (Barbara Drive in the Winterset neighborhood), this fantastic community resource will be close to my home and provide hours of entertainment for area kids (and their grownups!)

The oppositions take that this will somehow disrupt the peaceful quality of Lone Lake seems disingenuous. There are already "noisy" activities nearby. Soccer fields, tennis courts, basketball courts, playgrounds, and brand new pickleball courts. None of which was met with any resistance from area residents when they were proposed. The environmental concerns are also grasping at straws. I would have to say that the new pickleball court construction (and the nearby new housing developments on Shady Oak road, have done, and will do much more to impact the local ecology than a roughly 18" wide dirt trail through the woods.

Please vote in favor to keep Minnetonka on the forefront of regional sporting activity destinations. Please vote in favor to give Hopkins, Minnetonka, and Eden Prairie kids and teens a safe, well maintained place to ride.

Thank you for your consideration!

Chris and Gina Haar
4841 Barbara Drive
From: The Four Corner Kids
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2019 6:15 PM
To: Kelly O'Dea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkamtmb@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Susan Carter <scarter@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Bike trails at Lone park

Hello, my name is Jacob Ekstrand. I live at 15508 Highwood Drive in Minnetonka. I will be starting at the Minnetonka high school this year as a ninth grader. Me and a few friends joined the mountain bike team this summer. We used to run cross country, but we like mountain biking more.

I just want to say thank you for considering putting these trails in our city. We often have practices on the other parks with trails, but they are all really far away. I think it would be really nice to be able to ride to the trails at Lone Park, instead of having our parents drive us to practice.

Thank you,
Jacob Ekstrand

From: Jerry Levine
Sent: Saturday, August 10, 2019 1:36 PM
To: Brad Wiersum
Subject: Mountain Bike Trail

I am concerned that no neighborhood meetings have been held prior to the scheduled vote on the mountain bike trails. I live in the Vista Townhome development, and am directly impacted by this, and want to have my opinion heard. When will a neighborhood meeting be held?

I look forward to hearing from you,

Jerry Levine

From: Terri Osland
Date: August 13, 2019 at 9:14:22 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Support for Lone Lake Mountain Bike Trails

Mayor Wiersum and City Council,
Thank you in advance for carefully considering the proposal for mountain bike trails in Lone Lake. I am writing in support of this proposal. I am a resident of Minnetonka and live very near the park (just off of Baker Road south of Excelsior). I think we are very fortunate to have a park like Lone Lake that presents healthy outdoor experiences for a wide variety of people.

My personal interest in the trails has stemmed from my 15 year old son's passion for the sport. This past weekend, we camped as a family in Cuyuna and I rode those trails, this was my first time truly mountain biking. It was incredible exercise and a wonderful way to enjoy the outdoors.

I guess that I just assumed my young son would love physical activities that I enjoyed as a child, like baseball, basketball, soccer, etc....I signed him up to participate in these activities throughout the years, but none of these things stuck. As a 7th grader, he went on a ride with the Hopkins High Mountain Bike team and after the initial challenge of keeping up given the physical exertion required, he was hooked. Without a doubt, this is the MOST positive thing that my son is involved with as an extra curricular opportunity in the schools. The community of riders and coaches is a gift to him and other young people who don't quite connect with some of the traditional school sports.

I respect all environmental concerns, this is a value of mine, but our parks provide value to our community members by giving them opportunities to engage with our environment. Mountain biking is less disruptive to the environment than many other park features that are commonplace. I recently played at the new pickleball courts (a sport I personal love) and pondered the contradiction between the opposition over mountain biking with the silence heard when that massive area of green space was covered with non-environmentally friendly surfacing and metal fences.

Theodore Wirth will be more difficult to travel to via our system of trails in the coming years because of the construction of the light rail and it would be amazing for avid bikers in our suburb and outside of our suburb to have an alternative to engage in healthy exercise while enjoying the outdoors. Thank you for your consideration.

Kindly,

Terri Osland

Minnetonka Resident

From: Jennifer Munt
Date: August 13, 2019 at 3:39:45 PM CDT
To: Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Thanks!
Greetings, Deb!

Thanks for meeting with us this morning to discuss Lone Lake Park. I can only imagine how crazy your life is juggling a new job and your commitment to all things Minnetonka.

I’ve lived at Beachside for 21 years. My grandsons and I treasure our majestic forest. It’s where the kids connect with nature and learn to be good stewards of our great outdoors. We’re so grateful to be walking distance from the “Up North” experience. Today we saw bumblebees, monarch butterflies and deer - and relaxed to the chirping of birds and crickets.

To be fair, I visited the shared-use mountain bike and hiking trail at Hyland Park along the Minnesota River in Bloomington. It was unsafe, and downright frightening, for hikers and bikers to share a narrow 18” trail. While walking my dog, I was nearly run over by two bikers who were racing at high speed down a steep hill.

Please don’t carve mountain bike trails into our forest. Braemar and Carver Parks will soon offer amazing mountain bike courses without having a negative impact on the ecosystem we’ve worked so hard to protect at Lone Lake Park. We’ve already got plenty of recreational opportunities at the park - soccer, basketball, tennis, frisbee golf, a playground, and the new pickle ball courts. We don’t need mountain bikes on our nature trail.

Thanks for your hard work and the difficult decisions you have to make. I share your desire to achieve a win-win, so please reach out if you have ideas.

Warm regards,

Jennifer Munt
5261 Beachside Drive

---

From: Todd TeVogt
Date: August 13, 2019 at 2:28:58 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com

Subject: Mountain Bike Trails in Lone Lake Park

Hello to Mr. Wiersum and the entire Minnetonka City Council,

I am writing to you in regards to the potential Mountain Biking Trails that could be created in Lone Lake Park. My son will be in 8th grade this coming school year and has joined the Minnetonka Mountain Biking Team and is having a blast. We currently commute all over the metro area in search of some great trails to ride on (Theodore Worth, Elm Creek, Lake Rebecca, Lebanon Hills, Murphy Hanrehan, etc.). One thing that is missing is some great trails in Minnetonka! The Mountain Biking Team in Minnetonka and the community in general is growing right now and the need for good local trails is also
growing. I have heard about some kids "playing" in Purgatory Park and maybe doing some things that they should not be doing, but they are just hoping to get out and ride. What a great way to keep the kids off of technology and get them outdoors having fun.

I hope to make it to the City Council Meeting on August 26th, but also want to let you know how important that this is for our community.

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments.

Thanks,

Todd TeVogt

From: Mike Voss
Date: August 13, 2019 at 10:07:24 AM CDT
To: "bwiersum@eminnetonka.com" <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>, "dcalvert@eminnetonka.com"<dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>, "scarter@eminnetonka.com"<scarter@eminnetonka.com>, "bellingson@eminnetonka.com"<bellingson@eminnetonka.com>, "rschack@eminnetonka.com"<rschack@eminnetonka.com>, "mhappe@eminnetonka.com"<mhappe@eminnetonka.com>, "tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com"<tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake Mountain Bike Trail

Please consider voting in favor of building the mountain bike trail at Lone Lake so we as a community can all share the resource in the way we’d like to use it.

From: Jake Butzer
Date: August 12, 2019 at 8:49:37 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: In support of the trails

Dear Council,

Thank you your service and continued dedication to making Minnetonka a great place to live.

I live at 4840 Barbara Dr in Minnetonka and I am writing to express my support for the addition of mountain bike trails at lone lake park. About three years ago I picked up mountain biking as a means to get in shape. Since then I’ve had many friends and family members fall in love again with biking. My dad
and I have bonded over hours on mountain bike rides. Instead of going out to dinner for date night, my wife and I get a babysitter to go ride the trails at Theo together. My kids also share the love of the sport and my son would prefer a bike ride with his parents over video games.

Not only is mountain biking still a mechanism for me to live a healthy lifestyle, it has become a centerpiece of our family culture. Adding trails to Minnetonka would allow us to enjoy the sport we love in the city we love.

I ask that you vote in favor of the lone lake park mtb trails so that current and future residents have the opportunity to explore the beauty of Minnetonka.

Thanks again for your service and consideration.

Sincerely,

Jake Butzer
4840 Barbara dr.
Minnetonka MN 55343

From: steve mcdonald  
Date: August 12, 2019 at 7:12:31 PM CDT  
To: bellingson@eminnetonka.com, bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com  
Subject: Minnetonka mountain bike trails.

Hello. I wanted to voice my support for the proposed mountain bike trail you are voting on at the August 26th meeting.

I am 51 years old and have been mountain biking for the last 6-7 years. I love this activity and have had to drive in a car a 1/2 hour to 45 minutes just to get to a trail in the past. During my time biking I have found the mountain bike community strong stewards of the trails and parks they. It’s a very diverse group and very considerate of other users.

This trail will be a great community asset and will continue to advance Minnetonka as the best city in the state. Thank you for considering this project. It’s low risk to the City and high return to our residents.

Steve McDonald
4285 manor court road
Minnetonka Mn 55345

From: Aaron Osland  
Date: August 12, 2019 at 5:50:19 PM CDT  
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com,
Dear City Council Members,

My name is Aaron Osland and I live at 12808 Jorissen Road in Minnetonka. I'm want to voice my support for the proposed mountain bike trails in Lone Lake. My son has taken a strong interest in mountain biking and he is entering his 3rd year of participating on the Hopkins MTB team. Fitness, fun, love of nature, stewardship and family bonding have all been part of our family journey of learning and participating in this sport.

People can walk in every Minnetonka park. I'm hoping we can have ONE park where people of all ages can ride mountain bikes on trails. Please please please support this initiative.

Thank you,
Aaron Osland

Mayor and City Council,

Please count me among the supporters of mountain biking trails through Lone Lake Park. I have biked in places such as Lebanon Hills, and know how narrow (yikes!) the trails are and how little they impact the wilderness area around them.

I believe due diligence has been performed regarding the bees' and other animals' habitats. I'm very much in favor of keeping 'wild' spaces wild, and think that this recreational sport is a wonderful balance of getting people - particularly young people - OUTSIDE, while preserving those spaces.

Michele Pasko
13024 Muriel Road
I am emailing you today in support of the upcoming vote to add mountain biking to the City of Minnetonka. I live in Golden Valley so I am not a voter in Minnetonka but I would follow that with saying myself and my family regularly travel to ride trails in other locations. As a family, mountain biking has been a great sport that our entire family can enjoy together. These excursions often lead to us spending money in towns we would not otherwise spend time in helping local businesses.

Please vote in support of adding Mountain Bike Trails.

Thanks

Austin Holm
From: Andrew Theis
Date: August 12, 2019 at 12:21:42 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Mountain biking

I’m 12 and I love mountain biking, but the only good trails nearby are at Theodore Wirth. Could you please build some nearby.

From: "John Mirocha"
Date: August 14, 2019 at 10:18:06 AM CDT
To: "Brad Wiersum" <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>, <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>, <scarter@eminnetonka.com>, <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>, <rschack@eminnetonka.com>, <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>, <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>, "Geralyn Barone"
Subject: Lone Lake Bike Vote 8/26
All, Here are my thoughts regarding the vote. They center on the city not following its own processes on community engagement, violating its policy on preserve status and shifting the balance between preservation and development without democratic process.

I encourage you to vote no or table the decision and send it back to the parks committee for further work. They kicked the can to you in the first place without neighborhood input or discussion and analysis on their part with us at their open meetings. Hold them accountable.

John Mirocha, Ph.D.
5423 Maple Ridge CT
Minnetonka, MN 55343-9488
August 13, 2019
Mayor and Council

Preserve The Preserve and save Lone Lake Park from further development. Vote no on the mountain biking course proposal or table the motion until the city explores alternatives, holds neighborhood meetings and addresses issues of preservation versus development.

The issue of mountain biking in LLP has become a tipping point for me about development versus the preservation and enhancement of green space for passive use in Minnetonka. The current city council appears to be shifting the balance between these two factors to the development side without input from its residents. For example Section V of the POST plan states that land designated as a community preserve shall, “Provide reasonable trail access to the natural resource amenities within the community without unduly compromising their integrity and natural qualities.” Mountain bike trail heads within the Twin Cities see a range of 150 - 2,500 weekly users. This proposal ignores the history and intent of this Post document by even considering mountain biking activity in the park which all parties agree will cause damage. That the trails are being proposed is one thing but the process is an issue as well. The city has violated its own processes for neighborhood engagement and democracy; there have been no neighborhood meetings for those of us who live close to the park. In addition, some council members have declined to meet with residents or answer our questions about the plan. This is hardly democratic.

I am not against mountain biking or mountain bikers. I just don’t think you should carve bike trails into a small ecologically delicate city park where restoration work has been underway for 20 years, there are remnants of The Big Woods and there is a federally protected bee nesting there. The risks of damage even given actions to mitigate the damage are just too great. I hear the discussion comparing potential damage from bikers and other users and what group causes the most damage. The point that is missing in this discussion is that currently it is estimated that 12-20 people walk parts of the informal trails weekly whereas with the bike course dozens to thousands are predicted to bike the total 4.7 miles. The damage is magnified by the sheer number of bikers in the park versus others; frequency and intensity are the key issues.

While the outcome of the vote on the trails is important to me and others, you must realize that the issue now has become bigger than the trails themselves. Hundreds of people near the park and throughout Minnetonka are concerned about tipping the balance between preservation and development to the development side. Many also are extremely concerned with the lack of engagement by the city with those affected most by the trails; its neighbors.

I have decided to focus my energy on LLP, our park system as a whole and the city’s total environmental stance long term regardless of how the vote goes. Others are doing the same. There is a groundswell of activity in and around Minnetonka now around a vision for the city that resets the balance between preservation and enhancement and development to one that favors preservation and enhancement and uses this vision to guide its policies and actions. The demographic for this movement crosses all groups in our city and is comprised of high school students seeking climate change initiatives, potential new residents looking for green space in an urban setting to bring their children to as well as naturalists, environmentalists and others who want a park to go to that is uncrowded, quiet and safe to walk, reflect and learn. We seek a vision of a city that protects, preserves and enhance its ecologically rich park areas.
From: Ed Hassler  
Date: July 24, 2019 at 8:23:05 PM CDT  
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>, Deb Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>, scarter@eminnetonka.com, Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>, rschack@eminnetonka.com, Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>, Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: VOTE ON MOUNTAIN BIKING IN LONE LAKE PARK

Dear Minnetonka City Council:

On an informal walk at Lone Lake Park last year with Recreation Program Manager, Jesse Izquierdo, and Natural Resources Manager, Jo Colleran, Mr. Izquierdo admitted taking the pictures of two areas in the park and labeling them in the city’s mountain bike proposal as examples of erosion caused by pedestrians: the informal footpath on the east side of the tennis courts and the fault line from the water tower down to the playground. Neither is the result of foot traffic. The former was originally a dirt road used by the Bren family, later used illegally by mountain bikers. The latter was the remains of the tow rope path when the hill was denuded of trees and used for downhill skiing in the 1970s and subsequently used illegally by dirt bikers for hill climbing. I walk the park twice a day, rain or shine, 365 days a year, and I have never seen a walker or jogger on that steep ravine.

My question to the City Council is: If Mr. Izquierdo manufactured these assertions, what other false or misleading “facts” has he included in the proposal? Has anyone on the park board or city council
checked these claims? I’m hoping the council will postpone the vote on the mountain biking project until this clearly biased proposal can be re-examined.

Sincerely,

Ed Hassler

5516 Sanibel Drive

Minnetonka, MN 55343

---

From: Mike Vandeman
Date: July 24, 2019 at 7:42:33 PM CDT
To: Recipient list suppressed;
Subject: Mountain Biking in Our Parks


What were you thinking?? Mountain biking and trail-building destroy wildlife habitat! Mountain biking is environmentally, socially, and medically destructive!

Bicycles should not be allowed in any natural area. They are inanimate objects and have no rights. There is also no right to mountain bike. That was settled in federal court in 1996: https://mjvande.info/mtb10.htm. It's dishonest of mountain bikers to say that they don't have access to trails closed to bikes. They have EXACTLY the same access as everyone else -- ON FOOT! Why isn't that good enough for mountain bikers? They are all capable of walking....

A favorite myth of mountain bikers is that mountain biking is no more harmful to wildlife, people, and the environment than hiking, and that science supports that view. Of course, it's not true. To settle the matter once and for all, I read all of the research they cited, and wrote a review of the research on mountain biking impacts (see https://mjvande.info/scb7.htm). I found that of the seven studies they cited, (1) all were written by mountain bikers, and (2) in every case, the authors misinterpreted their own data, in order to come to the conclusion that they favored. They also studiously avoided mentioning another scientific study (Wisdom et al) which did not favor mountain biking, and came to the opposite conclusions.

Mountain bikers also love to build new trails - legally or illegally. Of course, trail-building destroys wildlife habitat - not just in the trail bed, but in a wide swath to both sides of the trail! E.g. grizzlies can hear a human from one mile away, and smell us from 5 miles away. Thus, a 10-mile trail represents 100 square miles of destroyed or degraded habitat, that animals are inhibited from using. Mountain biking, trail building, and trail maintenance all increase the number of people in the park, thereby preventing the animals' full use of their habitat. See https://mjvande.info/scb9.htm for details.
Mountain biking accelerates erosion, creates V-shaped ruts, kills small animals and plants on and next to the trail, drives wildlife and other trail users out of the area, and, worst of all, teaches kids that the rough treatment of nature is okay (it's NOT!). What's good about THAT?

To see exactly what harm mountain biking does to the land, watch this 5-minute video: http://vimeo.com/48784297.

In addition to all of this, it is extremely dangerous: https://mjvande.info/mtb_dangerous.htm.

For more information: https://mjvande.info/mtbfaq.htm.

The common thread among those who want more recreation in our parks is total ignorance about and disinterest in the wildlife whose homes these parks are. Yes, if humans are the only beings that matter, it is simply a conflict among humans (but even then, allowing bikes on trails harms the MAJORITY of park users -- hikers and equestrians -- who can no longer safely and peacefully enjoy their parks).

The parks aren't gymnasiums or racetracks or even human playgrounds. They are WILDLIFE HABITAT, which is precisely why they are attractive to humans. Activities such as mountain biking, that destroy habitat, violate the charter of the parks.

Even kayaking and rafting, which give humans access to the entirety of a water body, prevent the wildlife that live there from making full use of their habitat, and should not be allowed. Of course those who think that only humans matter won't understand what I am talking about -- an indication of the sad state of our culture and educational system.

--

I am working on creating wildlife habitat that is off-limits to humans ("pure habitat"). Want to help? (I spent the previous 8 years fighting auto dependence and road construction.)

Wildlife must be given top priority, because they can't protect themselves from us.

Please don't put a cell phone next to any part of your body that you are fond of!

---

**From:** "John Mirocha"

**Date:** July 15, 2019 at 4:46:12 PM CDT

**To:** <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>, <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>, <scarter@eminnetonka.com>,<bellingson@eminnetonka.com>, <rschack@eminnetonka.com>, <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>, <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>

**Cc:** <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>

**Subject:** Lone Lake Park Trail Questions

All, I write you in preparation for your upcoming discussion and vote on the proposed mountain biking trails in Lone Lake Park. My wife and I are 30 year residents of the city and moved here because of the
quality of life including great schools, abundant green space and a reputation for environmental leadership.

Many of us in the community are against building these trails in the park as we feel that our community needs space which is for passive use only. The construction of trails and mountain biking are not passive uses. A year ago we outlined our concerns and composed a set of questions for the mayor, council and the city manager to answer. Unfortunately, these questions have not been answered and many of them are still critical to the decision today. As the year has passed new questions have emerged. I have attached the revised and still relevant questions from 2018 as well as a few of the most pressing new issues that have emerged in 2019.

You were elected to represent your citizens and that means responding to our questions. We have attempted to engage you in a dialogue about the proposal via the questions but that has not been possible because you, or staff, have not responded. I, and many others, look forward to your answers prior to the vote. Without answering these questions how can you make a reasoned choice?

John Mirocha, Ph.D.
QUESTIONS RELATED TO THE LONE LAKE MOUNTAIN BIKING TRAILS PLAN

July 2019 Additions and July 2018 Revisions

1) Remnants of Big Woods (50 acres) have been verified in Lone Lake Park. In 2003 Wayzata residents approved a $3 million bond referendum to purchase 14 acres of Big Woods and place it under protection of the MN Land Trust. Why wouldn’t Minnetonka want to follow suit and place these 50 acres of Big Woods in Lone Lake Park under the protection of the MN Land Trust?

2) When existing park issues such as deteriorating information kiosks, park office/restroom soffit damage and new rogue bike trails are reported, Minnetonka Mike states that there is insufficient manpower to maintain the park as it is. What are the city’s plans for maintaining its current infrastructure much less deal with new maintenance issues?

3) The new pickle ball courts have created run off, erosion and invasive plant issues. What are the city’s plans for fixing these issues?

4) The pickle ball courts appear to be used sparsely. How does the city measure its ROI on such projects?

5) The city has talked about on off leash dog park as well as connecting the park to the new apartments on Rowland Road with a walk way of sorts. How might these additions affect the park’s capacity? What environmental issues will need to be addressed?

6) The city seems to be in a development mode in terms of filling open green space in favor of human activity at the expense of green space. When will the city address a policy and ordinance regarding preserving green space?

7) Some city council members believe that they need these mountain bike trails to draw younger residents to Minnetonka. Many of these residents will be diverse by socioeconomic status and ethnicity. How will they afford a mountain bike and how will they be able to pay the $500 club cost to join a team?

8) Many MORC members say they need these trails in Lone Lake Park so their children can ride there from their high schools to the park to ride. Mountain bikes are made for dirt terrain, not hard surface roads and sidewalks where they are difficult to ride. Therefore, the mountain bike team members are most likely to be driven to the park and dropped off (and picked up). What is the city doing to manage the extra traffic and congestion, and possibly parking?
July 2018 Revisions

1) The Study concludes that there will be environmental impact associated with the proposed trails and it will include the loss of vegetation, erosion, the spreading of invasive species and the disturbance of wildlife. Why have these impacts not been quantified?

2) Since the trail plan has not been staked in the field, how can the SEH naturalist and staff make so many conclusions and know about the environmental impacts?

3) The input received in Imagine Minnetonka was general and not site specific to any particular park. Why did the city even consider Lone Lake Park since it has spent so much time and money restoring it?

4) It seems like some of the detailed focus groups engaged by WSB & Associates were focused on Big Willow Park. Why hasn’t a similarly focused engagement been done regarding Lone Lake Park? To date, there have been no neighborhood meetings.

5) The design criteria identify the avoidance of high value restoration areas. Why does the Trail Concept Plan show looped trails throughout the high value restoration areas? Why is it not avoiding those areas?

6) One of the study graphics shows Existing Formal and Informal footpaths. How many conflict points will there be between the informal footpaths and bike trails? Isn’t this creating a significant safety issue? Why is the plan violating one of the agreed-upon criteria—that the trails minimally intersect existing footpaths?

7) Lone Lake Park carries both a community park and Preserve designation. The Study talks about trade-offs and balancing objectives of recreation and environmental protection. The City has been investing in the restoration of the natural resources at Lone Lake for over twenty years. The proposal to site 4.7 miles of Mountain Bike Trails through this park will clearly degrade the very natural resources the City has been steadfast in investing to protect and restore. This clearly represents a decision to shift the focus of the purpose of this park away from a preserve to be protected in favor of recreation. Was that question ever asked directly in any community engagement activity? Has the Park Board and the City Council actively decided to choose recreation over preservation for Lone Lake Park? What about other parks?

8) When was the policy decision made to change the purpose of the preserve portion of Lone Lake Park? Has the Park Board voted on changing this policy that they created?

9) Significant areas within Lone Lake Park are designated as bluffs for protecting these features. What percentage of the trails will be sited on protected bluffs?
10) The Study identifies the predominant tree species as oak and maple. Compaction of soils within the drip line of oak trees damage them and make them more susceptible to disease. What percentage of the total trail length will be within the drip lines of oak trees?

11) In a staff report several years ago, the City staff identified the hillside to the west of the lake as being severely eroded and damaged by undesignated trails. This plan puts a significant trail right there. Are you saying that this design can completely avoid the same problems the staff fought so hard to correct?

12) On what do you base the statement that there is an increase in mountain biking as a sport, and do you have any data about this specifically in Minnesota?

13) If you changed the policy at Lone Lake Park to have this high impact activity within the preserve part of the park—will you change the policy at the other parks? If you do not change the policies at the other parks, then how will you enforce the current ordinances as the public will likely become confused and think there is mountain biking in all Minnetonka parks (especially Purgatory Park which already has rogue bikers creating trails)?

14) Has the community safety department staff been consulted about how they will enforce the rules in Lone Lake Park? Will there be a mechanism set up (such as a web portal) where complaints can be submitted? If not, how are complaints made? Will the city provide small ATVs to retrieve injured or otherwise incapacitated trail users? If so, what is the cost for purchasing and maintaining such vehicles?

15) Are there any examples of parks with high value restoration areas with trails added? If so what is the timeline of those parks and have they been evaluated before and after the trails over a period of years? If no other parks with restored high value areas have had mountain bike trails added then is Lone Lake Park an experiment? If so, what is the timeline, and what are the metrics that will be used to measure the effects of the trails?

16) Are there any other mountain bike trails in regional trails with slopes of 25% to 35% graded slopes?

17) How can this 18 inch trail be multi use? How can a person walking share the trail with a mountain biker? Which person has the right of way?

18) The February 2018 Mountain Bike report for Purgatory Park states there are environmental concerns for building trails in the Park, and that avoiding high quality areas and not compromising restoration efforts does not leave enough acreage. Why was the same approach not used for Lone Lake Park? The plan will compromise restoration efforts and degrade high quality woodland areas.

19) The February 2018 Mountain Bike report state that there was a 2001 voter-approved Park and Open Space referendum and mountain biking was not addressed during the process. Will you be holding a voter referendum to determine if the neighborhood supports this proposal?
20) At the February 2018 Park Board meeting, the board directed the staff to move forward with studying Lone Lake Park. Included in the next steps for the process was to conduct community and neighborhood meeting(s) for public input? There have been no community or neighborhood meetings to date. When do you plan to hold these meetings?

21) In the Land Manager Survey which includes a total of 34 questions, only one question covered an environmental aspect - if funds are allocated for restoration and how much. When the overwhelming concern residents have expressed during the public process is environmental, why was there only one environment-related question in the Land Manager Survey? Why were the park ecologists not included in the survey?

22) In the draft report, it is stated that "Mountain bike trails are included as a nature type trail." What document was referenced that defines mountain bike trails as a nature trail and a form of passive recreation? The EPA defines active recreation as "a structured individual or team activity that requires the use of special facilities, courses, fields, or equipment," and passive recreation as "recreational activities that do not require prepared facilities like sports fields or pavilions. Passive recreational activities place minimal stress on a site's resources; as a result, they can provide ecosystem service benefits and are highly compatible with natural resource protection." Do you still assert that mountain biking is a passive recreational use when it has been clearly stated that the construction and use of the trails will degrade the park's natural resources?

23) The goal of the Natural Resources Stewardship Program (according to the staff report) is to achieve a sustainable landscape quality to be maintained indefinitely. How are we maintaining the landscape quality with the introduction of mountain bike trails when the SEH report concludes that there will be environmental impacts?

24) Minnetonka is planning to enter an MOU with a third party (MORC) to manage the trail. Could we please see an example of the MOU with the opportunity to provide input? What are the consequences if the MOU is not followed appropriately? Does it include quantifiable measures of performance for MORC?

25) Permitting such a project on private property would likely require escrow and irrevocable letters of credit in the event of non-performance. Will MORC supply such security for the trails they plan to manage?

26) Accidents will surely happen on the trail. Who is liable for injuries resulting from trail design and maintenance? Will MORC maintain sufficient insurance as well as indemnify the City, including waiver of subrogation?

27) There is a 200 foot span of combined mountain bike trail and regional trail in the proposal. How will the city ensure that bikers will not enter and ride on this shared trail at higher speeds than are safe?

28) Why is there no parking study in this proposal? The only information is the number of spaces. What is the current use of the parking lots? How many soccer games are typically scheduled at the Lone Lake field? How many pickle ball players are projected to use the new
From: Lonna Mosow  
Date: July 1, 2019 at 1:11:24 PM CDT  
Cc: dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com, bwiersum@eminnetonka.com  
Subject: Lone Lake Park - leave it!

Council members:

As a resident of Minnetonka and a frequent walker and jogger at the park, I plead to you to "leave Lone Lake alone!" There are so few parks in the area where one can get away from the noise and chaos of our daily lives.

Lone Lake Park has a long history of serving the community the wonders of its woods and habitat. There already is a vast amount of diversity that exits in the park: Soccer; Tennis; Basketball; Playground and now Pickle Ball Courts.

Read the latest research on the value of Nature as Mental and Physical Therapy and that none of us get enough of restorative time.

Please leave Lone Lake alone!!

Thank you.

Lonna

From: David Boyer  
Date: August 14, 2019 at 7:35:31 AM CDT  
To: "bwiersum@eminnetonka.com" <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>, "dcalvert@eminnetonka.com" <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>, "scarter@eminnetonka.com" <scarter@eminnetonka.com>, "bellingson@eminnetonka.com" <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>, "rschack@eminnetonka.com" <rschack@eminnetonka.com>, "mhappe@eminnetonka.com" <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>,  

"tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com" <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>

Subject: Mountain bike trails at lone lake.

Hello,
My wife and I recently purchased our first home at 11807 shady oak drive, Minnetonka. We have been married just over 1 year. We look forward to raising a family in Minnetonka.

We are both avid cyclist and are in support of single track trails at Lone lake park. Quick and safe Trail access played a major role in our home purchase process. Being able to ride directly from home and access a network of trails, (paved, gravel and single track) is a wonderful asset for a city to have.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,
-David and Jenée Boyer

From: Ben Marks
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 11:54 AM
To: Kelly <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Cc: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: MTB Advocate Volunteer hours Spreadsheet attached

Hi Kelly,

Hope you are well. Attached is a spreadsheet, prepared by Janet Van Sloun, that quantifies the number of hours the MTB Trail Advocate group have volunteered to help improve our parks. I believe this is important information that should be shared with the mayor and city council members prior to the August 26 meeting.

Ben Marks
From: John Mielke  
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 10:01 PM  
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkamtb@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Susan Carter <scarter@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: Support for Lone Lake MTB trails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. Vols.</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Task(s)</th>
<th>Leader(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-Aug-17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.25</td>
<td>Big Willow - N of creek</td>
<td>Deadhead/pull stickseed &amp; motherwort; prune cherry black knot</td>
<td>JVS, Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Aug-17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>Big Willow - N of creek</td>
<td>Choke cherry thicket, Deer enclosure &amp;</td>
<td>JVS, Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Sep-17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Big Willow on Mtka Blvd -</td>
<td>Weeding and mulching west of parking lot across from Applewood Pointe</td>
<td>JVS, Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Sep-17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Big Willow - N of creek</td>
<td>Prune cherry black knot disease, misc</td>
<td>Sarah, Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Sep-17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>Big Willow - S of creek</td>
<td>Plant native wildflowers near canoe landing (plants donated by Mary Wright)</td>
<td>JVS, Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Oct-17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Big Willow on Mtka Blvd -</td>
<td>Remove top of fill pile, dig &amp; replant natives (raspberry, oak), plant 40 wfr</td>
<td>JVS, Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Oct-17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>Big Willow - S of creek</td>
<td>Prune buckthorn west of parking lot around deer enclosure &amp; on cedar knoll</td>
<td>JVS, Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Dec-17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>W of parking up to former</td>
<td>Cut buckthorn &amp; stack along trail edge.</td>
<td>JVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>homestead</td>
<td>Left tall stumps for contractor treatmt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>163.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2018 Date | No. Vols. | Hours | Location                      | Task(s)                                                                 | Leader(s) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-May-18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>Lone Lake Park -</td>
<td>Pull Garlic Mustard (GM) cut &amp; bag seed tops</td>
<td>JVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Jun-18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Lone Lake Park -</td>
<td>Pull GM, cut &amp; bag seed tops</td>
<td>JVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Jun-18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Lone Lake Park -</td>
<td>Pull GM, cut &amp; bag seed tops</td>
<td>JVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2019 Date | No. Vols. | Hours | Location                      | Task(s)                                                                 | Leader(s) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-Jul-19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Lone Lake Park -</td>
<td>Cut volunteer trees in rain gardens; cut buckthorn on edge of Bball woods; left tall stumps for later treatment</td>
<td>JVS, HHH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Volunteer Hours 244.25
Dear Mayor and Council members,

I want to thank you again for your hard work in considering the facts and public opinion concerning the establishment of sustainable single-track mountain bike trails in Minnetonka. It has been a long process.

I wanted to share two personal thoughts in support of the trails.

First, the mountain bike advocacy group has quietly demonstrated our concern for the environment of Minnetonka by donating hundreds of hours toward invasive weed removal. We intend to continue to work with the city in restoration of the parks and provide for maintenance of the trails through trained voluntary efforts. I am a member of the Minnesota Off Road Cycle (MROC) group and will be trained by them to provide ongoing low cost (free) labor to sustain these trails. We believe that our presence will be an asset to the city, not a detriment.

Second, these trails will continue to provide multigenerational exercise and activity as a life long sport. I personally took up mountain biking 6 years ago to improve my fitness, balance, and strength in an outdoor activity that is fun and social. I enjoy single-track mountain biking with my children (in their 40s) and grandchildren (ages 4-18). I look forward to riding from our home to the trails rather than driving. Eight of my grandchildren live within biking distance of Lone Lake Park. In addition, I believe good exercise and learning new skills delays the onset of dementia. As a geriatrician caring for the elderly I am acutely aware of the need to address dementia proactively. As a 66 year old I find that mountain biking is a great silent, outdoor, non-motorized sport that I can enjoy for the next 15 to 20 years. I would like to do so in my own community, with my children and grandchildren.

Thanks for taking the time to read this, and considering the benefit for all Minnetonka residents,

John Mielke
16311 Limerick Lane
Minnetonka, MN
(23 years in this location, life long Mtka resident) Sent from my iPad

From: Jeff Swanson
Sent: Thursday, August 15, 2019 10:22 AM

To: Kelly ODae <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Minnetonka Mountain Bike Trail Advocates <minnetonkamtb@gmail.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Susan Carter <scarter@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>
Cc: Ben Marks
Subject: Trails at Lone Lake Park

I want to thank the City staff for their patience in the process of getting a mountain bike trail approved in Minnetonka. We are all excited for this to happen. As you know this process started as a Imagine
Minnetonka survey that had overwhelming amount of residents asking for this amenity in our great City. The Students at Minnetonka High also did a report showing the need for this amenity.

Young people have played a huge role in working with the City to get this approved. It has been over 3 years now and we are still waiting.

We are now at the point of a decision on the matter. City Staff is in full support of this trail system. Now it is in your hands.

You could choose to deny all of the efforts of the youth in our community who have put in an effort and it would be a MAJOR DISAPPOINTMENT for them. Imagine how disillusioned they would be with Government if that happened.

Also you would be buckling under the pressure of a few wealthy resident who have spent thousands on legal costs and so called experts to try to stop the trails from being built. This would also indicate to everyone involved that money and power rule our City and not the will of the majority.

This is a democracy and this is not supposed to happen.

A no vote will do significant damage to our community in these ways:

- Show that money and power rule our Cities decisions
- City staff recommendations do not matter even though they have strong support and all of the data to show why they support it.
- You would be setting a president in going against staff recommendations
- You will be giving a bad impression on our youth and other residents that the City bows to the pressure of the few and not the needs of the community.
- You would loose the opportunity to gain a huge base of volunteers who want to help preserve our parks and help with invasive species.

A no vote would have consequences

Please vote yes on the Lone Lake trails.

Thanks,

Jeff Swanson
15020 Evelyn Lane
Minnetonka

Proud resident of Minnetonka for over 40 years.
From: JOE BLACK
Sent: Friday, August 16, 2019 12:12 AM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>; Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; minnetonkamtb@gmail.com; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Susan Carter <scarter@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; Geralyn Barone <gbarone@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake Park Mountain Bike Trails

Minnetonka City Council:

I am writing to offer my support for the construction of single track mountain bike trails in Lone Lake Park in Minnetonka. Developing these trails is a cost-effective way to bring a great amenity to the community that will benefit city residents of all ages. The mountain bike trails will a way to enjoy the urban wilderness throughout the year.

My son joined the Minnetonka mountain bike team this year. The team has had to travel over a half hour to other trails for practices. The youth and older residents should have the opportunity to experience our community parks. When I was young the parks and undeveloped areas were available for trail riding. The least we can do is to provide a portion of one of our city parks to provide this to our children.

Sincerely, Joe Black

6087 Scenic Road, Minnetonka, MN

From: Paul Giguere
Date: August 15, 2019 at 8:42:14 PM CDT
To: dcalvert@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Lone Lake Park

Dear Ms Calvert,

During your campaign, when you visited us at our home at 5538 Nantucket Pl., MTKA., we heard you express your support for conservation and the environment. My wife and I voted for you in large part because of this.

Now we have heard that you’re in favor of a mountain bike trail in Lone Lake Park, even though there are many unanswered questions about the impact this will have on this beautiful park in which the city has invested a lot for conservation.

Please let us know if what we heard is true, because this may be hearsay.

Thank you very much.
Paul Giguere

From: linda goecke
Date: August 16, 2019 at 7:22:23 AM CDT
To: Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: OPPOSED to Proposed Lone Lake Mountain Bike Trail

To: Council member Deb Calvert
From: Linda Goecke, 6085 Rowland Road #111 Minnetonka, MN 55343

The August 2019 Minnetonka Memo states that the City received an award for advancing to Step 4 in the GreenStep Cities program. The article notes that the City has followed "best practices in categories such as land use and environmental management." HOW IRONIC, I thought -- the Lone Lake Mountain Bike Trail would be terrible environmental management. Yes, Minnetonka has taken many good steps toward sustainability, etc -- and I appreciate those.

However, I looked at the GreenStep website. The Land Use Category Best Practices states that cities would adopt "ordinances or processes that protect natural systems and valued community assets." Lone Lake Park is certainly a valued asset for its uniqueness, for its plants and animals, for the opportunity it provides for citizens to walk and experience a relatively unspoiled area.

My husband and I both strongly believe that a mountain bike trail does NOT belong in Lone Lake Park.

Thank you,

Mrs. Linda Goecke

From: Julia Mccunn
Date: August 16, 2019 at 10:31:26 AM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Lone Lake MTB Trails

Dear Mayor and Council members,

I’m writing today to show my support for the proposed mountain bike trails at Lone Lake Park. Please vote to move the project forward on August 26th.
I have worked in the outdoor recreation and cycling industries for the last 25 years. I have had an intimate view of the tremendous benefits that cycling - including offload riding - brings to communities around Minnesota (and elsewhere). The health and economic benefits cannot be overlooked, nor can the value of providing additional opportunities for recreation in our existing beautiful parks. Our young residents deserve to benefit from the amenities that Minnetonka has to offer. Unfortunately, some residents wish to keep these resources for themselves.

The opposition would have you believe that building the MTB trails will “kill” the park - that it is an all or nothing proposition. That is simply untrue. There are dozens of examples of sustainably built trails in Minnesota where hikers, horse riders, etc. share the resources without conflict. MORC (Minnesota Off Road Cyclists) have built hundreds of miles of sustainably built trails around our state. What we know is that nature very quickly takes back trails that go unused or un-maintained. You cannot say the same of paved trails in our community parks - of which Lone Lake has plenty.

Allow for this project to move forward, and you will quickly see the value of expanding the opportunities for recreation in our Minnetonka parks. You will also see one of Minnesota’s most active and well-organized advocacy groups spring into action to ensure that what is built is done so in a responsible way. In fact, these are some of the folks who have already cleared hundreds of pounds of invasive plants from Lone Lake Park. The work to create and maintain a beautiful, healthy park is already underway.

Thank you for your time. See you on August 26th.

Julia McCunn and Maria Zachmann
5013 Crown Street
Minnetonka, MN 55345

From: Lisa Harris
Date: August 16, 2019 at 9:32:10 AM CDT
To: Larry & Shari Rose
Cc: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>, Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>, Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>, Rebecca Schack <rachack@eminnetonka.com>, Susan Carter <scarter@eminnetonka.com>, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Re: MOUNTAIN BIKE TRAIL PROJECT

I agree with Larry! Stop your support of this project. It is not welcome in our community.

Regards,

Lisa Harris

Sent from the office of Lisa Harris
On Aug 16, 2019, at 8:23 AM, Larry & Shari Rose wrote:

*IF.....  You are really applying the Mission, Vision, Guiding Principles, and Goals of the City of Minnetonka, how can You consider constructing a mountain bike trail around an environmentally serene area within a well developed neighborhood. This area has quietly developed over the years, while protecting the wildlife, varieties of foliage, and huge variety of bees and insects. This entire neighborhood is not designed OR can be converted to accommodate an invasion mountain bikers. As I understand, the City plan does not include additional parking, restroom facilities, or normal typical park areas maintenance. Instead the plan will direct bikers to park within the limited parking within the area OR on the streets. I did not see the addition of restroom facilities. The picnic facilities, pickle ball courts, basketball court, and access to the lake, get very busy at times; BUT will they lose access to parking, because the bikers will be parking in those spaces. Trash collection and removal will be a problem. While the proposal included maintenance of the mountain bike trail by a select group of users, that will last only while the idea is fresh in their minds.

The environment impact will be huge, to the wildlife, soil erosion, the bees and insects, loss of mature trees, with potential home value decreases. There is no other way to describe it in any other way. The disruption to the joggers, families walking and playing in the park will be great.

The surrounding taxpaying housing will be severely disrupted. Would You support such a plan that might be right in YOUR backyard? I'm guessing NO. As long as it doesn't directly affect YOU, it seems like your interest levels change.

Might I propose three other areas a mountain bike trail could be placed:

1) Around the perimeter of the City Center Complex.
2) Around the open water area between the parking ramp on Hopkins Crossroad and the east end of Ridgedale Center.
3) Around the Hennepin County Home School.

These areas might NOT be nearly 5 miles around, but an extra trip to add up to those miles. Parking could be accommodated. The trails will directly affect far less neighborhood housing.

In a recent discussion with a mountain bike enthusiast from Hopkins, he’s all excited to have such a trail so close to Hopkins, “just so it’s not in his backyard”

Why has there been an absolute minimum amount on communication on this project, since it was tabled?
In mid August, 2018, I sent an email regarding my concerns to the City Council. Council Members Happe and Acomb at least responded.

I would hope each of You would consider my concerns and that of many others in our neighborhood, including current mountain bike riders.

I ask each of YOU to drop your support of this project in the Lone Oak Park area, and deny the project.

Larry Rose
5651 Sanibel Drive
Minnetonka, MN 55343

From: Dianne May
Date: August 16, 2019 at 4:31:47 PM CDT
To: dcalvert@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Lone Lake Park

We have lived close to Lone Lake Park for 18 years and used it nearly every day. PLEASE don't let anyone take away the serenity and peace we find there. The budding wild flowers take my breath away each spring as i enjoy the sounds of nature around me. The new born frogs serenade us on every walk. Fall colors and animals are a feast for our eyes and hearts.

The proposed bike track will destroy all of that and more. What is the reason it cannot be put in a more developed area that will not take away the beauty and tranquility of our precious park we have treasured for so long???

Please help vote this proposal down and save our park. It would be greatly appreciated by so many people who love and care about our wonderful Lone Lake Park just as it is now.

Best regards,

Dianne and George May
tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Lone Lake Park mountain bike trails

To Mr. Wiersum, Ms. Calvert, Ms. Carter, Mr. Ellingson, Ms. Schack, Mr. Happe and Mr. Bergstedt,

We are so excited by the possibility of mountain bike trails in Minnetonka’s Lone Lake Park!! Mountain biking has been a loved activity of our family for several years. Mountain biking keeps us healthy both mentally and physically by enjoying nature and getting exercise with our friends and family. To have trails so close to our home with just a quick ride to the trail head, it would encourage us to spend more time together as a family. We hope the City of Minnetonka will move forward with this wonderful initiative!! The City of Minnetonka has been known as a family-friendly city that promotes healthy living. We hope it will continue with this project!!

Thank you so much for your consideration!

Duane and Lesley Stobbe

From: Bill Hicks
Date: August 19, 2019 at 10:32:45 AM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: 2600 Crosby Road,

Good morning - please allow the mtn bike trails to get approved. Both my son and I are mtn bikers. We ride together. To have a set of trails near our home would be great. On weekdays - because the new trails would be much closer to home - we would be able to ride longer (because we would not have to drive home - which cuts into homework time!!!! Mtn bikers take great care of the land because we respect it because we use - in a good way.

Thank you for approving the trails!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Cheers – BH

From: Mark Fallon
Date: August 19, 2019 at 10:27:36 AM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Fwd: Mountain Bike Trails in Minnetonka
Hello to my Minnetonka City Council:

As a 33 year resident, please consider my desire to see the pending request for the approval of a Mountain Bike type trail be approved.

My confidence is high that our community will develop and implement this important outdoor attraction in a conscientious manner. Personally, I believe anything our community can do to promote outdoor activities for all, and especially the younger generation in Minnetonka, should be met with as much support and consideration as possible. Thank you.

Mark Fallon

4325 Blenheim Circle

From: Dan DeRoma
Date: August 19, 2019 at 10:23:36 AM CDT
To: "bwiersum@eminnetonka.com" <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>, "dcalvert@eminnetonka.com" <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>, "scarter@eminnetonka.com" <scarter@eminnetonka.com>, "bellingson@eminnetonka.com" <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>, "rschack@eminnetonka.com" <rschack@eminnetonka.com>, "mhappe@eminnetonka.com" <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>, "tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com" <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Mountain Bike Trails at Lone Lake - So Pumped!

Greetings Minnetonka City Counsel.

I’m writing you today in hopes that the trails that are proposed at Lone Lake can finally happen.

Biking on single track is my passion and I think you would agree that Mtn Bikers are not as the opposition states, I do not have loud rock music playing when I ride, I am not RAD, I’m actually very slow. Slower than most trail runners. Mountain biking is considered a “silent sport”.

Modern trail building has come along way, MORC applies the highest standards when building, using the natural terrain and having the lowest impact on nature possible. Trail run off is no longer a problem and we will not disrupt nature.

I also think it is important to get this next generation into biking, every biker is one less car on the road. Every biker is another healthy individual. Biking helps kids focus, plan ahead, be aware of the surroundings. This is truly a lifelong sport.
Also a fun fact, the Minnesota High Schools Cycling league has some of the highest participation out of all sports, with over 700-800 kids competing in racing across the state.

I volunteer with the Loppet Cycling and XC-ski team and have seen first had the progress of the youth cycling program, sustainable trails are possible, shared parks are possible, multi-use parks are possible.

I know the opposition is a very small group of very loud individuals who live next to this park. They have been spreading false statements all over the internet.

I’m so excited of this opportunity to have trails in our own back yard.

I have even donated to MORC and will be one of the volunteer trails builders and help maintain these trails, lets show the opposition we can all play nice together!

Thank you for your considerations and looking forward to the meeting on the 26th!

Dan DeRoma | CPMR | CSP | CFSP |

From: Emil Bogdanov
Date: August 19, 2019 at 10:15:37 AM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Gets kids off their computers - MTB Trail Vote

Please think bigger!

Mountain biking is a wonderful sport and provides opportunities for kids to get off their computers and enjoy nature. They are far less likely to go for a walk or run like some of the adults do.

The video showing how biking trails will disrupt the environment doesn't really represent the true state of other parks which already have trails - please check Lebanon Hills, Elm Creek, or Murphy Hanrehan parks. I frequently see all kinds of wild life there. Bikes do not pollute and don't cause any noise.
It brings me a great pleasure when I see young people and even little kids on their bikes enjoying the great outdoors. For example, at a recent visit to Murphy Hanrehan, there were multiple MTB school teams practicing.

Please give these kids more opportunities to enjoy nature!

From: Jack Barbier  
Date: August 19, 2019 at 9:33:42 AM CDT  
To: "bellingson@eminnetonka.com" <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>  
Cc: "dcalvert@eminnetonka.com" <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>, "bwiersome@eminnetonka.com" <bwiersome@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: Please say "NO" to bike trails in Lone Lake Park

Parks are for peace and quiet.... not desecration.

Mountain bikes whipping through the woods is not peace and quiet.

I say "NO" to trails in existing parks.... let the city and the bikers find and/or develop a more suitable place.

There are too many unanswered questions here.... please direct the Park Board to go back and find a different place that will not ruin it for others.

Jack Barbier, ChFC  
13001 St. David's Road

From: Chad Anderson  
Date: August 19, 2019 at 9:17:07 AM CDT  
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com  
Subject: Lone Lake Park Mountain Bike Trail

My name is Chad Anderson and I live at 5287 Beachside Dr, which is very close to Lone Lake Park. First and foremost, I am an avid mountain biker. But I oppose adding mountain bike trails to Lone Lake Park. My family frequents the park several times a week, using the walking trail extensively. The park will not support both the walking trails as well as the addition of mountain bike trails. I purchased a house in Minnetonka because of the access to natural areas and parks. There are hundreds of mountain bike trails in the Twin Cities... we do not need to compromise OUR green space for another mountain.
bike trail. Building mountain bike trails in Lone Lake will lead to conflict between mountain bikers and everyone else using the park. Mountain biking is fast and aggressive, and families with children using the park will inevitably come in conflict with the mountain bikers. I grew up in Minnetonka, and it has always been a place that embraces natural areas. I feel that adding mountain bike trails to an already established park is conceding to a minority of bike riders. I will be severely disappointed if the city decides to add the bike trails. I will also hold the city accountable if I am using the park with my family and something happens with a mountain biker.

I will conclude with this thought. I am under the impression that the city usually holds neighborhood meetings in an area that has potential development. I am not aware of any meetings that were held to discuss this? That seems very intentional on the city's part to not provide a forum for feedback from local citizens. The City of Minnetonka is developing every piece of land possible, and is turning a once beautiful area into a sprawling concrete jungle. Just look at the townhomes that are being built on Shady Oak Rd across from Sundial Center. How on Earth did the developer get approval to build these townhomes 5 feet from Shady Oak Rd? Isn't there setback requirements for this? Or is the City only interested in the additional tax revenues from more homes?

Please do the right thing and do not approve the addition of mountain bike trails to Lone Lake. I will be following this process closely and will see how each of you vote.

Regards,

Chad Anderson

From: Jacklyn Brown
Date: August 19, 2019 at 7:39:59 AM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Mountain Bike Trails at Lone Lake Park

Good morning city council members,

I am pleased to hear that there are others in Minnetonka that are as excited about adding mountain bike trails as I am. I am an avid road biker who has recently gotten into the sport of mountain biking. There is nothing better than being on a trail in nature and moving with the natural terrain. You don't have to worry about cars as in road biking, and you feel more connected with nature.
As more activities are becoming digitalized, I appreciate your consideration of trails as we need to get more youth outside so they don't disconnect from nature.

As a 31 year old resident of Minnetonka, I believe that everyone can be users of the park; young and old, bikers, walkers, bird watchers, and pickle ball players.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Jackie Brown

4835 Arlington Dr, Hopkins, MN 55343

From: Lonna Mosow
Date: August 19, 2019 at 5:50:18 AM CDT
To: dcalvert@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Mountain Bike Trail

Dear Council Member:

Nature is my therapy. To preserve nature is therapeutic.

My go to “nature retreat” had always been Woodlake Preserve in Richfield. I went there regularly to enjoy the quiet, the busy sounds of the squirrels and birds, the beauty of the land. Then as a Minnetonka resident, I discovered Lone lake Park. I’m a walker and runner and avoid the busy chaos and noise of our lake area. I fell in love with Lone Lake.

I am not opposed to Mountain Biking. What I do oppose are two things:

1) The lack of the council to share it’s “plan” for Mountain Biking at Lone Lake Pare long before we Minnetonka residents learned of the plan. I saw the notice in the Minnetonka Memo for the first time last year. I immediately started attending the council meetings for the opportunity to voice my feelings. It was apparent that the decision to add the Mountain Bike Trails to an area that already afforded a variety of recreational activities had been made. I object to this “political” bias and to oppose doing a more complete environmental assessment.
2) I feel the LLP is a much smaller area to accommodate this added activity compared to much larger parks who already offer this option as well as those now considering it. The opportunity to offer many more miles of trails as well as more challenging ones would be more attractive to those seeking the thrill and excitement of this sport.

Above all else, we are stewards of the land.

On August 26 I ask that you cast a NO vote for the Mountain Bike Trails.

Thank you.

Lonna

From: Allison Hatcher  
Date: August 18, 2019 at 10:24:54 PM CDT  
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com  
Subject: Lone Lake Park

Dear Council member,  
It’s time to build the mountain bike trail at Lone Lake. Your council has done a wonderful job of discovery and evaluation and the plans are carefully, respectfully, and thoughtfully prepared. Please vote in favor of the project and end the delay.  
Resident of Mtka for 60 years,  
Allison Hatcher

From: Steve Hum  
Date: August 18, 2019 at 8:26:39 PM CDT  
To: <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>, <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>, <scarter@eminnetonka.com>, <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>, <rschack@eminnetonka.com>, <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>, <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: Minnetonka Mountain Bike Trail at Lone Oak Park

I’m writing to ask you to vote to approve building mountain bike trails at Lone Oak Park.

As a 30+ year Minnetonka resident and taxpayer, I would like to see a park system that supports a variety of activities, not just the activities supported by the local neighborhood. The Minnetonka park
system belongs to all residents of Minnetonka. Currently Minnetonka parks do not provide an opportunity to mountain bike in a safe and challenging environment. Adding mountain bike trails at Lone Oak Park will help alleviate this, while doing so in an environmentally friendly way, and still allowing other uses such as walking.

I am looking forward to having a quality mountain bike trail system within cycling distance of my home.

Please vote to approve building the mountain bike trails at Lone Oak Park.

Sincerely,

Steve Hum
15803 Lexington Ave
Minnetonka, MN 55345

From: The Swenson Familt
Date: August 18, 2019 at 5:30:11 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Lone Lake Mountain bike trails

Mr. Mayor and all the Honorable Council Members,

I am writing to encourage your support of a mountain bike trail system at Lone Lake Park. I believe our public areas can be multi-use and allow many different users to interact together with respect and appreciation of each other’s activities. I am a parent that watched many soccer games at Lone Lake Park. I am also an active biker as well as pickleball player. As I play on the beautiful new courts at Lone Lake Park, I see many bikers come by on the paved trails. They are basically silent, and no group causes any issues for the other. I do not believe it would be any different with mountain bikers. I have many friends that ride road bikes as well as mountain bikes. There is no reason they should need to go to Chaska to find a good mountain bike trail to ride. The group that is against these trails doesn’t seem to understand that our public spaces should be for all to enjoy. Again, I ask that you vote in support of the mountain bike trail system at Lone Lake Park. Respectfully,
Paul Swenson
14600 Oakwood Rd
From: Paulson David  
Date: August 18, 2019 at 6:19:31 PM CDT  
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com  
Subject: Bike trail  

I am a resident of Deephaven and have no standing in your debate over bike trails in Minnetonka. What surprises me is the territorial protectiveness of a small group of Tonka residents who oppose a separate bike trail in one of the parks. I have ridden my bike in every park like area in Minnetonka and have ridden where ever I wanted where trails did not exist. This didn’t make any sense to me. Why should I be riding where I could impose my activity on some one strolling on a walk way for people and dogs. The parks are large enough to have a separate narrow trail for biking that is away from nomad pedestrian traffic. When I heard that there was a plan for a safe and separate bike trail, though long overdue, I thought it was a wonderful idea. When I heard that there was opposition to that idea, I was shocked and appalled. The status quo is dangerous and unacceptable. Bikers should be separate from pedestrians and both be should be provided access to a quite and safe environment separate from each other. Bikers do not want to run over pedestrians and pedestrians want to be free of bikers. Opposing this idea is wrought with unintended consequences.

The city of Minnetonka should consider the potential of liability, now that it has a safe solution. If it refuses this solution and a biker runs over a pedestrian without the trail, Minnetonka could be liable. Supporting this trail, which will not affect pedestrians, is a great solution for Minnetonka.

Deephaven Biker,  
David Paulson

From: Allison  
Date: August 18, 2019 at 6:01:11 PM CDT  
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com  
Subject: Lone Lake Park Mt Bike Trail  

To whom it may concern,  
I am a Minnetonka resident and have been for the last 40 years. Prior to that I spent all of my childhood growing up in Minnetonka adding another 15 years residence. As a child there were many open areas for recreation and general use. Now there is little in comparison. Kids these days need easy access to the outdoors and to activities that stimulate them and improve fitness. There are fewer of these opportunities with each passing year.

I have been involved with the process to see approved the construction of mountain bike trails in Lone Lake Park. I have attended meetings, I have done invasive species removal in the park. I have listened to a group of deep pocketed selfish landowners around the park talk about “their park” and misrepresent biking with many false statements and overdramatized testimony. It’s a public park with little use in a heavily populated area begging for access. I don’t encounter the nay sayers on invasive species clean up but I hear them complain about others destroying the park when those that use it
destroy it the most, like those right around the park.

The city has done excellent due diligence work on this project, it has been approved at every level, consistently. Please vote for our children, vote for the city, vote for greater access, vote to approve the mountain bike trails!

I trust you will do what is right for the many and not the few!
Sincerely,
Allison Hatcher

From:
Date: August 18, 2019 at 5:04:20 PM CDT
To: <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>, <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>, <scarter@eminnetonka.com>, <bellinson@eminnetonka.com>, <rschack@eminnetonka.com>, <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>, <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Mountain Biking in Lone Lake Park

Dear Minnetonka City Council Members,

I have lived in Minnetonka since 1992, and I am an avid cyclist including mountain biking. Just yesterday I had to travel to Burnsville to ride my mountain bike because there are no purpose built trails in Minnetonka. There is abundant evidence that purpose built trails result in minimal to no impact (reports from Lake Rebecca, Elm Creek, Murphy Hanrahan, Theodore Wirth, Lebanon Hills, etc.). All of these parks are multi use parks that have had park usage thrive with the addition of purpose built mountain biking trails.

I whole heartedly support the development of purpose built mountain biking trails in Lone Lake Park!

Please do not let a small vocal opposition group derail a plan that a large segment of our community eagerly endorses, and has demonstrated that the cycling community will respect and strive to maintain the quality of Lone Lake Park.

I look forward to your vote in favor for continuing the development of mountain biking trails in Lone Lake Park next Monday at the City Council Meeting.

Respectfully,

Dr. Rick Diehl
12702 Happy Oaks Court
Minnetonka, MN 55305-5068

From: "Jon Richie" <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>
Date: August 18, 2019 at 3:18:02 PM CDT
To: <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake Park

Dear Council Member Calvert,

My name is Jon Riche, I have been a resident of Minnetonka since the 1960’s when it was still a Village.

I lived through (and played part in) the tennis craze of the 1970’s. Tennis courts appeared in almost every neighborhood – after ground surveys where taken, earth graded, asphalt spread and concrete poured, court striping, nets and a 10+ foot chain link fence installed. After time tennis courts began to lose their luster and people started playing indoors year round. Similarly, hockey rinks appeared more and more frequently around schools and in neighborhoods in response to more kids who wanted to play hockey. I spent many days and nights playing hockey with my friends until the lights were turned off. Besides the shoveling we had to do to keep the rinks clear when it snowed we never really thought about everything it takes to keep them up and running. First there is the cost of boards, chain link backstops and 2 nets for every rink. Then there is the cost of labor and water to flood the rinks, which takes four to five separate trips just to get them ready to go. Add to these costs of snow removal every time it snows 3 to 4 men plus heavy equipment, the cost to re-flood the rinks, the cost to pay for lights and the cost of a warming house attendant. On top of this neighbors could look forward to nights of pucks banging off the boards and kids yelling. These days most kids don’t want to skate in the cold, but rather play indoors – year round.

This brings me to the proposed mountain bike trail in Lone Lake. I remember when this property was not a city park, but a private ski area. I was thrilled when it became a city park. I have visited this park many times along with Jidana, Evergreen, Big Willow, Purgatory to name a few. I could be found everyday in one of these parks walking with my Golden Retriever. Many times we don’t even see another person, other times we do. I for one see the idea of mountain bike trails to be one of the best ideas ever proposed in our city parks since cross country skiing at the Glen Lake golf course.

My reasons for stating are as follows:

1. Mountain biking is not a fad and will not be going away soon.
2. The terrain at Lone Lake is perfectly suited to this activity.
3. The cost of marking “official” trails will be minimal.
4. With many schools now having mountain bike clubs this will encourage more kids (and possibly their parents) to get outside and enjoy this park.
5. By utilizing portions of existing footpath it will greatly reduce cost to the taxpayer and the city parks department.

6. There is no need to install lighting, grade earth, put down asphalt, pour concrete, install chain link fencing, staff a warming house or worry about snow removal - ever.

7. There will be no need to install a sprinkler system e.g. soccer fields, softball fields etc.

8. A great activity for individuals and families to get outside – together.

9. The proposed trail would be multi use and utilized by others besides bikers, e.g. snow shoeing/winter hiking - 2 very popular silent sports.

10. There are 51 parks in the city of Minnetonka. Lone Lake is where it belongs.

* IF mountain biking ever goes away in the future the trails we be reclaimed by nature – naturally at no cost to the city.

As previously stated, I have used at least one Minnetonka park five+ times every week for many years. I am a hiker, nature lover and a dog walker. I also have no problem sharing Lone Lake with mountain bikes. There is room ample to accommodate this activity.

Thank you for your time and consideration regarding this matter. It is greatly appreciated.

Jon Richie
Minnetonka

From: Margaret McDonald
Date: August 17, 2019 at 10:24:07 PM CDT
To: "dcalvert@eminnetonka.com" <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Vote Yes on lone lake mountain bike trails

Parks are public! This means that they are for everyone! Bringing more people into our parks to enjoy our amazing resources is what our community needs. Please don’t forget the silent majority who appreciates the way that you have been progressing forward with the bike path!

Margaret McDonald
Canterbury Dr.
Minnetonka

From: Joshua Rebennack
Date: August 17, 2019 at 1:14:00 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com
Cc: dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Lone Lake Park - Information

Honorable Mayor & Council Members.
My name is Joshua Rebennack. I am writing you today regarding the discussion over mountain biking at Lone Lake Park. Before talking about mountain biking at Lone Lake Park, a little about me first.

I have worked in the civil/environmental engineering/surveying field for over 20 years. I’ve written, in whole or in part, dozens of Environmental Assessment Worksheets (EAW), the latest of which will be published August 19th. I’ve designed 17 miles of shared hiker/biker trails in urban and rural locations. (See postscript for a link to a construction set of drawings.) I travel the country and help cities create urban trail experiences thru an informative presentation on the topic. Because Minnesota is so far ahead of many states, I also end up doing concept plans for localities that have no experience with urban hiker/biker trails. In fact, currently I’m working on one for the Northwest Trail Alliance in Portland, Oregon.

I have become more and more concerned with the rhetoric surrounding the proposed construction of sustainable trails at Lone Lake Park. Some disagreement or points of view would be expected. Instead, the discourse, such as it is, feels unhinged.

What is happening in Minnetonka is having a larger effect than some local drama. Currently, there are ongoing discussions with Shasta Lake, California, to help them create their first urban trail system shared between hikers and mountain bikers. They approached trail designers in Minnesota to help them because they had heard that Minnesota was the place that had the trifecta: keeping all users happy, sharing without issues and maintaining or improving the ecological health of parks. Yet, that has been seriously obfuscated by the “Friends of Lone Lake Park”. Nothing beats the staff of a city trying to get council members to look at a proposal using Minnesota’s shared trails as a template of success, then having council remembers typing in "minnesota shared trails" in Google and getting acres of misinformation from recent op-eds out of Minnetonka.

Because of outsized effects of the misrepresentation of shared trails, the ecological impacts thereof and of urban mountain biking, those of us that do advocacy find ourselves wishing for some way to correct the falsehoods now being pushed by this small group. Unfortunately, most of the advocates, who are the most affected by rhetoric, are not Minnetonka residents and hence have no real input on the process.

Just because we don’t live in an invisible box should mean our knowledge is to be wasted. There is no reason for you to forgo answers from those in the know outside Minnetonka. To that end, I’m offering to help explain any part of sustainable trails that might be confusing, answer any questions about sharing or just to explain the bigger picture. I will do so focusing on the historical leadership Minnesota has had in this area, the science behind creating trails and the reality of trails already in place. I will always give direct references to historical, scientific or social literature. And I’ll stay out of the Minnetonka politics or lobbying for a certain vote at the upcoming meeting - it will be purely informational.
This vocal group has muddied the waters about a great many things. It's important to make clear what has been muddied, such as:

- What are sustainable trails?
- Is the type of mountain biking slated for Lone Lake Park active or passive recreational use?
- What is Minnesota's history and safety record with shared trails?
- Can ecological preserves and sustainable trails coexist?
- Does the Big Woods exist at Lone Lake Park?

If you have any questions, feel free to email at or call my cell phone at. I would be happy to discuss anything you wish to discuss. If you wish a personal visit, I would be glad to visit you at any time.

Please don’t let the propaganda drown out the truth of the leadership Minnesota has in creating spaces for all users while protecting the environment. Please be willing to ask the people in the know, who write scientific papers, who layout trails, who do construction drawings and know Minnesota’s leadership in urban shared trails, even if those people don’t happen to live in Minnetonka.

Thank you for your time.

Joshua

p.s. Link to construction drawings: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B3qBglNiEn2DTGNCs11UGd1VFk?usp=sharing

From: Charlie Gardner

Date: August 17, 2019 at 2:16:18 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Mountain bike trail

In this day and age we need more people getting outside and being active. I think mountain biking can get both young and old outside and active. I think you will in turn have more volunteers helping to keep natives and removal of invasive species. This is good thing!

From: nancy devitt
Date: August 17, 2019 at 2:34:28 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com
We are Minnetonka residents writing to raise objections to adding mountain bike trails to Lone Lake Park. The City and volunteers have done much to restore habitat and remove invasive shrubbery and trees in Lone Lake Park. Please do not undo this investment. Lone Lake Park is now in good condition and is too small to add parallel trails that will defeat the purpose of the last decade of investment in restoration.

Thank you for considering what we believe will be a negative impact on the Lone Lake environment.

Nancy Devitt & Richard Chase

11824 Bren Road, Minnetonka 55343

From: Mark Brill  
Date: August 18, 2019 at 11:44:05 AM CDT  
To: dcalvert@eminnetonka.com  
Subject: Proposed Mountain Bike Trail and upcoming vote

I strongly urge you to vote against the mountain bike trail in Lone Lake park for two reasons:

1. e-mountain bikes are quickly becoming popular, and they are known trail-eaters, causing erosion to non-paved trails. What would the City’s policy be regarding these bikes and the damage they can cause trails?
2. Where will the money come from when the mountain bikers fail to live up to their promise to maintain the trails, and the City is forced to hire someone to do the job?

Please vote “no” on this issue.

Mark Brill

11700 Vista Drive

Minnetonka, MN 55343

From: Luke Van Santen  
Date: August 18, 2019 at 10:03:38 AM CDT  
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com  
Subject: Support for Lone Lake Park Mountain Bike Trail

Good morning Mayor and Council members!
Please accept my apology for one more message on this topic - I am sure your inboxes are already full! It was my intent to not send any more messages about this since I am sure you are already well aware of where I stand; rather, I had planned only to speak in support at the 8/26 meeting.

My plans changed when other trail supporters shared a link to a video recently posted by trail opponents. Maybe you've already seen the video (link here) and if so I hope you were able to see it for what it was - a heartfelt plea from people who are intentionally uneducated about how singletrack (mountain bike trails) can fit in to park space. While I agree with their desire to maintain wooded areas and access to parks for all users, I couldn't help but be angered by how the creators and distributors of the video seem to not be above using very questionable tactics (unnamed "experts", intentionally jarring imagery and audio to cast all singletrack trail users in an unflattering (to put it mildly) light, and outright falsehoods) to try and defend their position. That anger led to this message.

I hope that each of you is able to see just how slanted the video is and will fully consider the implications of it having been made and posted when you vote on the 26th. I also hope you will remember all the hard work done by the Park Board and by City staff to fully vet (as affirmed by the court) this idea before making their recommendations to proceed. Last, I hope you will see how the inclusion of singletrack in the wide array of outdoor activities offered by the City will benefit us - child, adult, or senior, resident or regional neighbor, and most especially environmental advocates.

If any of you has any questions or would like to discuss the realities of singletrack I would be more than happy to do so at your convenience. In fact, if any of you would like to visit any existing singletrack trails in the west Metro, I would be happy to to your guide!

Respectfully,

Luke Van Santen

2148 Sheridan Hills Rd

From: Gary Fischer
Date: August 19, 2019 at 3:56:32 PM CDT
To: "Wiersum Brad, Mayor" <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>, Ellingson Bob Ward 1 <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>, Calvert Deb At-large A <dcsilver@eminnetonka.com>, "Calvert Deb, At-Large A" <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>, "Schack Rebecca, Ward 2" <rschack@eminnetonka.com>, "Happe Mike, Ward 3" <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>, "Carter Susan, At-L B" <scarter@eminnetonka.com>, "Bergsted Tim, W4" <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Mountain Bike Trail Setbacks

August 19, 2019
(I apologize for this second transmission of the same message, but I had trouble with my group addressing and wanted to make sure that you received it)

To: Minnetonka City Council Members

From: Vista Woods Homeowners Association

11810, 11812, 11814, 11816, 11820, 11822, 11824, 11826, 11830, 11832, 11834, and 11836 Bren Road, Minnetonka 55343

Subject: Request for Lone Lake Mountain Bike Trail setbacks from adjacent private property

The trail concept plan that you will consider on August 26, 2019, has no stated setback requirements from adjacent private property. Using the available trail plan, our association estimates that the trail will be within three feet of our property line. Our members feel that this is unreasonable and not consistent with the council's stated strategy of "carefully balancing individual property rights with community-wide interests..." (Strategic Profile Report)

By comparison, the Edina City Council on Jan. 3, 2018, unanimously approved the Braemar Park Master Plan, which includes a provision to locate all of its 5.4 miles of mountain bike trails "a minimum 100' setback from all adjacent private property lines." Edina developed this requirement by contacting each individual adjacent property owner. We request that Minnetonka planners do the same.

This is of particular importance to our association because as drawn with only a 3-foot separation, our driveway would provide an appealing, shortcut access to the trail from Bren Road. Also, a berm on our property along the trail would be a tempting rider sidetrack onto our property.

Please do not approve the mountain bike trails without including the condition that planners establish reasonable setback distances, developed by holding discussions with our association as well as contact with all adjacent property owners.
Yours truly,

(Authorized by the Vista Woods Board of Directors to communicate association concerns with the city council)

Gary Fischer, 11814 Bren Road -
Peter Sammond, 11816 Bren Road -
Gary Peterson, 11810 Bren Road –

From: Jenny Anderson  
Date: August 19, 2019 at 3:20:05 PM CDT  
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergestdt@eminnetonka.com  
Subject: Lone Lake Park

Please consider the Lone Lake Park mountain bike trail. We are blessed in Minnetonka to have many areas of nature, but we have no biking trails. As a new mountain biker, I am always thankful for the way bikers help to maintain the trails with many dedicating nights and weekends to that effort. I do not see hardly any trash on the trails because at the core, people who like to play in the woods, respect the woods. It's that simple. I gain so much from being in the woods and on my bike, I feel like I'm a kid again. Except I am challenging myself and spending time with friends who are like me.

I love our city: the arts, the nature, and the sports. I love it all. Let's keep evolving while maintaining the city's beauty.

Thanks for your consideration.

Jenny Anderson
4177 Hull Road, Minnetonka

From: jingram-mn  
Date: August 19, 2019 at 1:55:16 PM CDT  
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergestdt@eminnetonka.com  
Subject: Lone Lake MTB Trails
Greetings!

Jeff ingram 14400 Lennell Drive. 26 year Minnetonka resident.

I'm sure you're tired of emails on this topic from emotionally invested folks. I'd like to personally communicate that my wife (Carol) and I are fully in favor of this project. We have participated in park restoration, have adopted a drain and a park sign. So, you can count us on the side of keeping our parks and city beautiful and sustainable.

As determined by our Park and Recreation experts, these trails will be a positive amenity and will not cause damage to our resource.

Please vote in favor so we can keep Minnetonka vibrant and relevant.

Thanks for your support.

Jeff Ingram

From:
Date: August 19, 2019 at 1:39:51 PM CDT
To: <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>, <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>, <scarter@eminnetonka.com>, <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>, <rschack@eminnetonka.com>, <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>, <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>

Subject: Please Approve the Trails at Lone Lake Park!

Dear Mayor and Minnetonka City Council,

Please support the hundreds of Minnetonka residents who participate in the growing sport of off-road-cycling by approving the proposed trails at Lone Lake Park!

Minnetonka is competing for young families looking for outdoor recreational opportunities where they live. Mountain biking is growing in our community as evidenced by the 48% average annual growth rate of the National Interscholastic Cycling Association (NICA) since its inception in 2009. Minnesota was one of the first states to join NICA and our state and Minnetonka have seen similar growth rates. In NICA, children can race or just train, but unlike some other school sports, everyone participates. Here’s a link

I am a 22 year resident and tax payer of Minnetonka and unfortunately I am forbidden from participating in the sport of mountain biking in my own community. So are our children! We shouldn't have to drive to another city to mountain bike when one of the reasons we bike is to protect our environment!

The extensive survey and study carried out by Minnetonka city staff clarified the misconceptions about this life-long sport and presents a plan for a low-impact, sustainable trail.

Please approve the proposed trail at Lone Lake Park.

Thanks,
Dana

Dana Allan Kromer
3725 Elmwood Place
Minnetonka, MN

From: "
Date: August 19, 2019 at 12:29:48 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Cc: Marks Ben <
Subject: Please Support Sustainable Lone Lake Mountain Bike Trails

Dear Mayor and members of the Minnetonka City Council,

I am writing to you today in support of the proposed Lone Lake Mountain Bike Trails.

The diversity of our Minnetonka Community recreational offerings, our Minnetonka schools and our Minnetonka housing defines us as a very desirable place to live. This letter serves as a request for each of you to support our opportunity to take the next step and vote yes to improve our Minnetonka community recreational offerings.
As a resident and homeowner of Minnetonka since 1994, I take great pride in all 3 of these defining components of our community. All of them continue to grow through expanded programming, funding and resident involvement.

Mountain bike trails will add to our diverse athletic and recreation centric profile, by providing our residents, school-age youth, and our neighboring communities an opportunity that currently does not currently exist.

I am an avid cyclists who would benefit from these new trails.

The human benefits to me and other trail users include the following -
1. Improving cardiovascular performance
2. Improving balance
3. Weight loss- including myself, many mountain bikers has lost significant weight or maintain healthy weights by participating in this sport.
4. Last, but not least, this is a sport that provides us with the much needed FRESH AIR!

The social benefits include
1. Additional community recreational programming to provide a new sport in our education curriculum. (Through Minnetonka Community Education and schools).

The environmental benefits are
1. The local cycling teams will save significant travel times to other trails.
2. Improving our care/stewardship of our public lands/open space.
3. Removal of Buckthorn and other invasive/non-native plants.

We don’t have to take my word on any of these claims. The City of Crosby, MN has recently built several miles of trails and the results are overwhelming. The trail use has redefined the city and provided the foundation for a place to maintain and improve a healthy lifestyle.
Isn't this what we all want? Don't we want to live a healthy and active lifestyle? Mountain biking provides us this opportunity to live long and improve our health through sustainable activity.

Please support our trail development and vote yes on August 23, 2019.

Thanks,

Bob Diedrich
4524 Wilson St
Minnetonka, MN 55345

From: Bill Copenhagen>
Date: August 19, 2019 at 12:19:51 PM CDT
To: bwiersum@eminnetonka.com, dcalvert@eminnetonka.com, scarter@eminnetonka.com, bellingson@eminnetonka.com, rschack@eminnetonka.com, mhappe@eminnetonka.com, tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com
Subject: Support for Mountain Bike Trails

I am a Minnetonka resident, and I am writing to strongly endorse the creation of the trails at Lone Lake Park. I believe these trails will be an asset to the community. With much larger trails systems in the metro area, I don't think this will draw people in from all over the metro. I believe that this will draw people in the surrounding localities. I for one would love to be able to have a trail so close to home where I could take my kids biking.

This would be a wonderful addition to the community.

Unfortunately, I won't be able to make it to the hearing next week but wanted to send you a note of my support.

Thanks,

Bill Copenhagen
15561 Wing Lake Dr
Minnetonka, MN 55345
From: Marianne Wexler  
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2019 5:19 PM  
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Susan Carter <scarter@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>  
Cc:  
Subject: Court Upholds City Council’s Decision Regarding Environmental Assessment Worksheet  

Very disappointed with this outcome. As a long time Minnetonka resident and Minnetonka business owner, it is a sad day to read that the natural and quiet beauty of Lone Lake Park will most likely be voted to disappear. What makes this park unique is its “oasis” feel amidst all of the noise, clamor and constant need for thrill in society today. It appears that the board is not strong enough to say “enough” to the demands of special groups. The needs of the current and loyal Lone Lake Park users are just not important, I guess.

If the Mountain Bike Trails are voted in, it will be interesting to see how much more of the woodlands in the park will be destroyed to accommodate this activity and its parking needs. What are the future plans for the park? Skateboard park? Zip line trails? I fear walking in the park and enjoying the beauty of the trees will become a lost activity.

I strongly urge you to take in to consideration the wants and needs of your loyal current park users before casting your votes.

Marianne Wexler

From: michael smith  
Sent: Friday, June 28, 2019 1:52 PM  
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: Lone Lake

Please save a last remnant of the Minnesota Big Woods by saying NO to destroying Lone Lake Park with mountain bike trails!

Michael Smith

Minnetonka
I want protect Lone Lake Park." It is a surviving remnant of the Big Woods forest. I don’t believe that a mountain biking trail is compatible with keeping the forest wild."

Dear Brad,

Please preserve the Big Woods of Lone Lake Park for future generations. My wife and I have enjoyed walking the trails of this park for many years. I ask that you stop the construction of mountain bike trails.

Thank you,

Curt & Carol Meyer
13524 South street
Minnetonka, Mn.

Dear Brad,

Please preserve the Big Woods of Lone Lake Park for future generations. My wife and I have enjoyed walking the trails of this park for many years. I ask that you stop the construction of mountain bike trails.

Thank you,

Curt & Carol Meyer
13524 South street
Minnetonka, Mn.
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Susan Carter <scarter@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>

Subject: Regarding Mountain Bike Trails at Lone Lake Park

Good evening Mayor Wiersum and members of the City Council,

I wanted to send a message to ask that you vote for the Mountain Bike Trails at Lone Lake Park. As a Minnetonka resident and father of 2, and after reading through the plan for the trails, I'm very excited for our family to be able to enjoy our city's natural beauty while getting physical activity outdoors through the great sport of biking. I appreciate the city's concern and effort to mitigate environmental impact to the park, and look forward to our family joining others in volunteering to preserve it.

Thank you and have a great rest of your weekend!

Brian John
16526 Temple Cir,
Minnetonka, MN 55345

From:
Sent: Monday, July 1, 2019 11:40 AM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: FW: Lone Lake Park

PLEASE! PLEASE! SAVE LONE LAKE PARK FROM MOUNTAIN BIKES – LET’S PRESERVE WHAT NATURE WE HAVE LEFT!

Joan Ungar
12600 Marion Lane W
Minnetonka, MN 55303

Mayor, City Council Members, City Staff:
FIRST. Last year on an informal walk at Lone Lake Park with several city staff including Recreation Program Manager Jesse Izquierdo and then-Natural Resources Manager Jo Colleran, Mr. Izquierdo acknowledged taking photos of two areas in the park and labeling them in the city’s mountain bike proposal as examples of erosion caused by foot traffic. The first is the informal footpath on the east side of the tennis courts and the second is the fault line from the water tower down to the playground. Neither is the result of foot traffic. *Neither is the result of foot traffic.* The former was originally a dirt road used by the Bren family, later used illegally by mountain bikers. The latter is the remains of a gully created by a gasoline engine powered tow rope when the hill was used for downhill skiing in the 1970s, and subsequently used illegally by motorized dirt bikers for hill climbing. If the mayor or the city council or the park board or the city staff has set foot in Lone Lake Park recently they would see that the lower portion of this gully is completely overgrown. In my email to the park board before the vote last year I cited this issue. Apparently no one noticed or cared. In a July 24 email to the mayor and the city council I brought up this point again. On July 27 Mayor Wiersum responded and said he was not “going to involve myself in hearsay reports about what one or more individuals may or may not have said,” and “there is, in my opinion, no reason to delay a decision” on the mountain biking project vote. We have at least six witnesses to Mr. Izquierdo’s admission regarding the photos and subsequently labeling them as examples of erosion caused by foot traffic.

SECOND. In the proposal, the total area of the mountain bike course was listed as 0.9 acre, later updated to 1.1 acres. This disingenuous calculation was no doubt made by multiplying the claimed width of the course — the width of a bicycle’s handlebars — by its length, 4.7 miles. If you’ll recall, last year council member Mike Happe asked city staff what the acreage would be if a line were drawn around all the trails. Looking at the map of the proposed bike course, it covers almost the entire southern half of the park. *Almost the entire southern half of the park.*

THIRD. The mountain bike proponents are selling this proposal as a multi-use trail system. And the city is buying it. No responsible person would walk or jog on busy single track. I tell you this as an avid cyclist with many decades of experience and many tens of thousands of miles in the saddle. The mountain bikers will look you in the eye and say that people walk and hike on single track “all the time.” Don’t believe it.

My question to the Minnetonka city council is: If city staff manufactured these “facts” in the proposal, what else, what other false and misleading items have they included? Has anyone on the park board or city council done their homework and checked? Where is the due diligence? Is it not a city’s solemn responsibility to provide accurate and timely information to its residents? The city council must table the vote until this clearly biased and one-sided mountain bike proposal can be re-examined.

Sincerely,
From: John Piepkorn
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2019 10:05 AM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Susan Carter <scarter@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake Mountain Bike Trails

I am in full support of a sustainably-built mountain bike trail at Lone Lake Park.

Sincerely,

John Piepkorn
Minnetonka Resident

From: Janet Sandford
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2019 12:01 PM
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Mountain bike trails

Hi Kelly,

Here are some thoughts on the proposed trails in Lone Lake Park:

After seeing some of the questions raised regarding the proposed mountain bike trail, I decided to call four of the metro area mountain bike trails and talked directly to the person responsible for the maintenance of the trails. I created a set of questions to ask the trail managers about their experiences with mountain bike trails. Since the Edina park is still in the planning stages, I spoke with a park board person. Parks quoted here are Three Rivers, Lakeville, Theodore Wirth, Woodbury and Edina.

The questions I asked and the answers from the trail managers are quoted here:

- What advice do you have for starting a mountain bike trail?
Design is everything

§ Listen to the negative because the problems of bad design will not go away and will have to be resolved. Keep in mind, it is very easy to over develop an area. (Woodbury)

Trail Crossings

§ Do not mix foot paths with mountain bike paths or there will be ongoing problems at the intersections (Woodbury)

§ The proposed Lone Lake Park trail design has 15 crossings per a statement from Minnetonka staff.

Volunteers doing maintenance

§ Volunteers have good intentions but they are volunteers and have lives. Maintenance doesn’t always get done on a timely basis so Wirth is planning on hiring someone to maintain trails.

§ Minnetonka staff has said they do not have the manpower to handle maintenance.

What is done to maintain trails?

To keep volunteers positively engaged, the city needs to provide tools to perform the job. This includes power tools like chain saws, skill saws, and power generators. They also need standard hand tools like shovels, rakes, and wheelbarrows. (Woodbury)

All parks interviewed maintain about a 5-6 feet wide cut trail. Turns can grow from 4 to 10 feet based on the sharpness of the turn and the turning capability of the rider. Trails are recommended by managers to be wide enough for ATV usage for maintenance and emergency purposes.

Minnetonka plan states 18”-24” wide trail which is inconsistent with existing parks in the area.

What about trails near private property?

Do not design trails close to private property.

§ Wirth spent significant funds to correct a design flaw in trails because of bike head lamps shining into private residences.

§ Lakeville shuts down 1/3 of the trails after the leaves fall because trails are too close to private property.
Edina recognized this as a problem and will implement a 100 foot setback and running trails parallel to private property to help eliminate this issue.

Are rogue trails a problem?

- Three of the four parks indicated there was some degree of problem with rogue trails. Mountain bikers will create them so they can go faster, create shortcuts, or make the path more thrilling especially if there are steep hills or rocks.

This is not a comprehensive list of questions I asked the trail managers.

In conclusion, there are many more questions than answers to legitimate issues. Minnetonka should not implement a mountain bike trail in Lone Lake Park especially since there are two parks in various stages of progress within a reasonable distance from this park.

Thanks,

Dave Sandford

---

From: Janet Sandford  
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2019 12:02 PM  
To: Kelly ODea <kodea@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: Lone Lake Park

Hi,

I have some thoughts on the proposed mountain bike trail in Lone Lake Park:

I am concerned about creating a mountain bike trail in Lone Lake Park.

I currently walk our dog several times a day in the southeast corner of the park. With the proposed trail system, I will no longer be able to do that. I’m not sure if it is because the trail is too dangerous for the dog or the dog is too dangerous for the trail. In either case, the same should hold true for the wildlife in the park. If dogs are a problem, why is the wildlife not a problem on the trails?
My options for walking the dog are to walk him on the roads to get to the park or drive him to the park. Neither option is very appealing to me since I enjoy the nature part of the current walk also. It is dangerous for him to walk on the roads to get to the park. Just like the mountain bikers want to ride to the park, it seems silly for me to drive to get to the park.

If I am walking on these proposed multi use trails and they are only roughly 18” wide, where do I go when I encounter a mountain biker? Based on the growth around the trail, there won’t be room for me to step off the trail. If the trails are only 18” wide, how do bikers pass when one is faster than the other one? It would mean they each have to be on an edge and handlebars are in the vegetation. If I am on a hiking only trail and have to cross the multi use trail, will the bikers stop and let me cross as they should?

We have observed activities like cross country skiing, disc golf, and mountain biking in the park in the past. These activities were eliminated due to maintenance and erosion issues. The bikers rode in many places in the park where there were not trails. How are these issues any different now?

A police officer told me they would not respond to calls regarding people on the biking trails when they should not be. If the police don’t respond to this, what is the recourse when this happens?

I think that this plan should not be implemented. There are many other places for mountain bikers to currently ride. This park should continue to be an oasis that preserves green space for all residents.

Janet Sandford

From: Ben Marks
Date: August 20, 2019 at 11:33:14 AM CDT
To: Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Proposed Trails at Lone Lake Park

Dear Deb,

As you know, I am an advocate for the proposed trails at Lone Lake Park. It’s unfortunate that this project has become so divisive. Emotions are high and opinions are strong on both sides of this issue.

You have heard from me multiple times during the past three years. As my last communication to you prior to next week’s vote, it seemed most productive to simply state the facts as I understand them.

- During the summer and fall of 2016 the city ran the “Imagine Minnetonka” campaign. Residents were asked to express their one wish for the future of Minnetonka. Hundreds of votes were cast for ideas that related to the expansion of mountain bike trails. The most popular post of the entire campaign encouraged the city to start a conversation with residents and find a solution to
provide sustainable off-road trails within the city of Minnetonka. See attached page from Imagine Minnetonka Summary and Recommendations Report that addresses this topic.

- WSB & Associates were contracted by the city in the fall of 2017 to assist in a community outreach program regarding potential sustainable off-road trails in Minnetonka. Two focus groups and two public meetings were held in late 2017 and early 2018. More than 400 residents attended these meetings.
- In February of 2018 staff presented to the Park Board the results of the public engagement process as well as the criteria created to determine the feasibility of a park to sustain mountain bike trails. These criteria were used to analyze all city parks in Minnetonka and Lone Lake Park was the only park that met the requirements.
- Minnetonka has 44 neighborhood parks and 5 community parks. Off-road cycling is prohibited in all 49 parks.
- Lone Lake Park is classified as one of the five community parks for all residents to use.
- In early May 2018 a postcard was sent to all residents who live within 800 feet of Lone Lake Park, informing them of the proposed trails and inviting them to attend a public open house to learn more about the project and provide their input.
- On May 17, 2018 more than 200 residents attended the public open house and more than 170 residents completed comment cards.
- In June of 2018 city staff presented the plan for sustainable off-road trails at Lone Lake Park. The Park Board unanimously approved the plan.
- There are currently 2.72 miles of informal trails within Lone Lake Park.
- The proposal is for 4.70 miles of sustainably built off-road trails.
- Sustainably built trails cause less erosion than informal trails.
- The proposed trail is a one-directional, multi-user trail that is intended to be used by off-road cyclists, trail runners, snowshoe enthusiasts and walkers.
- Off-road-cycling is a “silent sport” categorized with activities such as cross-country skiing, snowshoeing, kayaking and canoeing.
- The Federal Environmental Protection Agency defines active and passive recreational uses. They place mountain biking in the “passive use” listing.
- There is precedent in Minnesota of off-road cycling being permitted in urban wildnesses, greenspaces, preserves, refuges and other properties only allowing passive use recreation, including the following:
  - Traverse des Sioux Park & Ottawa Wildlife Refuge – St. Peter, MN
  - Ney Nature Center – Henderson, MN
  - Piedmont Forest Preserve – Duluth, MN
  - Mission Creek Forest Preserve – Duluth, MN
  - Kaplan's Woods Park – Owatonna, MN
- The area that is now Lone Lake Park was a farm in the 1930’s and a ski hill in the 1970s. Attached is a map of the property from 1937, overlaid with the existing and proposed trails.
- There are 140 paved parking spots at Lone Lake Park. Carver Lake Park, a city owned park in Woodbury with 5.5 miles of sustainable off-road biking trails, along with other park amenities, also has 140 parking spots.
- Since this project began the Minnetonka Mountain Bike Trails Advocates have volunteered 244.25 hours helping city staff remove invasive species from our city parks. Please see attached
spreadsheet prepared by Janet Van Sloun, Restoration Specialist with city of Minnetonka Natural Resources Department.

- The proposed plan calls for local volunteers affiliated with Minnesota Off-Road Cyclists (MORC) to maintain the trails. MORC, established in 1994, has 25 years of experience working with land managers developing and maintaining sustainable off-road trails. Currently, MORC volunteers maintain 100 miles of sustainable off-road trails within 12 local trail systems.

- Off-road cycling is the fastest growing youth sport in Minnesota. Many communities, including Hopkins and Minnetonka, have youth mountain bike teams. The Minnesota High School Cycling League, founded in 2012, is a state-wide independent activity provider for student-athletes in 7th to 12th grade. Their mission is to build strong bodies, strong minds and strong character through cycling, regardless of ability level. The association has grown from just over a hundred riders to over 1,500 riders as of the most recent data published in 2018.

- A 2017 study titled “REI – The Path Ahead” states that American children spend an average of less than 7 minutes per day playing outside. See attached page from study that addresses this issue.

Please contact me if you have questions regarding these facts or need additional information. I’m confident that you will make the best decision for the future of our greater community, especially our youth.

Thank you for your public service.

Respectfully,

Ben Marks
4362 Avondale Street
Minnetonka, MN 55345
Sidewalks and bike lanes aren't just for kids and young families. When asked about “Aging in Place” and making the community more accessible to aging seniors, sidewalks came up again and again as this resident expressed:

"More transportation for seniors and everyone. More sidewalks and bike lanes for safety, like along Excelsior Blvd." - via Facebook

Specific ideas for safe walkways included:

- The main streets such as Excelsior Blvd. Making that road walkable will bring the community together
- Continue the existing sidewalk on Williston Road at Hwy 7 all the way to Minnetonka Blvd
- Williston Road at Hwy 7 all the way to Minnetonka Blvd
- Bren Road in-between Shady Oak and Baker and then joining Rowland
- All the way along Minnetonka Blvd from 101 to the Civic Center

Hundreds of votes were cast for ideas that related to the expansion of mountain bike trails. This comment earned 37 upvotes, which made it the most popular comment on MinnetonkaMatters.com:

"It would be fantastic if Minnetonka had sustainable, designated mountain bike trails. Many of us residents are avid off-road bikers and there are no designated trails in close proximity. Minnetonka High School has a mountain bike team and there is no place locally for them to train. There are several potential wooded areas within the city where a network of trails could be built. Let's start the conversation, find a solution, and build some trails!"
# Mountain Bike Volunteer Hours for Habitat Restoration 2017-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. Vols.</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Task(s)</th>
<th>Leader(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-Aug-17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.25</td>
<td>Big Willow - N of creek</td>
<td>Deadhead/pull stickseed &amp; motherwort; prune cherry black knot disease (CBK)</td>
<td>JVS, Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choke cherry thicket, Deer exclosure #8</td>
<td>Stickseed, motherwort, cherry black knot</td>
<td>JVS, Sarah, Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Sep-17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Big Willow on Mtka Blvd - Between brick pillars &amp; parking lot across from Applewood Pointe</td>
<td>Weeding and mulching west of parking lot on Mtka Blvd.</td>
<td>JVS, Sarah, Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Sep-17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Big Willow - N of creek</td>
<td>Prune cherry black knot disease, misc weeding</td>
<td>Sarah, Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Oct-17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>Big Willow - S of creek</td>
<td>Cut buckthorn, plant native wildflowers near canoe landing (plants donated by Mary Wright)</td>
<td>JVS, Sarah, Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Dec-17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Big Willow - S of creek, W of parking up to former homestead</td>
<td>Cut buckthorn &amp; stack along trail edge. Left tail stumps for contractor treatmnt.</td>
<td>JVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-May-18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>Lone Lake Park - S-Rain Garden, Lake Trails</td>
<td>Pull Garlic Mustard (GM), cut &amp; bag seed tops</td>
<td>JVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Jun-18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Lone Lake Park - Rowland Rd prairies &amp; trail</td>
<td>Pull GM, cut &amp; bag seed tops</td>
<td>JVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Jun-18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Lone Lake Park - Rowland Rd prairie &amp; cottonwoods</td>
<td>Pull GM, cut &amp; bag seed tops. JVS: pull stickseed &amp; motherwort.</td>
<td>JVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2019 Date</strong></td>
<td><strong>No. Vols.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td><strong>Task(s)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Leader(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Jul-19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Lone Lake Park - rain gardens &amp; Bbball woods</td>
<td>Cut volunteer trees in rain gardens; cut buckthorn on edge of Bbball woods; left tail stumps for later treatment</td>
<td>JVS, HHH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Volunteer Hours 244.25**
Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

I appreciate the opportunity to have met with many of you individually so I will try to keep my comments brief.

I believe our city showed a lot of wisdom and foresight in the POST plan when the sensitive areas of Lone Lake Park were designated as a preserve. As our beautiful city becomes increasingly subdivided I
think it’s more important than ever to keep to the original vision and preserve the Lone Lake Park Big Woods for our children and future generations,

As a master naturalist volunteer who has donated many hours of restoration services to the city I know the importance of an intact ecosystem. I live in Ward 2 and had not been to Lone Lake Park before the mountain bike proposal, I was amazed at what a gem we have in Minnetonka. I am concerned if the proposal for the mountain biking course goes through many Minnetonka residents would not know what they’re losing. We have an opportunity to realize the original vision of the preserve for truly passive use, a sanctuary for native plants and animals and an opportunity for teaching children about nature. As originally envisioned this can all be part of a balanced park system.

I would like to point out that I am not anti-mountain biking, I just know that Lone Lake Park is not the place for it. I’m glad that there are nearby courses on the horizon at Carver Park and Braemar Park. Carver Park is so much larger and more appropriate to mountain biking. Plus our county tax dollars are already going to pay for it. The Braemar course will be on land that hasn't had the years of restoration Lone Lake Park has had. In the case of Lone Lake Park, it would be unfortunate to ask our wonderful natural resources staff to undo and try to mitigate damage to years of restoration effort.

I am asking you to make the difficult decision to support the preserve at Lone Lake Park and say no to the mountain bike course proposal.

Thank you.

Jerrold Gershone

From: Marianne Wexler
Sent: Thursday, August 15, 2019 4:03 PM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Susan Carter <scarter@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: URGENT REQUEST

I know that the City Council will be voting on the proposed Mountain Bike Trails at Lone Lake Park this coming Monday and I need to voice my opinion as a Minnetonka resident. I am concerned for several reasons but most of all, I am extremely disappointed that there has been no official Lone Lake neighborhood meetings conducted to properly inform residents of the proposal and its impact on our every day lives. Because of that, I am requesting that you VOTE NO or at the very least, table the vote and start this process over again so that everyone affected by this proposal can be informed fairly.
I am including a letter that I sent on **July 1, 2018** which I did not receive any response:

I don’t usually get politically involved, but there is a topic that I feel is important because I and most of my neighbors use the Lone Lake Park walking trails just down the road from us. I am an avid walker and use the beautiful walking trails there in the spring, summer and fall as well as snowshoeing in the winter. The natural untouched beauty of this park with its mature trees and steep hills provides a convenient place for exercise and a quiet opportunity to convene with nature.

My concern is that the installation of the mountain bike trails would disturb the pristine nature of the park. These bike trails will be in close proximity to the walking trails no matter what you say or what was presented at the last meeting that I attended. The Lone Lake Park area consists of only 136 acres and other parks such as Lebanon Hills Park and Theodore Wirth Park that have added mountain bike trails are well over 2,000+ acres. This is the main reason why most are opposing the installation - the two activities should have enough room to be able to be enjoyed by itself without impacting each other physically or otherwise.

In addition, the mountain bike trails will attract more users from outside the Minnetonka area, increase traffic and will complicate the already limited parking availability that we already experience. It also goes without saying that the environmental impact for the plants, trees, and wildlife will be affected more than just having pedestrians or hikers.

As a parent of 3 boys who were highly involved in high school and college athletics, I do understand the importance of having a “practice” area somewhat in close proximity to the high school but 2 of my boys were downhill ski racers and becoming involved with a non-traditional high school sport such as this, we knew that we would have to travel distances for practices and races. For the high school mountain bike athletes, although it would be more convenient to have a “practice” area nearby, it seems to me that to change the “nature” of a park for their own use without considering the needs of those already using and enjoying the park, is selfish.

I left that meeting feeling as if I was let down by the City of Minnetonka. Over and over I heard comments from the supporters of the mountain bike trails that Minnetonka is a suburb of “older” people and that it was imperative to add features such as the mountain bike trails in order to attract younger families. I am aware that the Minnetonka schools are popular and in demand by many young families currently. School systems that excel like Minnetonka are supported by voting tax payers who are committed to building a strong tax base. Lots of the “older” folks are the ones contributing to this tax base.
I have been a resident of Minnetonka for over 35 years and own a business in the Opus Industrial Park of Minnetonka for the same amount of time. As a taxpayer and loyal supporter of the life in Minnetonka, I am opposed to the proposed Mountain Bike Trails at Lone Lake Park. I am hoping that you have not already made your decision and will take into consideration the feelings, concerns and needs of the Minnetonka residents.

In closing, once again, I ask that you VOTE NO or table the vote in order to restart this process the right and fair way.

Marianne Wexler

From: NANCY DICKINSON
Sent: Friday, August 16, 2019 3:26 PM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Rebecca Schack <rschack@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; Susan Carter <scarter@eminnetonka.com>; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>; Tim Bergstedt <tbergstedt@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake Park Mountain Bike System

Good Afternoon Mr Mayor and Council Members!

I have attached a letter I wrote concerning the proposed mountain bike system in Lone Lake Park. I live in Ward 2, but am sending this to all council members.

Thank You for taking the time to read my views about the bike system.

Have a great rest of your day!

Nancy Dickinson

From: Heather Simso
Sent: Friday, August 16, 2019 3:51 PM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake Park
Please vote “no” to the proposal to build a mountain bike trail in this small, forested gem. The peace, quiet and commitment to the environment can’t be overstated. There are so many areas devoted to mountain biking with established trails...Lebanon Hills is just one of many.

Heather Simso
4906 Coventry Rd W.
Minnetonka, 55345

From: Laura Brill
Sent: Saturday, August 17, 2019 9:16 AM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>; Deborah Calvert <dcalvert@eminnetonka.com>; pacomb@eminnetonka.com; Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>; Mike Happe <mhappe@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Upcoming vote on the Mountain Bike Trail

Dear city council members:

Before you cast you vote on this trail, please keep three things in mind:

1. The residents who live in the vicinity of this bike trail, the intrusion on their privacy and potential use of their property as a “shortcut” to the bike path.
2. The broken promises of other mountain bikers who said they would maintain other local trails but have not; and the cost to the city to hire staff to do so, as other local cities have had to do.
3. The impact of the trail on the endangered rusty patched bumble bee.

We already have soccer fields and pickle ball courts to serve our community for outdoor recreation. Please vote to prevent further denigration to Lone Lake Park.

Laura Brill

From: Mark Norquist
Sent: Saturday, August 17, 2019 10:50 AM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Lone Lake Mountain Bike Trail

Hello Mayor -
My name is Mark Norquist. I've been a Minnetonka resident for twenty one years and I feel compelled to voice my thoughts on the proposed mountain bike trail in Lone Lake Park.

I have often touted to others how well the city is governed by our elected officials, and managed by the very capable staff who work for the city. We're progressive in ideas that make sense, responsible in managing our amazing infrastructure, and yet we're fiscally responsible.

I am at a loss though in trying to understand why people would so strongly oppose the creation of a mountain bike trail in Lone Lake Park. This popular silent sport gets people outside and into nature, exercising under their own pedal power. I see this purely as an enhancement to our city's park system, and one that would tap into one of the fastest growing youth sports in America. It would get more people utilizing this beautiful park and enhance the value of our community.

A 2017 study titled REI - The Path Ahead states that American children spend an average of 7 hours a day viewing screens (TV, computer, phone) and less than 7 minutes per day outside. I would say these statistics point to an issue of epidemic proportion and that we as a community should be doing everything we can to reverse this trend and reconnect kids with the outdoors. I see the mountain bike trail one of the things we can do as a community in support of that effort.

I am a conservationist at my core. It informs my personal decisions, and years ago I decided to also make it a core focus of my professional work. The business I founded over 10 years ago (here in Minnetonka) is named GreenHead Strategies. One of our first projects was creating a pilot program in my Minnetonka neighborhood called "The GreenHead Challenge". We created awareness of resource issues and the need for behaviors that support conservation. To this day I work with many national conservation organizations to address ways we can promote more healthy and sustainable landscapes and communities.

One of the tenets of my work is understanding the connection between people and places in nature. In this work it’s always understood that conserving natural landscapes needs to be balanced with the need for people to interact with these places. Why?...the only way people will have an appreciation for these natural spaces is to get them out and interacting with them. There is a fine balance between these two priorities that needs to be acknowledged and appreciated.

I see the Lone Lake mountain bike trails as a way to tap into one of the fastest growing outdoor activities in America, to get our kids outside more (Did I also mention we have an obesity problem?), and to enhance the value of Minnetonka as a thriving and healthy community. I have confidence in our city staff and their ability to balance the needs for conservation of this natural landscape with the imperative
of creating more places for people to be outside. I wholeheartedly support the creation of the Lone Lake mountain bike trail and I hope you will too at the upcoming city council vote.

If you have any questions feel free to contact me.

Regards,
Mark Norquist
14000 Brandbury Walk
Minnetonka, MN 55345

From: Polly Bayrd
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2019 9:30 PM
To: Brad Wiersum <bwiersum@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: requesting a meeting re Lone Lake Park

Hi Mayor Wiersum,

I met you briefly once at the Marsh last year when you were meeting with Tim Bergstedt. (We briefly discussed Save The Boundary Waters campaign and our support of that).

I served on the Park Board for eight years (1992-2000) and was chair for six or seven of those years. I was very involved in both the development of the Minnetonka Trail system and in the natural resources stewardship program in our larger community parks. Geralyn Barone was assistant city manager at the time and was the primary staff person involved in Park and Recreation Board. Prior to that time in 1990, I and many others formed a group: "Minnetonkans for Natural Parklands" to support preserving Lone Lake Park as a natural area when there was a proposal for lighted ball fields in the western portion of that park. We presented a petition with 1,100 signatures to the City Council and Mayor Bergstedt and the council wisely decided to stop plans for that complex.

I'd love a chance to meet with you to share some of this history with you and share some of my concerns about the mountain biking proposal.

As of now, times that I'd be free to meet are many:
Monday 8/19 any time after 4:30 PM
Tuesday 8/20 any time before 2:30
Wednesday 8/21 between 2-5 PM
Thursday 8/22 any time
Friday 8/23 any time
Weekend any time.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Polly Bayrd
Environmental Impacts of Proposed Mountain Biking Trails in Lone Lake Park
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since the summer of 2018, EOR, at the behest of Protect Our Minnetonka Parks, has conducted a study of the outstanding natural resources in Lone Lake Park and the impacts of a mountain biking course on these natural resources. It is clear that the proposed trails will have severe negative impacts on trees, soil erosion, wildlife, and noise in the park. It is not too late for the Minnetonka City Council to reconsider whether the proposed trail is an appropriate use of Lone Lake Park.

This report documents where environmental impacts will and will not occur. It discusses the effects that the mountain bike course will have on park features.

Trees

Perhaps the most serious negative impact will occur to trees. EOR located 270 large trees within the proposed bike trail corridor. Of those, 188 meet the “High Priority Tree” definition established by the City of Minnetonka and 33 are located directly on the trail centerline (Figure 1). In many areas it will be impossible to locate a trail without impacting the Critical Root Zone of large trees.

Many sections of the proposed trail cross through high quality forest communities that qualify as “Mesic Oak Forest” Woodland Preservation Areas according to Minnetonka City code. Any tree located in a Woodland Preserve Area is considered a Protected Tree. When city ordinances are followed, the required mitigation for all the High Priority and Significant Trees affected by the trail would cost $680,000-$1,300,000.

When a single tree dies prematurely and falls, it causes a chain reaction of environmental effects including:

- The loss of part of the tree canopy, altering the amount of light and rainfall that reach the forest floor.
- Soil displacement from “tree throw” of soil and rocks in the roots.
- Increased erosion and sedimentation in surface water resources.

Birds

In addition to loss of tree habitat, birds will suffer substantially if the mountain bike course is constructed. EOR has conducted bird surveys in Lone Lake Park since August 2018. During that time, 103 species of birds have been observed, as shown in Table 2. Ten of these species are designated as Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN). Of the 48 species known to nest within Lone Lake Park, 41 species typically nest in woodland habitats. Many birds use the ground for nesting and use habitat within the first 20 feet from the ground up. In areas of trail development, species compositions shift to more disturbance tolerant species, and the number of species and the number of individual birds nesting and utilizing these corridors decline.

With the rich diversity of woodland bird species that occur within the park, it is important that this valuable habitat space not be disturbed. The large intact woodlands within the park are very important to nesting and migratory bird species, especially those that require mature, high quality forest habitat during certain stages of their lifecycles.
Rusty Patched Bumble Bees and Other Pollinators

The rusty patched bumble bee is a federally listed endangered species that will be negatively impacted by the mountain bike course construction. The species has exhibited a 92.54% relative abundance decline over the past decade. Its historical range covered the Upper Midwest, Northeast, as well as a corridor south into Georgia along the Appalachian Mountains. The Twin Cities metropolitan area is one of the last remaining places it is still documented. The presence of this endangered species in Lone Lake Park is likely due to the park’s size, the different habitats present, the lack of extensive pesticide use, the park providing protection from pesticide use in neighboring land, the years of restoration efforts resulting in a high diversity of flowering plants, and high quality nesting and overwintering habitat.

The rusty patched bumble bee is known to nest below ground in woodlands or woodland edge and has a long foraging season, starting in early to mid-May in central Minnesota. Lone Lake Park has been designated as a High Probability Zone (HPZ) for the rusty patched bumble bee by the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Construction of the mountain biking trail will kill rusty patched bumble bees and/or destroy their nesting habitat. USFWS will require the City of Minnetonka to apply for an endangered species take permit before beginning construction of the trail.

Amphibians and Reptiles

Amphibian and reptile populations will suffer losses due to the mountain bike course. The wetland, open-water, and forest mosaic within the park is particularly suitable for several species of amphibians and reptiles. Several frog species including spring peeper, gray treefrog, Cope’s grey tree frog, wood frog, and boreal chorus frog overwinter in leaf litter, in logs, or under rocks. To survive freezing temperatures, they produce natural antifreeze to prevent major organs from freezing; however, about 65% of their total body water content does freeze. As a result, these species are particularly vulnerable when they emerge in the spring. Trails will create fragmentation between mating, foraging, and overwintering habitats. Thousands of emerging and juvenile amphibians and reptiles can be seen moving through the forests and crossing trails to get from one habitat area to another. Trails proposed near habitat features used by frogs and turtles will inevitably lead to bikers hitting and crushing the wildlife.

Soils and Erosion

The mountain bike course will disturb more area than has been acknowledged, and it will violate city ordinances. The trail is designed to disturb an area that is three feet wide with a 5% outslope grade to provide stormwater runoff. To achieve this grade in areas of steep slopes, the trail will need to be cut into the steep slope on the uphill side and/or fill material will need to be added to the downhill side. As a result, the disturbed area will be at least 4.9 feet wide, which is more than 60% wider than the trail itself. The proposed bike trail does not comply with several sections of the city ordinance regulating steep slopes (See Section 5.1 and Appendix C).

The Minnetonka city ordinance regulating the shoreland district has several provisions that pertain to soil erosion. Much of the bike trail falls within the shoreland district because it is located within 1,000 feet from the ordinary high water level (OHWL) of Lone Lake. The proposed bike trail does not comply with several sections of the ordinance (See Section 5.2 and Appendix C).
Traffic and Noise

Lone Lake Park has long been valued as a place where people can enjoy the solitude and quietude of nature. The proposed mountain bike trail is not compatible with these values. The park is designated as an area of passive recreation, which is also not compatible with the proposed mountain bike trails. The park’s potential patronage is already increasing due to increased housing and transit development in the immediate area. As it is now, many people can use the park for many activities that rely upon its natural setting. Building a mountain biking course will give this setting over to one activity and drive away many other patrons. This is a significant change to the park’s current preserve qualities and current potential to remain a nature destination.

Wildlife Habitat

The mountain bike course will disrupt wildlife habitat. Lone Lake Park encompasses a variety of upland habitat types and is a large contiguous area (146 acres) of relatively high quality natural areas. As a result, the park is known to provide valuable habitat for a variety of species and is likely to support habitat for many species yet to be studied or documented within the park. EOR requested permission from the City of Minnetonka to conduct a wildlife study in Lone Lake Park. Permission was denied.

The addition of mountain bike trails creates a dense network of trails throughout all habitats and areas of the park, creating continuous interruption of the herbaceous layer. With the additional trails, few areas of the park will exceed more than 500 feet from a trail, parking lot, or adjacent residential development. In some areas, the trails are only 15 to 20 feet apart. This intensive dissection of the park will limit habitat suitability for larger wildlife like foxes and coyotes and eliminate habitat for smaller wildlife.

Archaeological, Historic, and Cultural Resources

Archaeological sites are at risk of being destroyed by the mountain bike course. A number of high glacial ridges and high benches ring Lone Lake in a nearly continuous circle. All are within 500 feet of the lake’s edge. These types of features in this landscape position are known to be “high sensitivity areas” for pre-contact, contact, and post-contact period Native American and European archaeological resources.

The Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (MnSHPO) sent emails to the City of Minnetonka on at least two occasions stating that archeological studies of Lone Lake Park should be conducted prior to design and approval of a mountain bike trail corridor. EOR requested permission from the City of Minnetonka to conduct a Phase I Archaeological Assessment of the proposed mountain bike trail corridor, at no cost to the City. The assessment would have included fieldwork, including digging several shallow (2-4 feet deep) test pits, which would be filled back in as soon as the assessment was complete. The City denied EOR permission to conduct the assessment and did not arrange for anyone else to conduct the assessment, despite the strong recommendations by MnSHPO.
Cumulative Effects

The proposed mountain bike trail and its environmental effects should not be viewed as an isolated project. They must be viewed in the larger context of other projects in and around the park, now and in the future. The cumulative effects on the environment by all these projects must be considered before authorizing construction of any one project.

The recently constructed pickle ball courts are of particular concern. The increased impervious surface area will increase stormwater runoff to Lone Lake. The lake is currently very high and encroaching on the maintained trails due to high precipitation in recent months. Had the pickle ball courts been constructed earlier, the lake would be at an even higher stage. The high rainfall amounts experienced this year are not unprecedented, and they will occur again in the future. Cumulative traffic and parking issues must also be addressed.

Conclusions

The proposed mountain bike course will have significant negative impacts to natural resources in Lone Lake Park, including the water resources, wildlife habitat, endangered species, and other passive recreation activities at the park. It will change the fundamental identity of the park away from being a place of quiet preserve that it is today.
1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Since the summer of 2018, EOR, at the behest of Protect Our Minnetonka Parks, has conducted a study of the outstanding natural resources in Lone Lake Park and the impacts of a mountain biking course on these natural resources. It is clear that the proposed trails will have severe negative impacts on trees, soil erosion, wildlife, and noise in the park. It is not too late for the Minnetonka City Council to reconsider whether the proposed trail is an appropriate use of Lone Lake Park.

2. TREES

Tree losses will be significant if the mountain bike course is constructed. It will not be possible to avoid large trees, as suggested in the proposed design.

2.1. Significant and High Priority Trees

EOR conducted a Tree Survey and Woodland Assessment in Lone Lake Park (See Appendix A). EOR located 270 trees within the proposed bike trail corridor that met one or more of the following criteria:

1. Measured 15 inches Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) or greater (except box elder),
2. Were located on the trail centerline and measured 10 inches DBH or greater, and/or
3. Were of significant ecological value (habitat tree, very old, etc.)

Of those, 188 meet the “High Priority Tree” definition established by the City of Minnetonka and 33 are located directly on the trail centerline (Figure 1). Based on EOR findings, the majority of trees surveyed along the proposed trail likely qualify as “Protected Trees” under City Code due to their status as a Significant Trees, High Priority Trees, and/or location in a Woodland Preservation Area.

Most trees were identified as healthy and in good condition. DBH measurements ranged from 10-46 inches, estimated heights ranged from 25-80 feet, and estimated crown diameter ranged from 15-85 feet. Twenty-six trees surveyed exceeded 30 inch DBH. Several snags, identified as good habitat trees, were also surveyed. Crown diameter was most frequently estimated between 30 and 45 feet, with eight trees exceeding crown widths of 65 feet. The majority of surveyed trees were estimated between 60 and 75 feet tall, however seven trees were estimated at a height of 80 feet. Also of note are several ironwood, black cherry, red oak, sugar maple, white oak, northern pin oak, and paper birch which, based on size and natural history, were estimated to be 100-200 years old.

Efforts to control buckthorn across the park have resulted in a healthy under story in many of the aforementioned areas. As a result, forest associated with much of the trail corridor is in good to excellent condition, supporting a diverse canopy and herbaceous layer. In fact, many sections of the proposed trail cross through high quality forest communities that qualify as “Mesic Oak Forest” Woodland Preservation Areas according to Minnetonka City code. Any tree located in a Woodland Preserve Area is considered a Protected Tree.
Figure 1. Significant Tree Locations
2.2. Trail Design and Tree Loss

The Minnetonka Tree Protection Ordinance defines a tree’s Critical Root Zone (CRZ) as the minimum area around a tree that must remain undisturbed. The CRZ of a tree can be measured different ways:

- Minnetonka Tree Protection Ordinance method: CRZ radius = DBH * 1.5 feet.
- At the City Council meeting on October 4, 2018, city staff stated that the CRZ of a tree in the bike trail corridor is the area within the drip line of the tree.

The CRZ, as defined in the Minnetonka Tree Protection Ordinance, has been mapped for all surveyed trees and is shown in Figure 2. Although prior documents have indicated trail siting will be shifted to avoid tree impacts, it is evident that siting a trail to avoid the CRZ of the surveyed trees will be impossible in many areas, especially high quality woodland areas with continuous tree canopy. Further complicating the potential shifting of trail alignment is the presence of additional Significant and High Priority trees not surveyed or mapped in this effort.

Shifting the trail alignment on slopes to avoid trees and critical root zones will make compliance with low impact trail design standards difficult. Compliance will be particularly challenging to impossible on the steep slopes associated with dense tree cover and high quality woodland, as it will be exceedingly difficult to navigate a trail alignment that simultaneously avoids tree impacts and maintains a less than 5% slope.

Thirty-three Significant Trees, including 17 High Priority Trees, were identified as located in the center of the trail alignment. According to Minnetonka City code, Significant Trees must be replaced with two one inch trees. In addition, large trees and shrubs located in Woodland Preserve Areas and High Priority Trees must be replaced at the rate of one inch DBH per one inch DBH removed for deciduous trees.

The cost of purchase and installation of two-inch nursery trees is typically $300-$500, depending on species and overall purchase quantity. Based on the DBH of respective Significant and High Priority Trees located in the center of the proposed trail alignment, tree replacement costs would be $84,000-$140,000. The mitigation required by the City Code for all the High Priority and Significant Trees affected by the trail would cost $680,000-$1,300,000.

The “mitigation” required by the City Code is important, but the true value of a decades-old tree in the forest cannot be replaced with a few young trees. It also does not account for trees that will be killed prematurely due to mountain bikes crushing roots and causing other disturbances within the CRZ. When a single tree dies prematurely and falls, it causes a chain reaction of environmental effects including:

- The loss of part of the tree canopy, altering the amount of light and rainfall that reach the forest floor.
- Soil displacement from “tree throw” of soil and rocks in the roots.
- Increased erosion and sedimentation in surface water resources.
Figure 2. Critical Root Zones of Impacted Trees

Critical Root Zones displayed in map were calculated as in described in the Minneapolis City Code.

CRZ radius = DBH + 1.5 feet
3. **VEGETATION**

Vegetation types will change and diversity will decrease due to the mountain bike course. Emmons & Olivier Resources, Inc. (EOR) inventoried vegetation within ten representative areas along a 20-foot corridor of the proposed mountain biking trail at Lone Lake Park (See Figure 3). The purpose of the survey was to:

1) Collect data regarding plant species presence and abundance within the representative areas, with a focus on shrubs and herbaceous plants, and
2) Estimate negative impacts to the plants in each area from trail construction and long-term use by mountain bikers. The data and results are included in Appendix B.

The plant inventory indicated that many areas of the park have high vegetative diversity and low invasive species cover for an urban park. Much of the park has never been developed for agriculture or other uses. However, other areas of the park have been impacted by its urban setting and historic land use as pasture, cropland, and a ski area. Invasive species, particularly buckthorn, are present throughout the park, with the lowest densities found in higher quality areas. Legacy impacts from historic land use have likely resulted in altered structure and diversity.
Figure 3. Vegetation survey plots and elevation
A total of 91 non-tree species and 103 species overall were identified within or in proximity to the trail corridor, including 63 forbs (woody plants), 15 shrubs, 11 grasses and sedges, 12 trees, and 2 vines (See Table 1).

Table 1. Plant species observations within and near the proposed mountain bike trail corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MN DNR Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forbs and Ferns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achillea millefolium</td>
<td>common yarrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actaea rubra</td>
<td>red baneberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageratina altissima</td>
<td>white snakeroot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrimonia striata</td>
<td>roadside agrimony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliaria petiolata</td>
<td>garlic mustard*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allium tricoccum</td>
<td>wild leek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphicarpa bracteata</td>
<td>hog peanut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemone quinquefolia</td>
<td>wood anemone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquilegia canadensis</td>
<td>cumbine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aralia nudicaulis</td>
<td>wild sarsaparilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aralia racemosa</td>
<td>American spikenard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctium minus</td>
<td>common burdock*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arisaema triphyllum</td>
<td>Jack-in-the-pulpit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asclepias syriaca</td>
<td>common milkweed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurybia macrophylla</td>
<td>large-leaved aster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athyrium filix-femina</td>
<td>lady fern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circaea lutetiana</td>
<td>common enchanter's nightshade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claytonia virginica</td>
<td>Virginia spring beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptotaenia canadensis</td>
<td>honewort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erigeron philadelphicus</td>
<td>Philadelphia fleabane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphorbia esula</td>
<td>leafy spurge*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutrochium maculatum</td>
<td>spotted Joe pye weed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutrochium purpureum</td>
<td>sweet-scented Joe pye weed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragaria vesca</td>
<td>wood strawberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galium aparine</td>
<td>cleavers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN DNR Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Galium triflorum</em></td>
<td>sweet-scented bedstraw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Geranium maculatum</em></td>
<td>wild geranium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Glechoma hederacea</em></td>
<td>creeping Charlie*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Helianthus strumosus</em></td>
<td>woodland sunflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hesperis matronalis</em></td>
<td>dame’s rocket*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Impatiens capensis</em></td>
<td>spotted touch-me-not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Leonurus cardiaca</em></td>
<td>common motherwort*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Maianthemum canadense</em></td>
<td>Canada mayflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Maianthemum racemosum</em></td>
<td>common false Solomon’s seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Monarda fistulosa</em></td>
<td>wild bergamot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Onoclea sensibilis</em></td>
<td>sensitive fern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Osmorhiza claytonii</em></td>
<td>Clayton’s sweet cicely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Osmorhiza longistylis</em></td>
<td>aniseroot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Osmunda claytoniana</em></td>
<td>interrupted fern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oxalis stricta</em></td>
<td>yellow wood sorrel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Phlox divaricata</em></td>
<td>blue phlox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Plantago major</em></td>
<td>common plantain*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ranunculus abortivus</em></td>
<td>kidney-leaved buttercup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ranunculus recurvatus</em></td>
<td>hooked crowfoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ratibida pinnata</em></td>
<td>gray-headed coneflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rudbeckia hirta</em></td>
<td>black-eyed susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Scrophularia lanceolate</em></td>
<td>lance-leaved figwort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Smilax sp.</em></td>
<td>carrion flower sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Solidago altissima</em></td>
<td>late goldenrod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Solidago canadensis</em></td>
<td>Canada goldenrod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Solidago flexicaulis</em></td>
<td>zigzag goldenrod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Solidago gigantea</em></td>
<td>giant goldenrod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Taraxacum officinale</em></td>
<td>common dandelion*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Thalictrum dioicum</em></td>
<td>early meadow-rue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Thalictrum thalictroides</em></td>
<td>rue anemone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tragopogon dubius</em></td>
<td>yellow goat’s beard*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN DNR Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Trifolium</em> spp.</td>
<td>clover spp.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Urtica dioica</em></td>
<td>stinging nettle*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Uvularia grandiflora</em></td>
<td>large-flowered bellwort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vernonia fasciculata</em></td>
<td>bunched ironweed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Veronicastrum virginicum</em></td>
<td>Culver’s root</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Viola</em> spp.</td>
<td>violet spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zizia aurea</em></td>
<td>golden alexanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grasses and Sedges</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bromus inermis</em></td>
<td>smooth brome*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carex blanda</em></td>
<td>charming sedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carex cephalophora</em></td>
<td>oval-headed sedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carex gracillima</em></td>
<td>graceful sedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carex pensylvanica</em></td>
<td>Pennsylvania sedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carex rosea</em></td>
<td>starry sedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carex spp.</em></td>
<td>unknown sedge spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dactylis glomerata</em></td>
<td>orchard grass*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Festuca subverticillata</em></td>
<td>nodding fescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Phalaris arundinacea</em></td>
<td>reed canary grass*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Poa pratensis</em></td>
<td>Kentucky bluegrass*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vines</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</em></td>
<td>Virginia creeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vitis riparia</em></td>
<td>wild grape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shrubs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cornus alternifolia</em></td>
<td>pagoda dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cornus racemosa</em></td>
<td>gray dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Corylus americana</em></td>
<td>American hazelnut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Diervilla lonicera</em></td>
<td>bush honeysuckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Frangula alnus</em></td>
<td>glossy buckthorn*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lonicera sp.</em></td>
<td>exotic honeysuckle*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Prunus virginiana</em></td>
<td>chokecherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rhamnus cathartica</em></td>
<td>common buckthorn*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1. Native Shrubs and Herbs

A total of 52 native forbs, 12 native shrubs, 7 native grasses and sedges, and 2 native vines were identified within or in proximity to the trail corridor during the plant inventory survey. Some plants were unidentifiable due to absence of flowers and included several asters, snakeroots, sedges, clovers, and violets.

Generally, the plant community along the trail corridor has high herbaceous and shrub diversity. Many of the plants are key indicators of healthy Southern Dry-Mesic Oak Forest, Central Mesic Hardwood Forest (Eastern), or other mesic to dry-mesic hardwood forest communities within the Minnesota and Northeast Iowa Morainal System. Many species were well-distributed throughout the trail corridor, including such shrubs as chokecherry, gray dogwood, and prickly gooseberry and forbs including common enchanter’s nightshade, white snakeroot, hog peanut, wood anemone, Jack-in-the-pulpit, sweet-scented bedstraw, and aniseroot. These species were observed even in areas of...
buckthorn invasion, albeit at lower densities and often co-occurring with introduced or invasive forbs. However, other native shrub and herb species were present or more common in areas of the trail corridor with limited buckthorn cover, particularly the north, east, and west facing slopes in the west-central and south-central areas of the park. These areas of the park contained the healthiest understories, of which Plots P05, P08, and P09 are most representative. Shrubs such as American hazelnut, pagoda dogwood, and bush honeysuckle contributed to a diverse shrub layer. Forbs such as columbine, lady fern, spotted Joe pye-weed, sweet-scented Joe pye-weed, wild geranium, Canada mayflower, common false Solomon’s seal, lance-leaved figwort, Clayton’s sweet cicely, zigzag goldenrod, early meadow rue, and rue anemone were much more common in these areas. Additionally, these areas were the only areas of the trail corridor in which wild leek, wild sarsaparilla, American spikenard, honewort, interrupted fern, and large-flowered bellwort were observed.

Open grassland areas occupy a low percentage of the trail corridor and were not included in plots. Native forbs observed in these areas included giant goldenrod, late goldenrod, Canada goldenrod, wild bergamot, common milkweed, bunched ironweed, Culver’s root, gray-headed coneflower, and black-eyed susan. Goldenrods, smooth brome, reed canary grass, black raspberry, and box elder appeared to be dominant components of open areas.

3.2. Introduced Shrubs and Herbs

A total of 17 introduced species were observed including 11 forbs, 3 shrubs, and 3 grasses. Of these, common buckthorn, glossy buckthorn, exotic honeysuckle, garlic mustard, and leafy spurge are considered the most invasive and were most ubiquitous in the woodland areas of the trail corridor. Buckthorn formed dense stands throughout various areas of the park and was often the dominant component of the understory, as exemplified by Plots P01, P02, P06, and P10. Most buckthorn was under 8 feet in height, but areas of the southwest, south-central, and especially the southeast portion of the trail corridor included buckthorn stands of old age. Glossy buckthorn was mostly present in the western areas of the park; however, it is likely present in other areas but young age made identification difficult. Garlic mustard and leafy spurge were frequently observed along woodland edges and in areas of buckthorn dominance, but cover was sparse to patchy and no dense areas were observed. Smooth brome, reed canary grass, creeping charlie, and dame's rocket were common along existing trails near open areas.

3.3. Native Plant Community Condition and Mountain Bike Trail Impacts

Construction of a mountain bike course at Lone Lake Park within the proposed trail corridor will negatively impact the native plant community via spread of invasive species, direct removal of vegetation, loss of vegetation due to frequent travel over routes, and increased exposure to disturbance such as canopy gaps and deer herbivory.

Proliferation of invasive plant species is a primary concern for trail establishment in Lone Lake Park. Many areas of the park contain very low densities of invasive species, such as the esker west of Lone Lake and the ridge south of Lone Lake. However, the proposed trail connects these areas to high density buckthorn populations and areas with garlic mustard, leafy spurge, dame’s rocket, and other invasives. Recreation trails act as corridors that facilitate invasions of non-native plants (Ballantyne and Pickering 2015). These species spread prolifically via seed, and they will disperse along the trail.
corridor via equipment such as shoes, clothes, and bike tires (Dickens et al. 2005). Buckthorn and garlic mustard are particularly problematic species in woodlands, out-competing native plants to form dense populations with little diversity. Both buckthorn and garlic mustard spread aggressively, invading high-quality woodlands even in the absence of disturbance. Invasion by these species poses substantial risk to the native understory at Long Lake Park.

Trail construction will require clearing of trees, shrubs, and herbs in addition to loss and stress created from repeated travel over routes. Shrubs and herbs along new sections of trail will be lost during construction. Woodland understory species generally have limited seed banks and dispersal potential, and once removed may be difficult to recover, especially under continuous use as a mountain bike trail (Vellend 2003, Mabry 2004). Additionally, removal or loss of vegetation will affect forest structure, with resulting negative impacts to both shrub and herb communities. For example, canopy gaps play an important role in woodland herb community composition, and could lead to shifts from shade tolerant understory communities to more open assemblages (Whigham 2004). Such shifts will likely occur in areas of Lone Lake Park with dense canopies and healthy understories, such as the esker west of Lone Lake and the ridge south of Lone Lake. Additionally, canopy gaps may favor the invasive species documented within Lone Lake Park that thrive along woodland edges, such as buckthorn, garlic mustard, leafy spurge, creeping charlie, and dame’s rocket.

Trail construction may also affect the herb and shrub community through altered patterns in deer herbivory. Woodland herb density and tree regeneration can be severely limited by deer browsing (Whigham 2004). Pressure from deer herbivory is likely exerting stress on existing plant communities within Lone Lake Park. However, it is unknown how resulting trail use and fragmentation of the proposed trail may shift deer behavior. For example, deer use of constructed trails may concentrate herbivory along the corridor and incur transport of invasive species. Invasive species impacts may be exacerbated due to unpalatability of buckthorn and garlic mustard (Nuzzo 2000, Knight et al. 2007). Changes in herbivory patterns could therefore result in indirect impacts to plant communities within Lone Lake Park.
4. WILDLIFE

4.1. Birds

EOR has conducted bird surveys in Lone Lake Park since August 2018. During that time, 103 species of birds have been observed, as shown in Table 2. Ten of these species are designated as Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN).

Several bird species observed in the park will be negatively impacted by the proposed mountain bike trail. Barred owl, broad-winged hawk, eastern wood pewee, yellow-throated vireo, and scarlet tanager prefer large, mature forests for nesting and foraging. In addition, two of the SGCN species observed in the park prefer habitats with low human disturbance and intact, high quality woodland: veery and ovenbird (Cornell lab of Ornithology 2018; MNDNR 2018b). Veery require hardwood forests, nest on or near the ground, and show an intolerance to disturbance. Ovenbirds are also ground nesters and spend a significant amount of time foraging on the ground. Indigo buntings typically nest within one-meter of the ground in low vegetation, and eastern wood-pewees require large tracts of mature forested habitat for foraging and nesting (Cornell lab of Ornithology 2018; MNDNR 2018c). These species will be negatively impacted when trail-related disturbances occur within areas where these species nest.

Of the 48 species known to nest within Lone Lake Park, 41 species typically nest in woodland habitats. Research regarding bird community composition and populations in trail development areas conclude that species compositions shift to more disturbance tolerant species along trail corridors, and the numbers of birds nesting and utilizing these corridors decline. For example, the park is known to support brown-headed cowbird, a parasitic bird that can negatively impact populations of songbirds, especially those that are non-aggressive or in population decline. Brown-headed cowbirds prefer areas with less dense vegetation and are likely to inhabit areas near trails due to decreased vegetative cover. A decline in vegetative cover would increase brown-headed cowbird brood parasitism for certain species known to nest in the park, especially those that are flushed off nests by disturbance that could result in increased detection by the cowbirds.

With the rich diversity of woodland bird species that occur within the park, it is important that this valuable habitat space not be disturbed. The large intact woodlands within the park are very important to nesting and migratory bird species, especially those that require mature, high quality forest habitat during certain stages of their lifecycles.

### Table 2. Bird species observed in Lone Lake Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>SGCN*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Crow</td>
<td><em>Corvus brachyrhynchos</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Goldfinch</td>
<td><em>Spinus tristis</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Redstart</td>
<td><em>Setophaga ruticilla</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Robin</td>
<td><em>Turdus migratorius</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Eagle</td>
<td><em>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore Oriole</td>
<td><em>Icterus galbula</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>SGCN*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barn Swallow</td>
<td>Hirundo rustica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barred Owl</td>
<td>Strix varia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay-breasted Warbler</td>
<td>Setophaga castanea</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belted kingfisher</td>
<td>Megaceryle alcyon</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-and-white Warbler</td>
<td>Mniotilta varia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburnian Warbler</td>
<td>Setophaga fusca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-capped Chickadee</td>
<td>Poecile atricapillus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackpoll Warbler</td>
<td>Setophaga striata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-throated Green Warbler</td>
<td>Setophaga virens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Jay</td>
<td>Cyanocitta cristata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-gray Gnatcatcher</td>
<td>Polioptila caerulea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-headed Vireo</td>
<td>Vireo solitarius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad-winged Hawk</td>
<td>Buteo platypterus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Creeper</td>
<td>Certhia americana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown-headed cowbird</td>
<td>Molothrus ater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Goose</td>
<td>Branta canadensis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Warbler</td>
<td>Cardellina canadensis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Waxwing</td>
<td>Bombycilla cedrorum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut-sided Warbler</td>
<td>Setophaga pensylvanica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney Swift</td>
<td>Chaetura pelagica</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipping Sparrow</td>
<td>Spizella passerina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Grackle</td>
<td>Quiscalus quiscula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Yellowthroat</td>
<td>Geothlypis trichas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper’s Hawk</td>
<td>Accipiter cooperii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark-eyed Junco</td>
<td>Junco hyemalis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double-crested Cormorant</td>
<td>Phalacrocorax auritus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downy Woodpecker</td>
<td>Picoides pubescens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Bluebird</td>
<td>Sialia sialis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Phoebe</td>
<td>Sayornis phoebe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Towhee</td>
<td>Pipilo erythrophthalmus</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Wood-Pewee</td>
<td>Contopus virens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Starling</td>
<td>Sturnus vulgaris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Sparrow</td>
<td>Passerella iliaca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden-crowned Kinglet</td>
<td>Regulus satrapa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden-winged Warbler</td>
<td>Vermivora chrysoptera</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden-winged Warbler X Blue-winged Warbler</td>
<td>Vermivora chrysoptera X V. cyanoptera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Catbird</td>
<td>Dumetella carolinensis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray-cheeked Thrush</td>
<td>Catharus minimus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Blue Heron</td>
<td>Ardea herodias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Crested Flycatcher</td>
<td>Mlyarchus crinitus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Scientific name</td>
<td>SGCN*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Horned Owl</td>
<td><em>Bubo virginianus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Heron</td>
<td><em>Butorides virescens</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairy Woodpecker</td>
<td><em>Picoides villosus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermit Thrush</td>
<td><em>Catharus guttatus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herring Gull</td>
<td><em>Larus argentatus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooded Merganser</td>
<td><em>Lophodytes cucullatus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Finch</td>
<td><em>Haemorhous mexicanus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Wren</td>
<td><em>Troglydotes aedon</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigo Bunting</td>
<td><em>Passerina cyanea</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Flycatcher</td>
<td><em>Empidonax minimus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln's Sparrow</td>
<td><em>Melospiza lincolnii</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia Warbler</td>
<td><em>Setophaga magnolia</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallard</td>
<td><em>Anas platyrhynchos</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville Warbler</td>
<td><em>Oreothlypis ruficapailla</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cardinal</td>
<td><em>Cardinalis cardinalis</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Flicker</td>
<td><em>Colaptes auratus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Waterthrush</td>
<td><em>Parkesia noveboracensis</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange-crowned Warbler</td>
<td><em>Oreothlypis celata</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osprey</td>
<td><em>Pandion haliaetus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovenbird</td>
<td><em>Seiurus aurocapilla</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Warbler</td>
<td><em>Setophaga palmarum</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Vireo</td>
<td><em>Vireo philadelphicus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pied-billed Grebe</td>
<td><em>Podilymbus podiceps</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pileated Woodpecker</td>
<td><em>Dryocopus pileatus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Siskin</td>
<td><em>Spinus pinus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-bellied Woodpecker</td>
<td><em>Melanerpes carolinus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-breasted Nuthatch</td>
<td><em>Sitta canadensis</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-eyed Vireo</td>
<td><em>Vireo olivaceus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-winged Blackbird</td>
<td><em>Agelaius phoeniceus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-billed Gull</td>
<td><em>Larus delawarensis</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose-breasted Grosbeak</td>
<td><em>Pheucticus ludovicianus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby-crowned Kinglet</td>
<td><em>Regulus calendula</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby-throated Hummingbird</td>
<td><em>Archilochus colubris</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusty Blackbird</td>
<td><em>Euphagus carolinus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarlet Tanager</td>
<td><em>Piranga olivacea</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp-shinned Hawk</td>
<td><em>Accipiter striatus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solitary Sandpiper</td>
<td><em>Tringa solitaria</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song Sparrow</td>
<td><em>Melospiza melodia</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sora</td>
<td><em>Porzana carolina</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swainson's Thrush</td>
<td><em>Catharus ustulatus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swamp Sparrow</td>
<td><em>Melospiza georgiana</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>SGCN*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Warbler</td>
<td><em>Oreothlypis peregrina</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Swallow</td>
<td><em>Tachycineta bicolor</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veery</td>
<td><em>Catharus fuscens</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbling Vireo</td>
<td><em>Vireo gilvus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-breasted Nuthatch</td>
<td><em>Sitta carolinensis</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-throated Sparrow</td>
<td><em>Zonotrichia albicollis</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Turkey</td>
<td><em>Meleagris gallopavo</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Flycatcher</td>
<td><em>Empidonax traillii</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson’s Warbler</td>
<td><em>Cardellina pusilla</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Wren</td>
<td><em>Trogloides hiemalis</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Duck</td>
<td><em>Aix sponsa</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Thrush</td>
<td><em>Hylocichla mustelina</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Warbler</td>
<td><em>Setophaga petechia</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-bellied Flycatcher</td>
<td><em>Empidonax flaviventris</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-rumped Warbler</td>
<td><em>Setophaga coronata</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-throated Vireo</td>
<td><em>Vireo flavifrons</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SGCN = Species of Greatest Conservation Need

---

### 4.2. Rusty Patched Bumblebee and Other Pollinators

The rusty patched bumble bee is a federally listed endangered species that will be further impacted by construction of the mountain bike course. The species has exhibited a 92.54% relative abundance decline over the past decade. Its historical range covered the Upper Midwest, Northeast, as well as a corridor south into Georgia along the Appalachian Mountains. The Twin Cities metropolitan area is one of the last remaining places it is still documented. The presence of this endangered species in Lone Lake Park is likely due to the park’s size, the different habitats present, the lack of extensive

![Image of rusty patched bumblebee](image_url)

*Figure 4. Rusty patched bumble bees photographed in Lone Lake Park in July 2018*
pesticide use, the park providing protection from pesticide use in neighboring land, the years of restoration efforts resulting in a high diversity of flowering plants, and high quality nesting and overwintering habitat (Figure 4).

The rusty patched bumble bee is known to nest below ground in woodlands or woodland edges and has a long foraging season, starting in early to mid-May in central Minnesota (queen emergence from hibernation) to late September or early October. According to the USFWS (2017a), “Queen hibernation occurs from October until May ... in small chambers in loose soil and/or leaf litter just a few centimeters below the ground or they use compost or rodent hills/mounds...Overwintering habitat is often in or near woodlands or woodland edges that contain spring blooming herbaceous plants, shrubs, and trees, which allows proximity to woodland spring blooming flowers, particularly spring ephemeral wildflowers, a critical early spring food source.” In addition IUCN (2018) suggests “All known and potential sites of this species should be protected from pesticides, habitat alteration, grazing, and other threats that can interfere with the habitat requirements of this species (availability of nectar and pollen throughout the colony season, underground nest sites, and hibernacula).”

4.2.1. Pollinator Observations in Lone Lake Park

Heather Holm is a resident of Minnetonka and is also a national expert on pollinators, specifically bees. Ms. Holm conducted informal pollinator surveys at Lone Lake Park since 2014. Flower-visiting insects including bees, wasps, butterflies, moths, beetles, and flies were recorded for each survey date. All survey dates were between 1 and 2.5 hours in length and between the months of June and September. All species listed were photographed and identified to genus or species. The results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Summary of Informal Pollinator Surveys at Lone Lake Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Surveys Conducted</th>
<th>Survey Window</th>
<th>Number of Pollinator Species Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Between June 19 and July 22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Between June 2 and September 13</td>
<td>44 (RPBB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Between June 30 and August 3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Between July 6 and September 8</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A worker rusty patched bumble bee was documented on July 21, 2016. In 2018, between July 14 and July 17, and on July 20, several rusty patched bumble bee workers were observed and documented in multiple locations within Lone Lake Park, demonstrating that there is at least one, and possibly more than one, active colony nesting within, or in close proximity to the park. Typical bumble bee foraging ranges occur between 500 yards and 1 mile, although flight range studies have demonstrated that bumble bees can find their way back to nests when transported up to 7 miles away. Bumble bees will balance energy expenditure and consuming forage resources, seeking out the closest foraging opportunities to their nesting sites.

On May 23, 2018, Ms. Holm walked the park and briefly assessed the herbaceous plants (absent from the SEH [2018] report). There are several primary spring pollen/nectar plants for the rusty patched bumble bee growing in the wooded slopes of the park where the trails are proposed including Geranium maculatum, Hydrophyllum virginianum, and Aquilegia canadensis. Fall forage plants
present on the same slopes include *Ageratina altissima* and *Solidago flexicaulis*. After emerging from hibernation, queen rusty patched bumble bees initially forage in woodlands on spring ephemerals; therefore, it is possible that nest initiation may occur in close proximity to the initial source of forage. However, bumble bee nests are very difficult to find.

### 4.2.2. Impacts from the Mountain Bike Trail

Lone Lake Park has been designated as a High Probability Zone (HPZ) for the rusty patched bumble bee by the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). HPZs are areas where the RPBB is likely present where suitable habitat is present. In these zones the risk for impacting the RPBB generally increase between March 16 and October 14 in open areas with floral resources and between October 15 and March 15 for ground disturbing activities in forested habitats.

Construction of the mountain biking trail will kill rusty patched bumble bees and/or destroy their nesting habitat. USFWS will require the City of Minnetonka to apply for an endangered species take permit before beginning construction of the trail.

### 4.3. Amphibians and Reptiles

The wetland, open-water, and forest mosaic within the park is particularly suitable for several species of amphibians and reptiles, but this will change with construction of a mountain bike course. EOR has observed 7 species within the park including American toad, boreal chorus frog, common garter snake, gray treefrog, green frog, northern leopard frog, and painted turtle (Table 3). In addition, the park also has potential habitat for wood frog, spring peeper, tiger salamander, eastern newt, snapping turtle, Cope’s gray tree frog, and several species of snakes. (Moriarty and Hall 2014; MNDNR 2018d).

Table 4. Herptofauna observed in Lone Lake Park in 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>Date observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American toad</td>
<td><em>Anaxyrus americanus</em></td>
<td>7/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boreal chorus frog</td>
<td><em>Pseudacris maculata</em></td>
<td>4/26/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common garter snake</td>
<td><em>Thamnophis sirtalis</em></td>
<td>6/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray treefrog</td>
<td><em>Hyla versicolor</em></td>
<td>5/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green frog</td>
<td><em>Lithobates clamitans</em></td>
<td>6/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern leopard frog</td>
<td><em>Lithobates pipiens</em></td>
<td>5/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted turtle</td>
<td><em>Chrysemys picta</em></td>
<td>4/26/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Species such as northern leopard frog, green frog, and Cope’s gray treefrog typically live near open water and grassland areas their entire lives. Eastern gray treefrogs and wood frogs are found in woodland habitats with wetlands nearby. These species emerge in the spring and primarily forage in wooded uplands until mid-May. Spring peepers also live in woodlands and typically inhabit shallow wetlands. Several frog species including spring peeper, gray treefrog, Cope’s grey tree frog, wood frog, and boreal chorus frog overwinter in leaf litter, in logs, or under rocks. To survive freezing temperatures, they produce natural antifreeze to prevent major organs from freezing; however, about 65% of their total body water content does freeze. As a result, these species are particularly vulnerable when they emerge in the spring (Moriarty and Hall 2014; MNDNR 2018d). During this time, these species are typically lethargic and very slow; as such, these species will not be able to avoid oncoming traffic. Wood frogs, gray treefrogs, and spring peepers overwinter in woodland areas and also utilize forested areas exclusively for foraging prior to migrating to wetlands for the mating season. Gray tree frogs spend daytime hours under loose bark and in tree cavities, while spring peepers and wood frogs utilize leaf litter and logs on the forest floor. As such, these three species in particular are vulnerable to disturbance and fragmentation of the wooded areas within the park. The juveniles can be observed moving through the forests and across the walking trails of Lone Lake Park by the hundreds during certain times of the year.

Human disturbance during the frog mating season are a threat as some species of frogs are secretive and will cease calling the moment they sense a potential danger nearby. Continued disruption will cause the frogs to retreat to the water and stop their choruses all together, thereby disrupting the mating process. Trails proposed near water features used by frogs and turtles will inevitably lead to collisions between wildlife and bikers. Trails will create fragmentation between mating, foraging, and overwintering habitats and will increase the number of collisions with emerging or juvenile herpetiles.

4.4. **Bats**

Due to the variety of tree species and mature nature of parts of Lone Lake Park, suitable habitat is available for several species of Minnesota bats. In fact, observations of bats have been documented by park visitors. EOR was denied permission to install bat monitoring equipment in Lone Lake Park by the City of Minnetonka. The equipment consists of recording equipment that records only high-frequency sounds emitted by bats at certain times of the year.

MN DNR has documented that several species of bats in the state are in decline (little brown bats, northern long-eared bats, big brown bats, and tri colored bats) (MNDNR 2018a, b). Of particular concern is the Northern Long-Eared bat (NLEB), a federally threatened bat species. NLEB often inhabit intact mesic hardwood forests, especially those near water features (Bat Conservation International 2018; MNDNR 2018a). This species mates in the fall, emerges from hibernation in May, and bears offspring in June or July. The NLEB forage at dusk using echolocation to feed on moths, flies, leafhoppers, caddisflies, and beetles. They typically forage in woodland clearings, under tree canopies, and over water. Lone Lake Park, due to its size and habitat composition, could support NLEB. In addition, to NLEB, Silver-haired bats need large tracts of mature forest and, as a result, could also be impacted by increased fragmentation of the forest (MNDNR 2018a).
5. **EROSION**
The mountain bike course will disturb more area than has been acknowledged, and it will violate city ordinances. EOR completed an assessment of soils and soil erosion (See Appendix C). The proposed mountain bike trail in Lone Lake Park has been described as being “low impact design” with minimal environmental impact. The design specifies that a 3-feet wide corridor will be constructed. As vegetation returns, the final trail will be 18 to 24 inches wide.

Much of the trail will be constructed on steep slopes with up to 33% grade. The 3-feet wide corridor will disturb an area wider than three feet in these steep areas. The area with steep slopes generally has severely erodible soils. Erosion will come from mountain bike tires and from water running along and across the trail. Additional erosion control and trail construction methods will be necessary in steep slope areas, but so far have not been discussed or included in the plans. The current plans for the bike trail are not in compliance with City of Minnetonka ordinances for steep slopes and erodible soils.

5.1. **Steep Slopes**
The trail is designed to disturb an area that is three feet wide with a 5% outslope grade to provide stormwater runoff. To achieve this grade in areas of steep slopes, the trail will need to be cut into the steep slope on the uphill side and/or fill material will need to be added to the downhill side, as illustrated in Figure 5. As a result, the disturbed area will be at least 4.9 feet wide, which is more than 60% wider than the trail itself.

![Figure 5. Trail design cross section](image-url)
The City of Minnetonka defines steep slopes as having 30% or higher grade. Areas within Lone Lake Park with steep slopes are shown on Figure 6. Several sections of the bike trail are designed on steep slopes.

The proposed bike trail does not comply with several sections of the city ordinance regulating steep slopes, including the following:

“a)  Purpose. The purposes of the standards governing the alteration of steep slopes are to:

1)  preserve steep slopes in essentially their natural state as part of a comprehensive open-space plan;

2)  encourage alternative approaches to conventional flatland development practices in areas of steep slopes, including the planning of development which fits the existing topography of the site;

3)  minimize grading and cut-and-fill operations consistent with the retention of the natural character of steep slopes;

4)  minimize the short and long-term increase in stormwater water-runoff and soil erosion problems incurred in the grading and development of steep slopes;

5)  preserve the predominant views, both from and of the steep slopes; and

6)  preserve the variety of topography which exists in the city and is an integral part of this city’s identity.”

“Finding 2. The development will not result in soil erosion, flooding, severe scarring, reduced water quality, inadequate drainage control, or other problems....”

“2.  use the existing natural drainage system as much as possible in its unimproved state, if the natural system adequately controls erosion.

b.  avoid building on or creating steep slopes with an average grade of 30 percent or more. The city may prohibit building on or creating such slopes in the following situations:

1. where the city determines that reasonable development can occur on the site without building on or creating such slopes; or

2. development on such slopes would create real or potentially detrimental drainage or erosion problems.”
Figure 6. Areas with steep slopes
5.2. **Erodible Soils**

As noted above, the proposed bike trail will feature a 5% outslope in steep areas to promote water runoff. The International Mountain Bicycling Association’s Guide to Providing Great Riding (see Marion and Wimpey, 2007) states that “While the use of a substantial outslope (e.g., 5 percent) helps remove water from treads, it is rarely a long-term solution. Tread cupping and berm development will generally occur within a few years after tread construction. If it is not possible to install additional grade reversals, reshape the tread to reestablish an outsloped tread surface periodically, and install wheel-friendly drainage dips or other drainage structures to help water flow off the trail.”

Figure 7 shows the proposed mountain bike trail corridor and the occurrence of erodible soils in Lone Lake Park. The proposed trail will be constructed on soils classified by the USDA (2018) as having “moderate” or “severe” potential erosion hazard (road, trail). “Moderate” indicates that some erosion is likely, that the roads or trails may require occasional maintenance, and that simple erosion-control measures are needed. “Severe” indicates that significant erosion is expected, that the roads or trails require frequent maintenance, and that costly erosion-control measures are needed.

The Minnetonka city ordinance regulating the shoreland district has several provisions that pertain to soil erosion. Much of the bike trail falls within the shoreland district because it is located within 1,000 feet from the ordinary high water level (OHWL) of Lone Lake. The proposed bike trail does not comply with several sections of the ordinance, including the following:

> “b) The person proposing any land altering activity on a riparian property, such as building a structure, road or driveway, or grading activity, that will impact a topographic area having an average slope of 12% or more measured over a horizontal distance of 50 feet or more, must demonstrate that the land altering activity will not impact the public water regulated by this section and must;

1) demonstrate that soil erosion will not occur as a result of the project activity;

2) demonstrate preservation of the existing vegetation to the extent practical; and

3) provide screening of structures such as buildings and vehicles as viewed from the water in summer leaf on conditions.

In no instance is land altering activity on a riparian property allowed on a slope averaging 20% or greater if it will have an adverse impact on the public water regulated by this section, such as erosion, loss of vegetation, or loss of screening as viewed from the lake. If the applicant can demonstrate that the land altering activity will not have an adverse impact on the public water then the activity must comply with the section 300.28 subsection 20, the steep slope ordinance.”

> “11. Alteration of Shoreland.

The removal of natural vegetation within shore and bluff impact zones must be restricted to prevent erosion into public waters, to consume nutrients in the soil and to preserve shoreland aesthetics. Removal of natural vegetation, grading and filling in the shoreland district is subject to the following provisions:
Figure 7. Erosion Hazard Areas
a) intensive clearing, as defined in this ordinance, of natural vegetation within shore and bluff impact zones is prohibited;”

Soils associated with woodland areas within the park consist of sandy loam and are friable [meaning the soils are easily crumbled or disturbed]. Regardless of trail design, erosion will occur due to increased impervious and un-vegetated surface area resulting from mountain bike trails. Trail widening, especially around corners over time leads to soil loss around trees and damage to root systems that could result in loss of trees and soil stabilization (Figure 8). Even well-managed and designed trails are likely to experience erosional issues and tree loss over time.

For example, based on the Land Manager Survey results included as Appendix A of the Minnetonka Mountain Bike Study, 4 of the 7 people surveyed identified erosion and downed trees as an ongoing issue, even with MORC actively managing trails. Several people specifically identified muddy and wet conditions as a particular issue when dealing with trail erosion and maintenance and also listed difficulties in managing/preventing ridership when soil conditions are susceptible to rutting and erosion.

Battle Creek Regional Park was not included in the conducted survey and has severe erosional problems related to mountain bike trails (Figure 8 and Figure 9). Battle Creek is similar in soil type and has steep slopes similar to that found in Lone Lake Park. It also has an existing system of paved and unofficial hiking trails, further paralleling the conditions at Lone Lake Park. The severity of the problem highlights the need for thoughtful and detailed consideration of the negative impacts of the actual trail design, not just conceptual plans.

Figure 8. Erosion exposing tree roots along a mountain bike trail in Battle Creek Regional Park
Concern over erosional impact from mountain biking has been documented by the City of Minnetonka twenty years ago. “Left unchecked, these impacts will, over time, undermine the integrity of the natural system in the park where this activity occurs. Excessive compaction caused by mountain bikes precludes growth of soil-stabilizing vegetation,” (City of Minnetonka, Parks, Open Space, and Trail System (POST) Plan, adopted 2001).

The potential trail layout intersects existing trails over 50 times (Figure 10). These intersections could result in a two-fold problem: 1) A cumulative stormwater effect that could significantly increase current erosional issues and simultaneously create new erosional issues, and 2) Trail navigation could be very confusing and lead to biking activity (unintentionally or intentionally) on hiking trails not designated for mountain biking. At Battle Creek Regional Park, Ramsey County Staff have indicated issues with mountain bikers creating new trails or utilizing some of the pre-existing unofficial hiking trails for biking, indicating precedent for such complications in a park with similar trail systems. Bikers are also known to create more challenging features by creating ramps and jumps using woody debris, rocks, and soil from habitat near the trail system which can exacerbate trampling and soil disturbance outside of the official trail corridor.
Potential for unauthorized trail usage and creation in Lone Lake Park is further complicated by the forest structure. Survey results and discussion with Dakota County staff indicate that trail systems with dense shrubby understory, often of buckthorn, force bikers to stay on designated paths and are less prone to dramatic trail widening. However, due to extensive invasive shrub management, Lone Lake Park has a healthy herbaceous layer with few shrubs; providing little interference or deterrence to wandering intentionally or unintentionally off-trail.

6. TRAFFIC AND NOISE

Lone Lake Park has long been valued as a place where people can enjoy the solitude and quietude of nature. The proposed mountain bike trail is not compatible with these values. The park is designated as an area of passive recreation, which is also not compatible with the proposed mountain bike trails. Park patronage will not only increase because of mountain bikers, but also from increased population and transportation centers near the park. Table 5 shows that 1068 new housing units and two Light Rail Transit stations are planned within 5500 feet (1.04 miles) of Lone Lake Park.

Table 5. Housing and transportation developments planned near Lone Lake Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Distance from LLP (ft)</th>
<th>Distance from LLP (mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Mariner</td>
<td>10400 Bren Road</td>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>249*</td>
<td>4251</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the SEH (2018) report suggests noise is not a biological issue, various peer-reviewed papers have identified the negative effects of ambient noise on wildlife, especially birds and insects. Ambient noise can significantly impair wildlife’s ability to identify mating calls, approaching danger, and sources of food and water. As a park space important to both a federally endangered bee species and several special concern birds, increased noise from trail usage and increased traffic is a valuable consideration. The City should invest in traffic and noise studies to identify and quantify the level of increased activity and noise the park would incur with the construction of mountain bike trails.

The park’s potential patronage is already increasing due to increased housing and transit development in the immediate area. As it is now, many people can use the park for many activities that rely upon its natural setting. Building a mountain biking course will give this setting over to one activity and drive away many other patrons. This is a significant change to the park’s current preserve qualities and current potential to remain a nature destination.

### WATER RESOURCES

Water resources within Lone Lake Park will be adversely affected by the proposed mountain bike trail. Effects will vary for wetlands, lakes, and streams.

#### 7.1. Wetlands

Several acres of wetland are found within the park, including one Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR) Public Water Wetland located along the western edge of the park, along with seasonally flooded basins, shallow marsh, deep marsh, shallow open water, shrub swamp, and wooded swamp communities. The western portion of the park is almost entirely mapped as wetland; wetland features also extend south and east of Lone Lake. It is possible additional wetlands are located within the park and have not been mapped based on extent of hydric soils and park topography. Wetlands are associated with hydric soils and many areas across the eastern and western portions of the park are associated with All Hydric or Predominately Hydric soil classification. Hydric soils tend to be saturated or inundated for extended periods of time and will be more susceptible to compaction, rutting, and erosion.

Wetland features within the park are highly valuable habitat for wildlife, reduce flooding along other parts of the creek, and are important landscape feature for filtering and slowing the movement of sediments and pollution to other surface waters. Many of these wetlands are isolated, seasonally wet or dry, and do not contain fish; providing valuable habitat to amphibians and reptiles. Filling or damage to wetlands within the park would reduce the ability of these systems to provide these important ecosystem services.
Due to the prevalence of hydric soils and wetland features within the park, the City of Minnetonka should engage in a wetland delineation review of the entire construction corridor associated with the trail. The Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act requires permitting of temporary and permanent fill or changes in structure or function of a wetland. Furthermore, additional crossing of Public Waters will similarly require permitting from the MN DNR. The City should avoid all crossings of wetlands or areas where concentrated overland flow from rain or snowmelt may occur, to prevent degradation of important habitat.

### 7.2. South Fork of Nine Mile Creek

The South Fork of Nine Mile Creek crosses through the western third of the park, meandering north to south. The stream is considered an altered waterway by MN DNR and is also a Public Watercourse. This stream is fairly shallow and clear, with sandy bottoms; providing habitat for small fish, amphibians, and a variety of aquatic insects. The creek is already adversely impacted by erosion and sedimentation from the existing trails in the park. Deposition of finely crushed rock from the trails is visible from trail crossings (Figure 11). Sediment from some of the proposed mountain bike trails could also be deposited in the creek, further degrading the aquatic habitat.

![Figure 11. Erosion of a Lone Lake Park maintained trail and sedimentation in Nine Mile Creek.](image-url)
7.3. **Lone Lake**

Lone Lake is located in the north-central portion of the park and extends outside of the park boundary to the north. This 17-acre kettle lake is considered a shallow lake (on average less than 15 feet deep) and is a MN DNR Public Water. This lake is highly productive, supporting a variety of submergent, floating, and emergent aquatic plants. These dense communities of aquatic plants, along with adjacent shrubs and trees provide foraging and nesting habitat for ducks, green herons, great blue herons, and other water birds; they also provide important habitat for aquatic invertebrates, such as dragonflies and damselflies. This shallow lake balances on the threshold of a mesotrophic and eutrophic (i.e. lots of algae) trophic status. Changes in the surrounding small watershed that could increase sedimentation or nutrient loading to the lake, such as mountain bike trails, could shift the lake to a permanently eutrophic state. This would result in large algal blooms, reduction of light penetration and water clarity, and, consequently, a reduced submergent aquatic plant community and habitat for water birds. High vegetative cover on wooded slopes and installed stormwater features currently help to reduce nutrient and sediment inputs to the lake.

EOR completed a water quality assessment on Lone Lake (See Appendix E). The purpose of the water quality assessment was to develop a lake water quality response model (BATHTUB) that predicts the impacts of the increased imperviousness from proposed plans for a mountain bike trail in the park on the in-lake phosphorus concentration of Lone Lake. EOR created the following BATHTUB model scenarios:

A. Previous conditions (2004) in Lone Lake (22.7% impervious area)
B. Current conditions (2016) in Lone Lake (23.6% impervious area),
C. Imperviousness increased by 0.9% from the proposed plans for a mountain bike trail in the park (24.5% impervious area).

To model the impacts of land cover changes on the water quality of Lone Lake, the Lone Lake BATHTUB model was calibrated based on 2016 conditions and the 2009-2011 growing season average in-lake phosphorus concentration. The 2016 calibrated model was then modified to reflect 2004 land cover conditions and land cover conditions under the proposed plans for a mountain bike trail in the park. The predicted change in Lone Lake phosphorus concentration for each scenario is presented in Table 14. BATHTUB predicted an increase in predicted in-lake phosphorus concentration due to increased imperviousness from the proposed plans for a bike trail in the park, 0.6 µg/L or a 2% increase.
Table 6. BATHTUB phosphorus loads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phosphorus Source</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Proposed Bike Trail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lb/yr</td>
<td>% total</td>
<td>lb/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric Deposition</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Runoff</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted In-lake Phosphorus</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration (µg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the in-lake water quality modeling show that increasing development in the park slightly increases the watershed phosphorus loads to Lone Lake by 0.5 lb/yr (or 3%) which BATHTUB predict would increase long-term average in-lake phosphorus concentrations in Lone Lake by 0.6 µg/L (or 2%). The state shallow lake eutrophication (pollution impairment) standard in the North Central Hardwoods Forest Ecoregion is 60 µg/L or less. The relatively low phosphorus concentration in Lone Lake (~30 µg/L measured during the 2009-2011 growing seasons) indicates that Lone Lake currently has very good water quality.

The estimated increase in watershed phosphorus loads in this analysis are based on average phosphorus land cover export values and do not account for localized sources of phosphorus to Lone Lake from erosion of trails that are located on steep, erodible soils near the lakeshore. Maintaining the aquatic plant community in the shallow, near-shore areas of Lone Lake will be important for mitigating the negative impacts of localized trail erosion on the water quality of Lone Lake. In addition, one unknown factor in this analysis is the impact of the 2% increase in in-lake phosphorus concentrations on long-term sediment accumulation rates in the two deep basins of Lone Lake. Long-term increases in sediment accumulation may increase the rate of eutrophication in Lone Lake over long time-scales (decades), but at unknown levels presently.

8. WILDLIFE HABITAT

The mountain bike course will disrupt wildlife habitat. Lone Lake Park encompasses a variety of upland habitat types and is a large contiguous area (146 acres) of relatively high quality natural areas. As a result, the park is known to provide valuable habitat for a variety of species and is likely to support habitat for many species yet to be studied or documented within the park. Lone Lake Park has been used to teach wildlife camps with local school children and for Girl Scout day camps. People like the park for the occasional wildlife sightings. Wildlife keep the habitat healthy. For example, areas with resident red fox are shown to have fewer rodents and fewer ticks infected with Lyme's disease.

EOR requested permission from the City of Minnetonka to conduct a wildlife study in Lone Lake Park. Permission was denied. The study would have involved placing wildlife cameras at locations where wildlife would most likely be spotted, away from existing trails.
EOR recorded wildlife sightings during several trips over the last year. The species identified are listed in Table 7.

**Table 7. Mammals observed in Lone Lake Park**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>Date observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern gray squirrel</td>
<td><em>Sciurus carolinensis</em></td>
<td>8/30/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American beaver</td>
<td><em>Castor canadensis</em></td>
<td>8/30/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern short-tail shrew</td>
<td><em>Blarina brevicauda</em></td>
<td>9/6/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fox</td>
<td><em>Vulpes vulpes</em></td>
<td>10/25/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-tailed deer</td>
<td><em>Odocoileus virginianus</em></td>
<td>10/25/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern chipmunk</td>
<td><em>Tamias striatus</em></td>
<td>6/17/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed 4.7 miles (24,816 ft.) of mountain bike trails at 5-6 feet (124,080 sq. ft. to 148,896 sq. ft.) of initial disturbance would result in the initial direct loss of 2.85 to 3.42 acres of native forest vegetation in the park. The addition of mountain bike trails creates a dense network of trails throughout all habitats and areas of the park, creating continuous interruption of the herbaceous layer. With the additional trails, few areas of the park will exceed more than 500 feet from a trail, parking lot, or adjacent residential development. In some areas, the trails are only 15 to 20 feet apart. This intensive dissection of the park will limit habitat suitability for larger wildlife like foxes and coyotes and smaller wildlife such as toads. According to SEH’s Lone Lake Park Biological Assessment, fragmentation effects are more serious when you also consider usage frequency, speeds, and unpredictability of biking:

"Currently, the interaction of wildlife with walkers or joggers over a 2-mile trail route is infrequent, and likely predictable to the animal. With active bike trails, you have an increase in the frequency of interaction, as there would be a greater length of trails, and they would be more concentrated. It is expected that the trail users would be more likely to encounter a greater number of animals than a pedestrian, due to the greater distance traveled over a period of time. Because of the speed of travel, the length of the trails, and concentration of the trails within desired areas, there is a greater opportunity for bike riders to be disruptive to wildlife ... but for some species the inclusion of bike trails may be sufficient for them to be displaced." (SEH, 2018. Page 15.)

This is particularly concerning when usership rates of other Metro area parks are examined. Based on the survey included in the Minnetonka Mountain Bike Study, usership at Metro mountain biking trails ranged from 0-500/day, depending on season. An average of the low estimates provided by each park is a ridership of 47 persons/day (Min 0, Max 200, n=7). This is could be a highly disruptive increase in disturbance to wildlife when trail length and timing of usage is considered, given it is likely trail usage will be higher at particular times and on particular days.

The City of Minnetonka needs to determine the negative impacts of fragmentation created physically on the landscape, and as a product of intense and unpredictable usage, and how the anticipated levels
of usage will impact wildlife at different times of day and year (e.g., prime forage times, mating and nesting seasons for wildlife).

9. ARCHAEOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL, AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

9.1. Need for a Phase I Archaeological Assessment

Archaeological sites are at risk of being destroyed by the mountain bike course. The Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (MnSHPO) sent emails to the City of Minnetonka on at least two occasions stating that archeological studies of Lone Lake Park should be conducted prior to design and approval of a mountain bike trail corridor:

- In an email dated April 5, 2018, Amanda Gronhovd, State Archaeologist, wrote to Jesse Izquidero, City of Minnetonka, “The Office of the State Archaeologist does not have any sites or cemeteries recorded within the red area, but there is a very high potential for unrecorded archaeological and cemetery sites in this vicinity. I strongly recommend that you plan on having the areas surveyed by an archaeologist prior to development.”

- In a letter dated September 28, 2018, Amanda Gronhovd, State Archaeologist, wrote to Kelly O’Dea, Minnetonka Services Director, “Because the proposed project is located around and adjacent to Lone Lake, in a region with a significant number of archaeological and cemetery sites, the property has a very high potential for unrecorded archaeological or cemetery sites.

“For your reference, I was contacted in March by the Minnetonka Recreation Program Manager (Jesse Izquidero) regarding this project. At the time I also recommended that a cultural resources investigation take place (see attached). I reiterate this, and recommend that a qualified archaeologist conduct a survey prior to earthmoving.”

EOR requested permission from the City of Minnetonka to conduct a Phase I Archaeological Assessment of the proposed mountain bike trail corridor, at no cost to the City. The assessment would have included fieldwork, including digging several shallow (2-4 feet deep) test pits, which would be filled back in as soon as the assessment was complete. The City denied EOR permission to conduct the assessment and did not arrange for anyone else to conduct the assessment, despite the strong recommendations by MnSHPO.

Minnesota Statue § 138.40 subdivision 3 of the Field Archaeology Act requires state and local agencies to submit development plans to the MnSHPO, Minnesota Office of the State Archaeologist, and to the Indian Affairs Council for review of potential impacts to significant archaeological and cultural resources. This statute states:

“When significant archaeological or historic sites are known or, based on scientific investigations, are predicted to exist on public lands or waters, the agency or department controlling said lands or waters shall submit construction or development plans to the state archaeologist and the director of the society for review prior to the time bids are advertised. The state archaeologist and the society shall promptly review such plans and within 30 days of receiving the plans shall make recommendations for the preservation of archaeological or
Historic sites which may be endangered by construction or development activities. When archaeological or historic sites are related to Indian history or religion, the state archaeologist shall submit the plans to the Indian Affairs Council for the council’s review and recommend action.” Minn. Stat. § 138.40 subd. 3

Before the proposed trail network is installed, and as part of the environmental review process, project plans should be submitted to the MnSHPO, Minnesota Office of the State Archaeologist, and the Indian Affairs Council for review and assessment of impacts to potentially significant archaeological and cultural resources. This should require an intensive archaeological and cultural resources survey of the proposed trail network so impacts can be assessed and an informed decision developed based on project plans. Development of the proposed trails system without the necessary reviews by the MnSHPO, Minnesota Office of the State Archaeologist, and the Indian Affairs Council and without consideration to preserving significant archaeological resources would result in the project being non-compliant with the Field Archaeology Act and the Minnesota Historic Sites Act.

At this time, there does not appear to be a nexus that would necessitate compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for construction of the proposed mountain bike trail system. While some jurisdictional waters of the United States (including regulated wetland resources) could be involved and the project would be subject to Section 404 authorization under the Clean Water Act, it is unlikely the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers would “federalize” the entire project area. Under current guidance, the USACE would likely only require a review of areas in its jurisdiction (which are in low probability areas for archaeological resources).

In the greater Saint Paul-Minneapolis metropolitan area, Native American groups are active in protecting, preserving, and transmitting their cultural heritage and patrimony. The preservation of “Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs)” is especially important to these groups. Broadly defined, TCPs are properties associated with the cultural practices and beliefs of a living community. These practices or beliefs are rooted in that community’s history and are important in maintaining the cultural identity of the community. Examples of TCPs may include dancing grounds, hunting and collecting areas, farm fields, burial grounds, or “shrines.” Based on a review of available documents, it is difficult to determine if any of the Native American groups listed on the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development website, who have a stated some interest in activities that could affect TCPs in the metro area, have been consulted regarding the installation of trails through the area.

9.2. Archaeological Resource Potential

EOR conducted a study to assess and identify potentially significant archaeological and cultural resources that could be affected by the proposed trail network. Background research was conducted using the MnSHPO site files for information on previously identified archaeological sites within one mile (1.6 kilometer) of the project area. Previously inventoried architectural and historical properties and reports of previously conducted surveys near the project area were also reviewed. In addition, researchers examined historical maps of the project area at the Minnesota Historical Society library and historical aerial photographs at the University of Minnesota’s Borchert Map Library. The goals of this study were accomplished using a variety of methods and approaches, specifically:
• An on-line literature search and review of records and county histories at the National Register and the Minnesota State Register (http://www.mnhs.org/shpo/nrhp/)
• A review of Minnesota State Historic Preservation data collected for the project area;
• A review of historic aerial photographs of the proposed project area; and
• Review supplementary GIS data to determine the potential for archaeology and cultural resources.

A number of high glacial ridges and high benches ring Lone Lake in a nearly continuous circle (Figure 12). All are within 500 feet of the lake’s edge. While the exact age and site type is difficult to determine given the limited research conducted in the immediate area, these types of features in this landscape position are known to be “high sensitivity areas” for pre-contact, contact, and post-contact period Native American and European archaeological resources.
Figure 12. Topographic maps of the Lone Lake Park area.
There is the potential for discovering intact, precontact archaeological resources anywhere on the Des Moines Lobe where the ground remains relatively undisturbed. However, there is greater potential if undisturbed land is:

- within 500 feet (150 meters) of an existing or former water source of 40 acres (19 hectares) or greater in extent, or within 500 feet (150 meters) of a former or existing perennial stream;
- located on topographically prominent landscape features;
- located within 300 feet (100 meters) of a previously reported site; or
- located within 300 feet (100 meters) of a former or existing historic structure or feature, such as a building foundation or cellar depression.

The preliminary literature review shows that little is known about archaeological or cultural resources within the Park. Given the Park’s position within a kettle-and-kame landscape—with several prominent kame ridges which have a strong potential for both prehistoric and historic-period Native American and European archaeological resources—there is a very real possibility that significant, previously unknown and unrecorded archaeological and cultural resources could be adversely and irreparably affected and impacted by any proposed development within the Park. The lack of known archaeological resources within the Park does not equate to the absence of these kinds of irreplaceable resources.

10. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS
The proposed mountain bike trail and its environmental effects should not be viewed as an isolated project. They must be viewed in the larger context of other projects in and around the park, now and in the future. The cumulative effects on the environment by all these projects must be considered before authorizing construction of any one project.

The recently constructed pickle ball courts are of particular concern. The increased impervious surface area will increase stormwater runoff to Lone Lake. The lake is currently very high and encroaching on the maintained trails due to high precipitation in recent months. Had the pickle ball courts been constructed earlier, the lake would be at an even higher stage. The high rainfall amounts experienced this year are not unprecedented, and they will occur again in the future. Cumulative traffic and parking issues must also be addressed.

11. CONCLUSIONS
The proposed mountain bike course will have significant negative impacts to natural resources in Lone Lake Park, including the water resources, wildlife habitat, endangered species, and other passive recreation activities at the park. It will change the fundamental identity of the park away from being a place of quiet preserve that it is today.
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1. BACKGROUND

Emmons & Olivier Resources, Inc. (EOR) surveyed trees within a 20-foot corridor of the proposed mountain biking trail at Lone Lake Park, Minnetonka. The purpose of the survey was to collect data regarding potential impacts to significant and ecologically important trees as well as to determine whether the Lone Lake Park mountain bike trail, as proposed, has the potential to cause material adverse effects or impacts upon the environment.

2. METHODS

Prior to field investigations, EOR ecologists conducted a mapping exercise to identify large canopy trees near the proposed trail alignment using aerial imagery. In addition, EOR mapped a 20-foot wide corridor associated with the proposed trail alignment. This corridor was loaded to a Global Positioning System (GPS) device and used as the boundary for field inventory of trees.

EOR ecologists conducted a tree inventory and woodland assessment on October 25th, 2018. Weather conditions were cloudy and cool at the time of the field work.

EOR located trees within the corridor that met one or more of the following criteria:

1. Measured 15 inches Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) or greater (except box elder),
2. Were located on the trail centerline and measured 10 inches DBH or greater, and/or
3. Were of significant ecological value (habitat tree, very old, etc.)

Data collected during the tree survey included:

- Tree identification to species - using bark, leaves, tree shape, buds, buds scars, and other distinguishing characteristics.
- Diameter at Breast Height (BDH) - measured by wrapping DBH tape around the trunk at breast height. If the tree had multiple trunks the total of all trunks were combined.
- Crown diameter - estimated visually.
- Tree height - estimated visually.
- Notes regarding condition, habitat value, age, etc.

Furthermore, EOR assessed the habitat (community type and woodland quality) along the proposed trail. Assessment of habitat included consideration of age class, structure, invasive species, herbaceous layer quality, and adjacency to existing infrastructure.
3. RESULTS

3.1. SIGNIFICANT AND HIGH PRIORITY TREES

EOR located 270 trees within the corridor that met the previously identified conditions, of which 188 meet the “High Priority Tree” definition established by the City of Minnetonka and 33 are located directly on the trail centerline (Figure 1). Based on EOR findings, the majority of trees surveyed along the proposed trail likely qualify as “Protected Trees” under City Code due to their status as a Significant Trees, High Priority Trees, and/or location in a Woodland Preservation Area.

Species (n=23) identified during tree survey included: American basswood (n=9), American elm (n=9), big-tooth aspen (n=6), black cherry (n=31), black walnut (n=1), black willow (n=16), bur oak (n=3), eastern cottonwood (n=8), eastern red cedar (n=2), eastern white pine (n=3), green ash (n=8), ironwood (n=3), northern pin oak (n=49), paper birch (n=14), quaking aspen (n=17), red maple (n=5), red oak (n=50), silver maple (n=2), sugar maple (n=21), and white oak (n=28). Wild apple and boxelder were also identified during field work but did not meet the established survey criteria.

Most trees were identified as healthy and in good condition. DBH measurements ranged from 10-46 inches, estimated heights ranged from 25-80 feet, and estimated crown diameter ranged from 15-85 feet. Twenty-six trees surveyed exceeded 30 inch DBH. Several snags, identified as good habitat trees, were also surveyed. Crown diameter was most frequently estimated between 30 and 45 feet (N=171), with eight trees exceeding crown widths of 65 feet. The majority of surveyed trees were estimated between 60 and 75 (N=200) feet tall, however seven trees were estimated at a height of 80 feet. Also of note are several ironwood, black cherry, red oak, sugar maple, white oak, northern pin oak, and paper birch which, based on size and natural history, were estimated to be 100-200 years old (n=15).

3.2. HABITAT ASSESSMENT

Forest Classification and Maturity

Southern Dry-Mesic Oak Forest (likely MHs37) accounts for the majority of the forest community associated with the proposed trail alignment. This community type is predominately located on the large east, west, and north-facing hillslopes to the west and south of Lone Lake. Near streams, at the base of slopes, and adjacent to wetland areas, the forest community transitions to southern wet-mesic hardwood forest. A few areas along the proposed trail corridor also appear to support degraded mesic savanna communities. These communities are located on a hill top in the southwest portion of the park just north of the trail arch accessed from Rowland Avenue, and in the southeast corner of the park along Highway 61 and Bren Road. Savanna areas were dominated by forbs, grasses, and shrubs with few large trees (wild apple, bur oak, red cedar). In addition, several portions of the trail cross through areas heavily infested with buckthorn. Areas of exceptional buckthorn density are found in the southeast corner of the park and the eastern extents of the trail system.
Based on field visits and review of historical imagery, the wooded areas on slopes appear to be succeeding to mature forest. Specifically, the ridge and slopes to the south and west of Lone Lake and north of the water tower are likely remnant woodland from prior to 1930. Mature forest within the park provides important habitat, not only as a result of species composition but also as a result of varied age classes, snags and fallen trees, and the resulting diversification of microhabitat structure. For example, several snag trees were observed that offer quality habitat to woodpeckers, owls, and likely bats.

Efforts to control buckthorn across the park have resulted in a healthy understory in many of the aforementioned areas. As a result, forest associated with much of the trail corridor is in good to excellent condition, supporting a diverse canopy and herbaceous layer. In fact, information gathered during field visits by EOR staff suggests many sections of the proposed trail cross through high quality forest communities that likely qualify as “Mesic Oak Forest” Woodland Preservation Areas according to Minnetonka City code. Any tree located in a Woodland Preserve Area is a Protected Tree.

4. ANALYSIS

4.1. TRAIL DESIGN AND TREE LOSS

The Minnetonka Tree Protection Ordinance defines a tree’s Critical Root Zone (CRZ) as the minimum area around a tree that must remain undisturbed. The CRZ of a tree can be measured different ways:

- Minnetonka Tree Protection Ordinance method: CRZ radius = DBH * 1.5 feet.
- At the City Council meeting on October 4, 2018, city staff stated that the CRZ of a tree in the bike trail corridor is the area within the drip line of the tree.

The CRZ, as defined in the Minnetonka Tree Protection Ordinance, has been mapped for all surveyed trees and is shown in Figure 2. Although prior documents have indicated trail siting will be shifted to avoid tree impacts, it is evident that siting a trail to avoid the CRZ of the surveyed trees will be impossible in many areas, especially high quality woodland areas with continuous tree canopy. Further complicating the potential shifting of trail alignment is the presence of additional Significant and High Priority trees not surveyed or mapped in this effort.

Shifting the trail alignment on slopes to avoid trees and critical root zones will make compliance with low impact trail design standards difficult. Compliance will be particularly challenging to impossible on the steep slopes associated with dense tree cover and high quality woodland, as it will be exceedingly difficult to navigate a trail alignment that simultaneously avoids tree impacts and maintains a less than 5% slope.

4.2. COSTS

Thirty-three Significant Trees, including 17 High Priority Trees, were identified as located in the center of the trail alignment. According to Minnetonka City code, Significant Trees must be replaced with two one inch trees. In addition, large trees and shrubs located in Woodland Preserve Areas and High Priority Trees must be replaced at the rate of one inch DBH per one inch DBH removed for deciduous trees.

The cost of purchase and installation of two-inch nursery trees is typically $300-$500, depending on species and overall purchase quantity. Based on the DBH of respective Significant and High Priority
Trees located in the center of the proposed trail alignment, tree replacement costs would be $84,000-$140,000. Mitigation for all the High Priority and Significant Trees affected by the trail would cost $680,000-$1,300,000.

4.3. INVASIVE SPECIES

The City of Minnetonka has invested considerable time and money, including substantial citizen volunteer efforts, to remove and manage invasive species within the city park system. In particular, Lone Lake Park has undergone extensive removal and management of buckthorn. As a result of these efforts, Lone Lake Park has a healthy understory of native herbaceous vegetation within many wooded areas of the planned trail corridor. However, the trail corridor also crosses repeatedly through some areas of very dense buckthorn infestation. It is likely seeds from these portions of the trail will be transferred to other areas of the trail through tires and shoes.

Reintroduction of buckthorn to the high quality forested areas, especially steep slopes, could have a variety of consequences. By out-competing native plants for light, water, and nutrients, buckthorn inhibits regeneration of native tree and shrub seedlings, and reduces herbaceous ground cover. As a result, dense monoculture thickets of buckthorn reduce habitat complexity and plant diversity; reducing forage for native pollinators and detritus important to frogs. Furthermore, buckthorn berries act as a laxative, resulting in little benefit to berry-consuming birds and wildlife. In terms of water quality, the resulting deterioration of the surface litter layer and reduction of herbaceous understory cover will reduce infiltration and increase erosion and sedimentation.

Introduction of garlic mustard to interior forested areas of the park would be particularly upsetting as it is very aggressive and difficult to treat and manage. It is currently in the park along disturbed areas of the woodlands and likely to spread with increased disturbance in forested areas. Scientific articles and publications often refer to this species as a tragedy to deciduous forests due to it ferocious spread and potential to decimate native plant communities. Concern for spread of garlic mustard is validated by the consequences observed in Terrace Oaks Park in Burnsville, Minnesota, where the City of Burnsville has documented the spread of garlic mustard along the mountain bike trail corridor.
Figure 1. Significant Tree Locations

Trees identified in this map were located within a 20-foot corridor associated with the proposed trail alignment and met one or more of the following criteria:

1) Measured 13 inches DBH or greater (except box elder)
2) Were located on the trail corridor and measured 10 inches DBH or greater
3) Were of significant ecological value (habitats, trees, very old, etc.)
Figure 2. Critical Root Zones of Surveyed Trees
APPENDIX B. VEGETATION SURVEY

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Lone Lake Park Environmental Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>Minnetonka City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cc</td>
<td>Protect Our Minnetonka Parks, Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Stu Grubb, PG; Jimmy Marty, Environmental Scientist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding</td>
<td>Plant Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>July 5, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. BACKGROUND

Emmons & Olivier Resources, Inc. (EOR) inventoried vegetation within ten representative areas along a 20-foot corridor of the proposed mountain biking trail at Lone Lake Park, Minnetonka. The purpose of the survey was to 1) collect data regarding plant species presence and abundance within the representative areas, with a focus on shrubs and herbaceous plants, and 2) estimate potential impacts to the plants in each area from trail construction and long-term use by mountain bikers.

2. METHODS

Prior to field investigations, EOR identified ten representative areas along a 20-foot wide corridor associated with the proposed trail alignment (the trail corridor). The areas were selected based on aerial imagery, elevation, historic land use, aspect, past observations of rusty-patched bumblebee use, and plant community observations made during previous field efforts. Plot locations are displayed on Error! Reference source not found. and Error! Reference source not found..

The plant inventory was conducted on June 7 and June 10, 2019. At the time of the survey, most plants were identifiable, though senescence of spring ephemerals and early-stage growth of late-summer taxa limited a complete plant inventory. EOR ecologists navigated to the ten representative areas and established 10 x 10 meter (33 x 33 foot) plots at each location, partially extending beyond the trail corridor. Data collected at each plot included:

- Tree, shrub, and herbaceous plant identification to species level. If adequate identification features were not present, taxa were identified to the finest taxonomic resolution possible.
- Percent cover class of each taxa and plant-life form group (e.g. canopy, sub-canopy, etc.)

Plot data collection followed Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MNDNR) Native Plant Community (NPC) classification (MNDNR 2005) and relevé plot methods (MNDNR 2013). Additionally, EOR recorded incidental observations of shrubs and herbaceous plants located outside of plots during travel along the trail corridor. Observations made outside the plot boundaries were not comprehensive; therefore, the plant species list should not be construed as documentation of all species present within the trail corridor.

Categories for plant layer cover adhere to the following descriptions:

- Continuous = 75-100% cover
• Interrupted = 50-75% cover
• Patchy = 25-50% cover
• Sparse = 5-25% cover
• Rare = <5% cover

EOR identified condition ranks for each community based on the guidelines outlined by the MNDNR (2009).

• A-rank occurrences have excellent ecological integrity. They have species composition, structure, and ecological processes typical of the natural or historic range of the community and have been little disturbed by recent human activity or invasive species.
• B-rank occurrences have good ecological integrity. They include lightly disturbed plant communities and communities that were disturbed in the past but have recovered and now have relatively natural composition and structure. B-rank occurrences normally will return to A-rank condition with protection or appropriate management.
• C-rank occurrences have fair ecological integrity. They show strong evidence of human disturbance, but retain some characteristic species and have some potential for recovery with protection and management.
• D-rank occurrences have poor ecological integrity. The original composition and structure of the community have been severely altered by human disturbances or invasion by exotic species. They have little chance of recovery to their natural or historic condition.
Figure 13. Vegetation Plot Locations
Figure 14. Vegetation Plot Locations with Elevation
3. RESULTS

The plant inventory completed at Lone Lake Park indicated that many areas of the park have high vegetative diversity and low invasive species cover for an urban park. However, the park has been impacted by its urban setting and historic land use as pasture, cropland, and a ski area (EOR 2019). Invasive species, particularly buckthorn, are present throughout the park, with the lowest densities found in higher quality areas. Legacy impacts from historic land use have likely resulted in altered structure and diversity.

The majority of the trail corridor appears to be representative of Southern Dry-Mesic Oak Forest (NPC MHs37) of varying condition, though characteristics of Central Mesic Hardwood Forest (Eastern) (NPC MHC36) are also present. These communities are very similar and share many of the same understory species. The MHs37 community is typically dominated by northern red oak, white oak, and basswood with black cherry and shagbark hickory, while the MHC36 community is dominated by northern red oak, basswood, and sugar maple with ironwood, green ash, quaking aspen, bur oak, red maple, and paper birch. The ranges of these NPCs overlap near Lone Lake Park, thus the vegetation at Lone Lake Park may represent a transitional community or it could be altered due to historic land use.

Open grassland areas are located in the southeastern and southwestern sections of the park and represent a relatively minor part of the trail corridor. No plots were located within these areas; dominant vegetation appeared to be smooth brome and reed canary grass, goldenrods, black raspberry, and box elder. These open areas may represent degraded Mesic Savanna (NPC UPS24) due to dominance by grasses and forbs with few large trees and shrubs, but the dominance by non-native species such as smooth brome and reed canary grass made it difficult to classify.

Other native plant communities that are possible within the trail corridor may include Southern Wet-Mesic Hardwood Forest (Minnesota Native Plant Community Class MHs49) along the base of slopes and near wet areas, but these plant communities were observed infrequently and were in a degraded condition due to buckthorn invasion.

3.1. PLOT INVENTORY

Plot condition rankings ranged from D (poor ecological integrity) to B/C (fair to good ecological integrity). Lowest quality plots generally were dominated by buckthorn and had presence of additional invasive or weedy species. Highest quality plots were located on the esker west of Lone Lake (P05) and the ridge south of Lone Lake (P08 and P09). These plots exhibited communities typical of NPCs, but either had some invasive species present or lacked some aspects of reference NPCs. Vegetation structure within plots not dominated by buckthorn was varied and included plots with relatively open shrub layers and ground cover (e.g. P07), patchy to interrupted shrub layers (e.g. P09), and interrupted shrub layers (e.g. P05).
Table 8. Condition Ranking of Plots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Condition Rank</th>
<th>Notes on Condition Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P01</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Interrupted to continuous cover of buckthorn. Garlic mustard and weedy forbs present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P02</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Interrupted cover of buckthorn; leafy spurge and weedy forbs present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P03</td>
<td>C/D</td>
<td>Patchy cover of buckthorn and leafy spurge present, but interrupted cover of black cherry and patchy cover of 10 native woodland forbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P04</td>
<td>C/D</td>
<td>Patchy cover of buckthorn and garlic mustard present, but patchy to interrupted cover of 10 native woodland forbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P05</td>
<td>B/C</td>
<td>No invasive species cover and canopy, sub-canopy, and shrub layer typical of MHc36. Only sparse ground cover of 8 native woodland forbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P06</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Continuous cover of buckthorn. No invasive forbs but sparse cover of only 6 native forbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P07</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Canopy and sub-canopy typical of MHc36. Sparse cover of buckthorn and sparse ground cover of 9 native woodland forbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P08</td>
<td>B/C</td>
<td>Canopy, sub-canopy, and shrub layer typical of MHc36. Interrupted to continuous ground cover typical of MHc36 and MHs37. Sparse buckthorn cover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P09</td>
<td>B/C</td>
<td>Canopy and sub-canopy typical of MHs37. Patchy cover of buckthorn and garlic mustard present. Patchy cover of 9 native woodland forbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Continuous cover of buckthorn. No invasive forbs but sparse cover of only 6 native forbs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plot P01

Plot P01 is located in the western area of Lone Lake Park along the middle of a west-facing slope. Dominant trees included quaking aspen and eastern red cedar and appeared to be typical of the surrounding area, which included interrupted to continuous cover of aspens 30-60-feet in height. Canopy cover at P01 was interrupted and lacked old growth individuals. The shrub layer was dominated by interrupted to continuous cover of glossy and common buckthorn. Despite the dense buckthorn cover, 17 herbs were observed at patchy to interrupted cover. Dominant herbs included native woodland species such as white snakeroot, sensitive fern, fragrant bedstraw, wood strawberry, and giant goldenrod in addition to invasive/weedy species such as garlic mustard and common plantain. Garlic mustard was particularly abundant in the area relative to the rest of the trail corridor.
Plot P01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forbs &amp; Ferns</th>
<th>Grasses &amp; Sedges</th>
<th>Vines</th>
<th>Shrubs &amp; Saplings</th>
<th>Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - red baneberry (*Actaea rubra*)  
- white snakeroot (*Ageratina altissima*)  
- roadside agrimony (*Agrimonia striata*)  
- garlic mustard (*Allaria petiolata*)  
- common burdock (*Arctium minus*)  
- jack-in-the-pulpit (*Arisaema triphyllum*)  
- common enchanter's nightshade (*Circaea lutetiana*)  
- wood strawberry (*Fragaria vesca*)  
- sweet-scented bedstraw (*Galium longistylis*)  
- sensitive fern (*Onoclea sensibilis*)  
- aniseroot (*Osmorhiza longistylis*)  
- common plantain (*Plantago major*)  
- kidney-leaved buttercup (*Ranunculus abortivus*)  
- hooked crowfoot (*Ranunculus recurvatus*)  
- giant goldenrod (*Solidago gigantea*)  
- common dandelion (*Taraxacum officinale*)  
- stinging nettle (*Urtica dioica*) | | - charming sedge (*Carex blanda*)  
- starry sedge (*Carex rosea*) | - glossy buckthorn (*Frangula alnus*)  
- exotic honeysuckle (*Lonicera sp.*)  
- ironwood (*Ostrya virginiana*)  
- chokecherry (*Prunus virginiana*)  
- common buckthorn (*Rhamnus cathartica*)  
- red raspberry (*Rubus idaeus*)  
- western poison ivy (*Toxicodendron rydbergii*)  
- prickly ash (*Zanthoxylum americanum*) | - green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*)  
- eastern red cedar (*Juniperus virginiana*)  
- quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) |

Plot P02

Plot P02 is located in the western area of Lone Lake Park on a nearly level hillcrest. Trees in the surrounding area appeared to be of a younger age class and included eastern red cedar, aspen, and black cherry. Dominant canopy species included quaking aspen. Sub-canopy species included eastern red cedar, black cherry, and green ash. The shrub layer was dominated by interrupted cover of glossy and common buckthorn, with frequent observations of gray dogwood, exotic honeysuckle, black cherry, and smooth sumac. Although ground cover was sparse to patchy, 19 herbs were observed and included many native woodland herbs typical of mesic hardwood forests such as red baneberry, white snakeroot, lady fern, hog peanut, wood anemone, Virginia spring beauty, sweet-scented bedstraw, wood strawberry, and aniseroot. Invasive or weedy herbs including leafy spurge, common dandelion, and common plantain were also observed. Leafy spurge was particularly abundant in the area relative to the rest of the trail corridor.
### Plot P02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forbs &amp; Ferns</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>red baneberry (<em>Actaea rubra</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white snakeroot (<em>Ageratina altissima</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roadside agrimony (<em>Agrimonia striata</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hog peanut (<em>Amphicarpaea bracteata</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wood anemone (<em>Anemone quinquefolia</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lady fern (<em>Athyrium filix-femina</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common enchanter's nightshade (<em>Cimicifuga racemosa</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia spring beauty (<em>Claytonia virginica</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leafy spurge (<em>Euphorbia esula</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wood strawberry (<em>Fragaria vesca</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweet-scented bedstraw (<em>Galium triflorum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aniseroot (<em>Osmorhiza longistylis</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common plantain (<em>Plantago major</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hooked crowfoot (<em>Ranunculus recurvatus</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snakeroot sp. (<em>Sanicula sp.</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giant goldenrod (<em>Solidago gigantea</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common dandelion (<em>Taraxacum officinale</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grasses &amp; Sedges</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>charming sedge (<em>Carex blanda</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>starry sedge (<em>Carex rosea</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vines</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia creeper (<em>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wild grape (<em>Vitis riparia</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shrubs &amp; Saplings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>box elder (<em>Acer negundo</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sugar maple (<em>Acer saccharum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gray dogwood (<em>Cornus racemosa</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glossy buckthorn (<em>Frangula alnus</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>green ash (<em>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eastern red cedar (<em>Juniperus virginiana</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exotic honesuckle (<em>Lonicera sp.</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ironwood (<em>Ostrya virginiana</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black cherry (<em>Prunus serotina</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>northern red oak (<em>Quercus rubra</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common buckthorn (<em>Rhamnus cathartica</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smooth sumac (<em>Rhus glabra</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red raspberry (<em>Rubus idaeus</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>western poison ivy (<em>Toxicodendron rydbergii</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prickly ash (<em>Zanthoxylum americanum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trees</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>green ash (<em>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eastern red cedar (<em>Juniperus virginiana</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quaking aspen (<em>Populus tremuloides</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black cherry (<em>Prunus serotina</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Plot P03

Plot P03 is located in the south-central area of Lone Lake Park near the crest of a southwest-facing slope. Trees in the surrounding area appeared to consist of older oak with younger black cherry and aspen. Dominant canopy species observed included red oak and quaking aspen. Sub-canopy species included box elder, black cherry, and quaking aspen. The shrub layer was dominated by interrupted cover of black cherry and patchy buckthorn. Ground cover was dominated by western poison ivy and Virginia creeper, with sparse herb cover. Giant goldenrod, starry sedge, and sweet-scented bedstraw were the most common forbs, though 12 other species were also observed, including a
small patch of woodland sunflower. Invasive or weedy herbs leafy spurge and common plantain were also observed.

### Plot P03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forbs &amp; Ferns</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>white snakeroot (<em>Ageratina altissima</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roadside agrimony (<em>Agrimonia striata</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hog peanut (<em>Amphicarpaea bracteata</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common enchanter’s nightshade (<em>Circaea lutetiana</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leafy spurge (<em>Euphorbia esula</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweet-scented bedstraw (<em>Galium triflorum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woodland sunflower (<em>Helianthus strumosus</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common plantain (<em>Plantago major</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snakeroot sp. (<em>Sanicula sp.</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late goldenrod (<em>Solidago altissima</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giant goldenrod (<em>Solidago gigantea</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common dandelion (<em>Taraxacum officinale</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grasses &amp; Sedges</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>charming sedge (<em>Carex blanda</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>starry sedge (<em>Carex rosea</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vines</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia creeper (<em>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wild grape (<em>Vitis riparia</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shrubs &amp; Saplings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>box elder (<em>Acer negundo</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sugar maple (<em>Acer saccharum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gray dogwood (<em>Cornus racemosa</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glossy buckthorn (<em>Frangula alnus</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>green ash (<em>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exotic honeysuckle (<em>Lonicera sp.</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black cherry (<em>Prunus serotina</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common buckthorn (<em>Rhamnus cathartica</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red raspberry (<em>Rubus idaeus</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>western poison ivy (<em>Toxicodendron rydbergii</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prickly ash (<em>Zanthoxylum americanum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trees</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>box elder (<em>Acer negundo</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quaking aspen (<em>Populus tremuloides</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black cherry (<em>Prunus serotina</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>northern red oak (<em>Quercus rubra</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Plot P04

Plot P04 is located in the north-central area of Lone Lake Park along the middle of a northwest-facing slope. The surrounding area consists of young oak, ironwood, maple, and aspen, with scattered older red and white oaks and ground cover containing native woodland forbs. Dominant trees at P04 included ironwood, but tree canopy cover was patchy to interrupted. Common buckthorn dominated the shrub layer but was patchy in cover. Beyond the plot, buckthorn cover increased to the south and decreased to the north and east. Hog peanut dominated the herbaceous layer with patchy cover; 12 additional herbs were observed with sparse cover, including many woodland species typical of Southern Dry-Mesic Oak Forest. Garlic mustard and common motherwort were observed but limited to few individuals.
Plot P04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forbs &amp; Ferns</th>
<th>Grasses &amp; Sedges</th>
<th>Vines</th>
<th>Shrubs &amp; Saplings</th>
<th>Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• white snakeroot (<em>Ageratina altissima</em>)</td>
<td>• starry sedge (<em>Carex rosea</em>)</td>
<td>• Virginia creeper (<em>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</em>)</td>
<td>• sugar maple (<em>Acer saccharum</em>)</td>
<td>• ironwood (<em>Ostrya virginiana</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• garlic mustard (<em>Alliaria petiolata</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• wild grape (<em>Vitis riparia</em>)</td>
<td>• black cherry (<em>Prunus serotina</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• hog peanut (<em>Amphicarpaea bracteata</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• common buckthorn (<em>Rhamnus cathartica</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• common burdock (<em>Arctium minus</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• prickly gooseberry (<em>Ribes cynosbati</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• common enchanter's nightshade (<em>Circaea lutetiana</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• red raspberry (<em>Rubus idaeus</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• sweet-scented bedstraw (<em>Galium triflorum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• western poison ivy (<em>Toxicodendron rydbergii</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wild geranium (<em>Geranium maculatum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• prickly ash (<em>Zanthoxylum americanum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• common motherwort (<em>Leonurus cardiaca</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• aniseroot (<em>Osmorhiza longistyli</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• hooked crowfoot (<em>Ranunculus recurvatus</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• snakeroot sp. (<em>Sanicula sp.</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• giant goldenrod (<em>Solidago gigantea</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plot P05

Plot P05 is located in the north-central area of Lone Lake Park near the upper portion of an east-facing slope. The surrounding area consists of large red and white oak with younger maple and ironwood. Dominant trees at P05 include two large red oaks (DBH = 25.7 and 27.4 inches) with a sub-canopy consisting of young sugar maple and ironwood. Many tree saplings were observed at P05 and included white oak, red oak, black cherry, ironwood, and sugar maple saplings within the shrub and ground cover layers. The shrub layer was dominated by chokecherry, with interrupted cover exceeding 50%. Ground layer cover was dominated by patchy cover of Virginia creeper with sparse herbaceous cover of native woodland wildflowers and lady fern. No invasive or weedy species were observed.
## Plot P05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forbs &amp; Ferns</th>
<th>Grasses &amp; Sedges</th>
<th>Vines</th>
<th>Shrubs &amp; Saplings</th>
<th>Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• wood anemone (<em>Anemone quinquefolia</em>)</td>
<td>• starry sedge (<em>Carex rosea</em>)</td>
<td>• Virginia creeper (<em>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</em>)</td>
<td>• sugar maple (<em>Acer saccharum</em>)</td>
<td>• sugar maple (<em>Acer saccharum</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• lady fern (<em>Athyrium filix-femina</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ironwood (<em>Ostrya virginiana</em>)</td>
<td>• ironwood (<em>Ostrya virginiana</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• common enchanter's nightshade (<em>Circaea lutetiana</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• black cherry (<em>Prunus serotina</em>)</td>
<td>• northern red oak (<em>Quercus rubra</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Canada mayflower (<em>Maianthemum canadense</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• chokecherry (<em>Prunus virginiana</em>)</td>
<td>• northern red oak (<em>Quercus rubra</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• kidney-leaved buttercup (<em>Ranunculus abortivus</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• white oak (<em>Quercus alba</em>)</td>
<td>• sugar maple (<em>Acer saccharum</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• snakeroot sp. (<em>Sanicula</em> sp.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• northern red oak (<em>Quercus rubra</em>)</td>
<td>• sugar maple (<em>Acer saccharum</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• zigzag goldenrod (<em>Solidago flexicaulis</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• prickly gooseberry (<em>Ribes cynosbati</em>)</td>
<td>• northern red oak (<em>Quercus rubra</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• rue anemone (<em>Thalictrum thalictroides</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• red raspberry (<em>Rubus idaeus</em>)</td>
<td>• ironwood (<em>Ostrya virginiana</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Plot P06

Plot P06 is located in the central area of Lone Lake Park along the middle of an east-facing slope. Trees in the surrounding area appeared to consist of older oak with younger black cherry and aspen, with dense buckthorn occupying the shrub layer. Dominant canopy species observed included red oak and quaking aspen. Sub-canopy species included black cherry, big-toothed aspen, and several large common buckthorn. The shrub layer was dominated by continuous cover of buckthorn with some prickly ash. The ground cover layer was dominated by near continuous cover of western poison ivy and Virginia creeper, with sparse cover of herbaceous species. However, several native woodland herbs were observed and did not include any invasive or weedy species.
Plot P06

Forbs & Ferns
- white snakeroot (*Ageratina altissima*)
- hog peanut (*Amphicarpaea bracteata*)
- Jack-in-the-pulpit (*Arisaema triphyllum*)
- lady fern (*Athyrium filix-femina*)
- common enchanter’s nightshade (*Circaea lutetiana*)
- aniseroot (*Osmorhiza longistylis*)

Grasses & Sedges
- Pennsylvania sedge (*Carex pensylvanica*)
- starry sedge (*Carex rosea*)

Vines
- Virginia creeper (*Parthenocissus quinquefolia*)

Shrubs & Saplings
- sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*)
- gray dogwood (*Cornus racemosa*)
- exotic honeysuckle (*Lonicera sp.*)
- ironwood (*Ostrya virginiana*)
- big-toothed aspen (*Populus grandidentata*)
- chokecherry (*Prunus virginiana*)
- northern red oak (*Quercus rubra*)
- common buckthorn (*Rhamnus cathartica*)
- western poison ivy (*Toxicodendron rydbergii*)
- prickly ash (*Zanthoxylum americanum*)

Trees
- big-toothed aspen (*Populus grandidentata*)
- quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*)
- black cherry (*Prunus serotina*)
- white oak (*Quercus alba*)

Plot P07

Plot P07 is located in the south-central area of Lone Lake Park near the toe of a northwest-facing slope. The surrounding area consists of large red and white oak with younger maple, ironwood, and aspen. In general, vegetation structure at P07 was dominated by a dense canopy and sub-canopy with a sparse shrub layer and interrupted ground cover. Dominant trees at P07 include red oak and big-toothed aspen with a sub-canopy of red maple. The shrub layer consisted of sparse cover by green ash and common buckthorn. Ground layer cover was dominated by interrupted cover of Virginia creeper and western poison ivy. Ten herbs were observed at P07 with most frequent occurrences of wood anemone, Jack-in-the-pulpit, and common enchanter’s nightshade. Relatively few buckthorn were present and no invasive or weedy herbs were observed.
Plot P07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forbs &amp; Ferns</th>
<th>Grasses &amp; Sedges</th>
<th>Vines</th>
<th>Shrubs &amp; Saplings</th>
<th>Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• hog peanut (<em>Amphicarpaea bracteata</em>)</td>
<td>• starry sedge (<em>Carex rosea</em>)</td>
<td>• Virginia creeper (<em>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</em>)</td>
<td>• green ash (<em>Fraxinus pennsylvonica</em>)</td>
<td>• red maple (<em>Acer rubrum</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wood anemone (<em>Anemone quinquefolia</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• exotic honeyuckle (<em>Lonicera sp.</em>)</td>
<td>• ironwood (<em>Ostrya virginiana</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jack-in-the-pulpit (<em>Arisaema triphyllum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• big-toothed aspen (<em>Populus grandidentata</em>)</td>
<td>• big-toothed aspen (<em>Populus grandidentata</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• common enchanter’s nightshade (<em>Circea lutetiana</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• chokecherry (<em>Prunus virginiana</em>)</td>
<td>• northern red oak (<em>Quercus rubra</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Canada mayflower (<em>Maianthemum canadense</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• common buckthorn (<em>Rhamnus cathartica</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• common false Solomon’s seal (<em>Maianthemum racemosum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• prickly gooseberry (<em>Ribes cynosbat</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• yellow wood sorrel (<em>Oxalis stricta</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• red raspberry (<em>Rubus idaeus</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• kidney-leaved buttercup (<em>Ranunculus abortivus</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• basswood (<em>Tilia americana</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• violet sp. (<em>Viola sp.</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• western poison ivy (<em>Toxicodendron rydbergii</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• prickly ash (<em>Zanthoxylum americanum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plot P08

Plot P08 is located in the south-central area of Lone Lake Park near the upper portion of a north-facing slope. The surrounding area consists of large oak and aspen with young maple. Dominant trees at P08 include quaking aspen with a sub-canopy of red maple. The shrub layer included a mix of common buckthorn, pagoda dogwood, American hazelnut, green ash, and red raspberry, with several native shrubs. Ground layer cover was diverse and characteristic of a healthy Southern Dry-Mesic Oak Forest. Dominant ground cover included Virginia creeper, Jack-in-the-pulpit, rue anemone, and lady fern. Relatively few buckthorn were present and no invasive or weedy herbs were observed.
Plot P08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forbs &amp; Ferns</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>roadside agrimony (<em>Agrimonia striata</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hog peanut (<em>Amphicarpaea bracteata</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wood anemone (<em>Anemone quinquefolia</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>columbine (<em>Aquilegia canadensis</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack-in-the-pulpit (<em>Arisaema triphyllum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lady fern (<em>Athyrium filix-femina</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common enchanter’s nightshade (<em>Circaea lutetiana</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweet-scented Joe pye weed (<em>Eutrochium purpureum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada mayflower (<em>Maianthemum canadense</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common false Solomon’s seal (<em>Maianthemum racemosum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interrupted fern (<em>Osmunda claytoniana</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snakeroot sp. (<em>Sanicula sp.</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rue anemone (<em>Thalictrum thalictroides</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grasses &amp; Sedges</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>charming sedge (<em>Carex blanda</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vines</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia creeper (<em>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wild grape (<em>Vitis riparia</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shrubs &amp; Saplings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>box elder (<em>Acer negundo</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red maple (<em>Acer rubrum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pagoda dogwood (<em>Corylus alternifolia</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gray dogwood (<em>Corylus racemosa</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American hazelnut (<em>Corylus americana</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>green ash (<em>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exotic honeysuckle (<em>Lonicera sp.</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ironwood (<em>Ostrya virginiana</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black cherry (<em>Prunus serotina</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chokecherry (<em>Prunus virginiana</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common buckthorn (<em>Rhamnus cathartica</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri gooseberry (<em>Ribes missouriense</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red raspberry (<em>Rubus idaeus</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>western poison ivy (<em>Toxicodendron rydbergii</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trees</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>red maple (<em>Acer rubrum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paper birch (<em>Betula papyrifera</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ironwood (<em>Ostrya virginiana</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quaking aspen (<em>Populus tremuloides</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plot P09

Plot P09 is located in the southeast area of Lone Lake Park on the middle portion of a west-facing slope. The surrounding area consists of large red and white oak with young maple and ironwood. Vegetation structure at P09 was characterized by continuous canopy cover with patchy to interrupted shrub and ground cover. Dominant trees at P09 included two large red oaks (DBH = 24.8 and 28.9 inches) with a sub-canopy of sugar maple and ironwood. Chokecherry dominated the shrub layer with patchy cover of common buckthorn. Ground layer cover was dominated by patchy to interrupted cover of Virginia creeper with sparse to patchy herbaceous cover of native woodland wildflowers such as Jack-in-the-pulpit, zigzag goldenrod, rue anemone, and wood anemone. A single garlic mustard plant was observed; no other invasive or weedy herbs were observed and buckthorn cover was relatively low compared to other areas of the trail corridor.
# Plot P09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forbs &amp; Ferns</th>
<th>Grasses &amp; Sedges</th>
<th>Shrubs &amp; Saplings</th>
<th>Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• garlic mustard (<em>Alliaria petiolata</em>)</td>
<td>None observed</td>
<td>• gray dogwood (<em>Cornus racemosa</em>)</td>
<td>• sugar maple (<em>Acer saccharum</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• hog peanut (<em>Amphicarpaea bracteata</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• green ash (<em>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>• ironwood (<em>Ostrya virginiana</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wood anemone (<em>Anemone quinquefolia</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• ironwood (<em>Ostrya virginiana</em>)</td>
<td>• northern red oak (<em>Quercus rubra</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• columbine (<em>Aquilegia canadensis</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• common buckthorn (<em>Rhamnus cathartica</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jack-in-the-pulpit (<em>Arisaema triphyllum</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• prickly gooseberry (<em>Ribes cynosbati</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• common enchanter’s nightshade (<em>Circaea lutetiana</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• western poison ivy (<em>Toxicodendron rydbergii</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• kidney-leaved buttercup (<em>Ranunculus abortivus</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• zigzag goldenrod (<em>Solidago flexicaulis</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• rue anemone (<em>Thalictrum thalictroides</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Plot P10

Plot P10 is located in the southeast area of Lone Lake Park on a relatively flat upland. The surrounding area consisted primarily of mature buckthorn with few larger trees, which consisted primarily of aspen, box elder, cottonwood, and maple. Plot vegetation structure was dominated by patchy canopy cover of big-toothed aspen, a continuous sub-canopy and shrub layer of common buckthorn, and sparse ground cover. The plot was typical of a buckthorn thicket with an absence of native tree regeneration, low ground species diversity, and lack of leaf litter. Though cover was sparse, several native woodland herbs were observed, including a relatively high density of woodland sedge species. No invasive or weedy herbs were observed, though some garlic mustard was present in the surrounding area.
### Plot P10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forbs &amp; Ferns</th>
<th>Grasses &amp; Sedges</th>
<th>Vines</th>
<th>Shrubs &amp; Saplings</th>
<th>Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• hog peanut (<em>Amphicarpa bracteata</em>)</td>
<td>• charming sedge (<em>Carex blanda</em>)</td>
<td>• Virginia creeper (<em>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jack-in-the-pulpit (<em>Arisaema triphyllum</em>)</td>
<td>• graceful sedge (<em>Carex gracillima</em>)</td>
<td>• wild grape (<em>Vitis riparia</em>)</td>
<td>• gray dogwood (<em>Cornus racemosa</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• common enchanter’s nightshade (<em>Circaea lutetiana</em>)</td>
<td>• starry sedge (<em>Carex rosea</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• common buckthorn (<em>Rhamnus cathartica</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• sweet-scented bedstraw (<em>Galium triflorum</em>)</td>
<td>• sedge sp. (<em>Carex sp.</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• gooseberry sp. (<em>Ribes sp.</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• giant goldenrod (<em>Solidago gigantea</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• western poison ivy (<em>Toxicodendron rydbergii</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• violet sp. (<em>Viola sp.</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. **INCIDENTAL OBSERVATIONS AND SHRUB/HERB LAYER OVERVIEW**

Plots were generally representative of the shrub and herb community of the trail corridor, but a variety of species were observed beyond the plots. A total of 91 non-tree species and 103 species overall were identified within or in proximity to the trail corridor, including 63 forbs, 15 shrubs, 11 grasses and sedges, 12 trees, and 2 vines (Table 9).

3.2.1. **NATIVE SHRUBS AND HERBS**

A total of 52 native forbs, 12 native shrubs, 7 native grasses and sedges, and 2 native vines were identified within or in proximity to the trail corridor during the plant inventory survey. Some plants were unidentifiable due to absence of flowers and included several asters, snakeroots, sedges, clovers, and violets.

Generally, the plant community along the trail corridor has high herbaceous and shrub diversity. Many of the plants are key indicators of healthy Southern Dry-Mesic Oak Forest, Central Mesic Hardwood Forest (Eastern), or other mesic to dry-mesic hardwood forest communities within the Minnesota and Northeast Iowa Morainal System. Many species were well distributed throughout the trail corridor, including such shrubs as chokecherry, gray dogwood, and prickly gooseberry and forbs including common enchanter’s nightshade, white snakeroot, hog peanut, wood anemone, Jack-in-the-pulpit, sweet-scented bedstraw, and aniseroot. These species were observed even in areas of buckthorn invasion, albeit at lower densities and often co-occurring with introduced or invasive forbs. However, other native shrub and herb species were present or more common in areas of the trail corridor with limited buckthorn cover, particularly the north, east, and west facing slopes in the west-central and south-central areas of the park. These areas of the park contained the healthiest...
understories, of which Plots P05, P08, and P09 are most representative. Shrubs such as American hazelnut, pagoda dogwood, and bush honeysuckle contributed to a diverse shrub layer. Forbs such as columbine, lady fern, spotted Joe pye-weed, sweet-scented Joe pye-weed, wild geranium, Canada mayflower, common false Solomon’s seal, lance-leaved figwort, Clayton’s sweet cicely, zigzag goldenrod, early meadow rue, and rue anemone were much more common in these areas. Additionally, these areas were the only areas of the trail corridor in which wild leek, wild sarsaparilla, American spikenard, honewort, interrupted fern, and large-flowered bellwort were observed.

Open grassland areas occupy a low percentage of the trail corridor and were not included in plots. Native forbs observed in these areas included giant goldenrod, late goldenrod, Canada goldenrod, wild bergamot, common milkweed, bunched ironweed, Culver’s root, gray-headed coneflower, and black-eyed susan. Goldenrods, smooth brome, reed canary grass, black raspberry, and box elder appeared to be dominant components of open areas.

3.2.2. **INTRODUCED SHRUBS AND HERBS**

A total of 17 introduced species were observed including 11 forbs, 3 shrubs, and 3 grasses. Of these, common buckthorn, glossy buckthorn, exotic honeysuckle, garlic mustard, and leafy spurge are considered the most invasive and were most ubiquitous in the woodland areas of the trail corridor. Buckthorn formed dense stands throughout various areas of the park and was often the dominant component of the understory, as exemplified by Plots P01, P02, P06, and P10. Most buckthorn was under 8 feet in height, but areas of the southwest, south-central, and especially the southeast portion of the trail corridor included buckthorn stands of old age. Glossy buckthorn was mostly present in the western areas of the park; however, it is likely present in other areas but young age made identification difficult. Garlic mustard and leafy spurge were frequently observed along woodland edges and in areas of buckthorn dominance, but cover was sparse to patchy and no dense areas were observed. Smooth brome, reed canary grass, creeping charlie, and dame’s rocket were common along existing trails near open areas.

4. **ANALYSIS: NATIVE PLANT COMMUNITY CONDITION AND POTENTIAL MOUNTAIN BIKE TRAIL IMPACTS**

Plot condition rankings ranged from D (poor ecological integrity) to B/C (fair to good ecological integrity). Areas of the park with fair and fair to good ecological integrity represent excellent opportunities for restoration and enhancement to higher condition with proper management and protection. The plant communities of the park may be sensitive to development of a mountain bike trail, resulting in impacts to not only the plant community, but also pollinators and wildlife.

4.1. **NATIVE PLANT COMMUNITY**

Construction of a mountain bike trail at Lone Lake Park within the proposed trail corridor will impact the native plant community via spread of invasive species, direct removal of vegetation, loss of vegetation due to frequent travel over routes, and increased exposure to disturbance such as canopy gaps and deer herbivory.

Proliferation of invasive plant species is a primary concern for trail establishment in Lone Lake Park. Many areas of the park contain very low densities of invasive species, such as the esker west of Lone
Lake and the ridge south of Lone Lake. However, the proposed trail connects these areas to high density buckthorn populations and areas with garlic mustard, leafy spurge, dame’s rocket, and other invasives. Recreation trails act as corridors that facilitate invasions of non-native plants (Ballantyne and Pickering 2015). These species spread prolifically via seed, and there is potential for dispersal along the trail corridor via equipment such as shoes, clothes, and bike tires (Dickens et al. 2005). Buckthorn and garlic mustard are particularly problematic species in woodlands, out-competing native plants to form dense populations with little diversity. Both buckthorn and garlic mustard spread aggressively, invading high-quality woodlands even in the absence of disturbance. Invasion by these species poses substantial risk to the native understory at Long Lake Park.

The City of Minnetonka has invested considerable time and money, including substantial citizen volunteer efforts, to remove and manage invasive species within the city park system. In particular, Lone Lake Park has undergone extensive removal and management of buckthorn. These efforts are a key reason for the diversity present at the park and require ongoing maintenance. Should the proposed trail facilitate buckthorn or garlic mustard invasion, additional management will be required to maintain current conditions. Careful planning for invasive species prevention and management at the park should be integrated into trail planning, including the cost of such efforts.

Trail construction will require clearing of trees, shrubs, and herbs in addition to loss and stress created from repeated travel over routes. Impacts to trees were addressed in the Technical Memorandum “Tree Survey and Woodland Assessment” dated November 18, 2018. Shrubs and herbs along new sections of trail will be lost during construction. Woodland understory species generally have limited seed banks and dispersal potential, and once removed may be difficult to recover, especially under continuous use as a mountain bike trail (Vellend 2003, Mabry 2004). Additionally, removal or loss of vegetation may affect forest structure, with resulting impacts to both shrub and herb communities. For example, canopy gaps play an important role in woodland herb community composition, and could lead to shifts from shade tolerant understory communities to more open assemblages (Whigham 2004). Such shifts may be plausible in areas of Lone Lake Park with dense canopies and healthy understories, such as the esker west of Lone Lake and the ridge south of Lone Lake. Additionally, canopy gaps may favor the invasive species documented within Lone Lake Park that thrive along woodland edges, such as buckthorn, garlic mustard, leafy spurge, creeping charlie, and dame’s rocket.

Trail construction may also affect the herb and shrub community through altered patterns in deer herbivory. Woodland herb density and tree regeneration can be severely limited by deer browsing (Whigham 2004). Pressure from deer herbivory is likely exerting stress on existing plant communities within Lone Lake Park. However, it is unknown how resulting trail use and fragmentation of the proposed trail may shift deer behavior. For example, deer use of constructed trails may concentrate herbivory along the corridor and incur transport of invasive species. Invasive species impacts may be exacerbated due to unpalatability of buckthorn and garlic mustard (Nuzzo 2000, Knight et al. 2007). Changes in herbivory patterns could therefore result in indirect impacts to plant communities within Lone Lake Park.

4.2. POLLINATORS AND WILDLIFE
Pollinators and wildlife may be impacted by the proposed trail via the loss of native forbs and shrubs as discussed above. A total of 52 native forbs and 12 native shrubs were documented at Long Lake Park, many of which provide important forage for pollinators. Plants documented at Long Lake Park include spring ephemerals and early, mid, and later summer flowering plants and provide forage for pollinators and birds throughout the growing season.

Of particular concern at Lone Lake Park is the presence of rusty patched bumble bee, a federally listed endangered species. Multiple rusty patched bumble bee observations were documented in Lone Lake Park in 2016 and 2018, and at least one colony is thought to nest within the park. Rusty patched bumble bees nest belowground in woodlands or woodland edges (USFWS 2016). The foraging season occurs from early May to early October in central Minnesota, requiring a high diversity of flowering plants throughout the growing season. Spring ephemerals are especially important as they serve as a critical early-season food source. Survival and reproductive success of the rusty patched bumble bee individuals hinges on diverse floral resources in close proximity to nests.

The combination of woodland habitat, diversity of flowering plants, and observation records of the rusty patched bumble bee at Lone Lake Park make it likely that areas of the trail corridor serve as important habitat. Several plants documented as preferred forage for the rusty patched bumble bee were observed during the plant inventory at Lone Lake Park including wild geranium, chokecherry, black cherry, Missouri gooseberry, prickly gooseberry, common milkweed, sweet scented Joe-pye weed, spotted Joe-pye weed, jewelweed, wild bergamot, Canada goldenrod, giant goldenrod, late goldenrod, zigzag goldenrod, Culver’s root, bush honeysuckle, and basswood (USFWS 2017).

Although the timing of the plant inventory may have missed some spring ephemerals, many early bloomers that may serve as early season forage were also observed during the plant inventory, including Virginia spring beauty, wood anemone, wood strawberry, blue phlox, kidney-leaved buttercup, hooked buttercup, violets, large-flowered bellwort, columbine, Canada mayflower, common false Solomon’s seal, and golden alexanders. These plants are in addition to other important pollinator forage observed during the plant inventory, such as common yarrow, large-leaved aster, lance-leaved figwort, woodland aster, dogwood, and other flowering plants. Based on these observations of quality forage within and near woodland habitat, it is likely that areas of the trail corridor serve as foraging grounds, or even nest sites, for the rusty-patched bumble bee. Any disturbance to rusty-patched bumblebee habitat should be considered due to the status and sensitivity of the species.

Changes to the native forb and shrub community may also affect wildlife at the park. Currently, the plant diversity observed at the park includes many fruiting shrubs and forbs that are food sources for wildlife. Additionally, the varied structure provides a diversity of cover. The risk of buckthorn invasion may have consequences for wildlife. Buckthorn provides inadequate cover for many wildlife species, and the berries lack nutrition due to their laxative effect (Knight et al. 2007). Disturbance to existing vegetation and the risk of invasion by buckthorn could therefore lead to negative impacts for wildlife.
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Table 9. Plant species observations within and near the mountain biking trail corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MN DNR Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forbs and Ferns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achillea millefolium</td>
<td>common yarrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actaea rubra</td>
<td>red baneberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageratina altissima</td>
<td>white snakeroot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrimonia striata</td>
<td>roadside agrimony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliaria petiolata</td>
<td>garlic mustard*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allium tricoccum</td>
<td>wild leek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphicarpaea bracteata</td>
<td>hog peanut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemone quinquefolia</td>
<td>wood anemone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquilegia canadensis</td>
<td>columbine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aralia nudicaulis</td>
<td>wild sarsaparilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aralia racemosa</td>
<td>American spikenard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctium minus</td>
<td>common burdock*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arisaema triphyllum</td>
<td>Jack-in-the-pulpit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asclepias syriaca</td>
<td>common milkweed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurybia macrophylla</td>
<td>large-leaved aster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athyrium filix-femina</td>
<td>lady fern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circaea lutetiana</td>
<td>common enchanter's nightshade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claytonia virginica</td>
<td>Virginia spring beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptotaenia canadensis</td>
<td>honewort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erigeron philadelphicus</td>
<td>Philadelphia fleabane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphorbia esula</td>
<td>leafy spurge*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutrochium maculatum</td>
<td>spotted Joe pye weed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutrochium purpureum</td>
<td>sweet-scented Joe pye weed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragaria vesca</td>
<td>wood strawberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galium aparine</td>
<td>cleavers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galium triflorum</td>
<td>sweet-scented bedstraw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geranium maculatum</td>
<td>wild geranium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glechoma hederacea</td>
<td>creeping Charlie*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helianthus strumosus</td>
<td>woodland sunflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN DNR Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hesperis matronalis</em></td>
<td>dame's rocket*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impatiens capensis</td>
<td>spotted touch-me-not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonurus cardiaca</td>
<td>common motherwort*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maianthemum canadense</td>
<td>Canada mayflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maianthemum racemosum</td>
<td>common false Solomon's seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monarda fistulosa</td>
<td>wild bergamot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onoclea sensibilis</td>
<td>sensitive fern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmorhiza claytonii</td>
<td>Clayton's sweet cicely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmorhiza longistylis</td>
<td>aniserooot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmunda claytoniana</td>
<td>interrupted fern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxalis stricta</td>
<td>yellow wood sorrel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlox divaricata</td>
<td>blue phlox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantago major</td>
<td>common plantain*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranunculus abortivus</td>
<td>kidney-leaved buttercup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranunculus recurvatus</td>
<td>hooked crowfoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratibida pinnata</td>
<td>gray-headed coneflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudbeckia hirta</td>
<td>black-eyed susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrophularia lanceolate</td>
<td>lance-leaved figwort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smilax sp.</td>
<td>carrion flower sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidago altissima</td>
<td>late goldenrod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidago canadensis</td>
<td>Canada goldenrod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidago flexicaulis</td>
<td>zigzag goldenrod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidago gigantea</td>
<td>giant goldenrod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraxacum officinale</td>
<td>common dandelion*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalictrum dioicum</td>
<td>early meadow-rue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalictrum thalictroides</td>
<td>rue anemone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragopogon dubius</td>
<td>yellow goat's beard*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trifolium spp.</td>
<td>clover spp. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urtica dioica</td>
<td>stinging nettle*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uvularia grandiflora</td>
<td>large-flowered bellwort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernonia fasciculata</td>
<td>bunched ironweed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN DNR Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronicastrum virginicum</td>
<td>Culver’s root</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola spp.</td>
<td>violet spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zizia aurea</td>
<td>golden alexanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grasses and Sedges</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromus inermis</td>
<td>smooth brome*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex blanda</td>
<td>charming sedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex cephalophora</td>
<td>oval-headed sedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex gracillima</td>
<td>graceful sedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex pensylvanica</td>
<td>Pennsylvania sedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex rosea</td>
<td>starry sedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex spp.</td>
<td>unknown sedge spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dactylis glomerata</td>
<td>orchard grass*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festuca subverticillata</td>
<td>nodding fescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalaris arundinacea</td>
<td>reed canary grass*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poa pratensis</td>
<td>Kentucky bluegrass*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vines</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</td>
<td>Virginia creeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitis riparia</td>
<td>wild grape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shrubs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornus alternifolia</td>
<td>pagoda dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornus racemosa</td>
<td>gray dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corylus americana</td>
<td>American hazelnut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diervilla lonicera</td>
<td>bush honeysuckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frangula alnus</td>
<td>glossy buckthorn*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonicera sp.</td>
<td>exotic honeysuckle*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus virginiana</td>
<td>chokecherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhamnus cathartica</td>
<td>common buckthorn*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhus glabra</td>
<td>smooth sumac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribes cynosbati</td>
<td>prickly gooseberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribes missouriense</td>
<td>Missouri gooseberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubus idaeus</td>
<td>red raspberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN DNR Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rubus occidentalis</em></td>
<td>black raspberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Toxicodendron rydbergii</em></td>
<td>western poison ivy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zanthoxylum americanum</em></td>
<td>prickly ash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Acer negundo</em></td>
<td>box elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Acer rubrum</em></td>
<td>red maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Acer saccharum</em></td>
<td>sugar maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Betula papyrifera</em></td>
<td>paper birch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</em></td>
<td>green ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ostrya virginiana</em></td>
<td>ironwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Populus grandidentata</em></td>
<td>big-toothed aspen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Populus tremuloides</em></td>
<td>quaking aspen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Prunus serotina</em></td>
<td>black cherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quercus alba</em></td>
<td>white oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quercus rubra</em></td>
<td>northern red oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tilia americana</em></td>
<td>basswood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Introduced Species
6. BACKGROUND

The proposed mountain bike trail in Lone Lake Park has been described as being "low impact design" with minimal environmental impact. The design specifies that a 3-feet wide corridor will be constructed. As vegetation returns, the final trail will be 18 to 24 inches wide.

Much of the trail will be constructed on steep slopes with up to 33% grade. The 3-feet wide corridor will disturb an area wider than three feet in these steep areas. The area with steep slopes generally has severely erodible soils. Erosion will come from mountain bike tires and from water running along and across the trail. Additional erosion control and trail construction methods will be necessary in steep slope areas, but so far have not been discussed or included in the plans. The current plans for the bike trail are not in compliance with City of Minnetonka ordinances for steep slopes and erodible soils.

7. STEEP SLOPES

The City of Minnetonka defines steep slopes as having 30% or higher grade. Areas within Lone Lake Park with steep slopes are shown on Figure 15. Several sections of the bike trail designed on steep slopes.

The trail is designed to disturb an area that is three feet wide with a 5% outslope grade to provide stormwater runoff. To achieve this grade in areas of steep slopes, the trail will need to be cut into the steep slope on the uphill side and/or fill material will need to be added to the downhill side, as illustrated in Figure 16. As a result, the disturbed area will be at least 4.9 feet wide, which is more than 60% wider than the trail itself.

The proposed bike trail does not comply with several sections of the city ordinance regulating steep slopes, including the following:

"a) Purpose. The purposes of the standards governing the alteration of steep slopes are to:

1) preserve steep slopes in essentially their natural state as part of a comprehensive open-space plan;

2) encourage alternative approaches to conventional flatland development practices in areas of steep slopes, including the planning of development which fits the existing topography of the site;"
3) minimize grading and cut-and-fill operations consistent with the retention of the natural character of steep slopes;

4) minimize the short and long-term increase in stormwater water-runoff and soil erosion problems incurred in the grading and development of steep slopes;

5) preserve the predominant views, both from and of the steep slopes; and

6) preserve the variety of topography which exists in the city and is an integral part of this city’s identity.”

“Finding 2. The development will not result in soil erosion, flooding, severe scarring, reduced water quality, inadequate drainage control, or other problems....”

“2. use the existing natural drainage system as much as possible in its unimproved state, if the natural system adequately controls erosion.

b. avoid building on or creating steep slopes with an average grade of 30 percent or more. The city may prohibit building on or creating such slopes in the following situations:

1. where the city determines that reasonable development can occur on the site without building on or creating such slopes; or

2. development on such slopes would create real or potentially detrimental drainage or erosion problems.”

8. SOIL EROSION

Soil erosion is an indirect and largely avoidable impact of trails and trail use. Trails can be eroded by the bike treads or by wind and water running over the exposed, bare soil.

There are two forces generated by mountain bikes on soil; the downward compaction force from the eight of the rider and the bike, and the rotational shearing force from the turning of the rear wheel. Mountain bikers create the greatest erosion impact while going uphill, particularly on muddy or loose soil. The erosion impact when going downhill is usually minimal, except when riders brake hard and skid, or when wheels displace soil to the outside of a sharp turn. Minimal erosion occurs on flat terrain except for rutting in wet or uncompacted soils (Cessford, 1995).

Soil can be eroded by wind, but generally, erosion is caused by flowing water. Over time, the trail will develop a cupped or insloped tread surface that intercepts and carries water. The concentrated runoff picks up and carries soil particles downhill, eroding the tread surface.

Loose, uncompacted soil particles are most prone to soil erosion, so trail uses that loosen or detach soils contribute to higher erosion rates. Erosion potential is closely related to trail grade because water becomes substantially more erosive with increasing slope. The size of the watershed draining to a section of trail is also influential - larger volumes of water are substantially more erosive.

When trails are located in areas of poor drainage or across highly organic soils that hold moisture, tread muddiness can become a persistent problem. Muddiness is most commonly associated with locations where water flows across or becomes trapped within flat or low-lying areas. Soil compaction, displacement, and erosion can exacerbate or create problems with muddiness by causing cupped treads that collect water during rainfall or snowmelt. Thus, muddiness can occur...
even along trails where there is sufficient natural drainage. Subsequent traffic skirts these problem spots, compacting soils along the edges, widening mud holes and tread width, and sometimes creating braided trails that circumvent muddy sections. (Marion and Wimpey, 2007).

As noted earlier, the proposed bike trail will feature a 5% outslope in steep areas to promote water runoff. The International Mountain Bicycling Association’s Guide to Providing Great Riding (see Marion and Wimpey, 2007) states that “While the use of a substantial outslope (e.g., 5 percent) helps remove water from treads, it is rarely a long-term solution. Tread cupping and berm development will generally occur within a few years after tread construction. If it is not possible to install additional grade reversals, reshape the tread to reestablish an outsloped tread surface periodically, and install wheel-friendly drainage dips or other drainage structures to help water flow off the trail.”

Figure 17 shows the proposed mountain bike trail corridor and the occurrence of erodible soils in Lone Lake Park. The proposed trail will be constructed on soils classified by the USDA (2018) as having “moderate” or “severe” potential erosion hazard (road, trail). “Moderate” indicates that some erosion is likely, that the roads or trails may require occasional maintenance, and that simple erosion-control measures are needed. “Severe” indicates that significant erosion is expected, that the roads or trails require frequent maintenance, and that costly erosion-control measures are needed.

Soil types that are present in the area of the bike trail and classified as severe potential erosion hazard include:

- Kingsley-Gotham complex (sandy loam)
- Lester loam (loam)

Both are relatively coarse grained soils that can develop on steep slopes. The sand and fine sand fractions of the soil are more susceptible to erosion than silt and clay, which tend to be compacted and resist erosion and infiltration.

Specific soil erosion control measures and locations have not been included on the mountain bike trail plans to date. Some possible erosion control measures that could be implemented include water bars, swales, rock drains, drainage pipe, and culverts. Any of these would add to the area disturbed by the bike trail. Geotextiles can also be incorporated into the bike trail to add stability to the soils and prevent erosion. However, geotextiles would add substantial engineering and materials costs to the project.

The Minnetonka city ordinance regulating the shoreland district has several provisions that pertain to soil erosion. Much of the bike trail falls within the shoreland district because it is located within 1,000 feet from the ordinary high water level (OHWL) of Lone Lake. The proposed bike trail does not comply with several sections of the ordinance, including the following:

“b) The person proposing any land altering activity on a riparian property, such as building a structure, road or driveway, or grading activity, that will impact a topographic area having an average slope of 12% or more measured over a horizontal distance of 50 feet or more, must demonstrate that the land altering activity will not impact the public water regulated by this section and must;

1) demonstrate that soil erosion will not occur as a result of the project activity;

2) demonstrate preservation of the existing vegetation to the extent practical; and
3) provide screening of structures such as buildings and vehicles as viewed from the water in summer leaf on conditions.

In no instance is land altering activity on a riparian property allowed on a slope averaging 20% or greater if it will have an adverse impact on the public water regulated by this section, such as erosion, loss of vegetation, or loss of screening as viewed from the lake. If the applicant can demonstrate that the land altering activity will not have an adverse impact on the public water then the activity must comply with the section 300.28 subsection 20, the steep slope ordinance."

“11. Alteration of Shoreland.

The removal of natural vegetation within shore and bluff impact zones must be restricted to prevent erosion into public waters, to consume nutrients in the soil and to preserve shoreland aesthetics. Removal of natural vegetation, grading and filling in the shoreland district is subject to the following provisions:

a) intensive clearing, as defined in this ordinance, of natural vegetation within shore and bluff impact zones is prohibited;”

9. REFERENCES


Figure 15. Areas with Steep Slopes
Figure 16. Mountain Bike Trail Cross Section
Figure 17. Erosion Hazard

Data source: USDA (2018)
APPENDIX D. WATER QUALITY

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Lone Lake Park – Proposed Mountain Bike Trail</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>January 9, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To / Contact info</td>
<td>Protect Our Minnetonka Parks, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cc / Contact info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From / Contact info</td>
<td>Meghan Funke, PhD, PE; Stu Grubb, PG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding</td>
<td>Lake Water Quality Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. INTRODUCTION

On behalf of Protect Our Minnetonka Parks, EOR conducted a water quality assessment of Lone Lake to provide insight into the impact of development on lake water quality. The following memo describes the methodology, results, and conclusions of the water quality assessment of Lone Lake.

The purpose of the water quality assessment was to develop a lake water quality response model (BATHTUB) that predicts the potential impacts of the increased imperviousness from proposed plans for a mountain bike trail in the park on the in-lake phosphorus concentration of Lone Lake. EOR created the following BATHTUB model scenarios:

D. Previous conditions (2004) in Lone Lake (22.7% impervious area)
E. Current conditions (2016) in Lone Lake (23.6% impervious area),
F. Imperviousness increased by 0.9% from the proposed plans for a mountain bike trail in the park (24.5% impervious area).

The following memo summarizes the inputs and assumptions of the BATHTUB models, and the BATHTUB predicted in-lake phosphorus concentration response of Lone Lake to the increased imperviousness from the proposed plans for a mountain bike trail in the park.

11. MODEL ASSUMPTIONS & INPUTS

The modeling software BATHTUB (Version 6.1) was selected to link phosphorus loads with in-lake water quality. A publicly available model, BATHTUB was developed by William W. Walker for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Walker 1999). It has been used successfully in many lake studies in Minnesota and throughout the United States. BATHTUB is a steady-state annual model that predicts lake summer (June through September) mean surface water quality. BATHTUB’s time-scales are appropriate because watershed phosphorus loads are determined on an annual basis, and the summer season is critical for lake use and ecological health. The heart of BATHTUB is a mass-balance phosphorus model that accounts for water and phosphorus inputs from tributaries, watershed runoff, the atmosphere, and sources internal to the lake; and outputs through the lake outlet, water loss via evaporation, and phosphorus sedimentation and retention in the lake sediments.
In typical applications of BATHTUB, lake and reservoir systems are represented by a set of segments and tributaries. Segments are the basins (lakes, reservoirs, etc.) or portions of basins for which water quality parameters are being estimated, and tributaries are the defined inputs of flow and phosphorus loading to a particular segment. For this study, Lone Lake was represented as a segment, and the drainage area to the lake was represented as a single tributary to the lake (i.e., the segment). BATHTUB allows a choice among several different phosphorus sedimentation models. The Canfield-Bachmann phosphorus sedimentation model (Canfield and Bachmann 1981) was chosen for this analysis as it best represents the lake water quality response of Minnesota lakes and is commonly used for lake water quality and Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) regulatory studies.

The input sources and data required to run the BATHTUB models for this assessment included:

- **2009-2011 growing season (June-September) average phosphorus concentration at Lone Lake monitoring station 27-0094-00-201** (Table 10). Source:
  - Minnesota Pollution Control Agency Environmental Data Access: Surface Water Data ([https://www.pca.state.mn.us/quick-links/eda-surface-water-data](https://www.pca.state.mn.us/quick-links/eda-surface-water-data)).

- **Lake physical characteristics** (Table 11). Sources:
  - *Surface area*: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Hydrography Lakes and Open Water GIS layer ([http://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/chouse/water_lakes.html](http://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/chouse/water_lakes.html)).
  - *Lake depths*: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Lake Bathymetry GIS layer, 1991-1992 ([http://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/chouse/water_lakes.html](http://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/chouse/water_lakes.html)).
  - *Mean depth and volume*: Calculated from lake depths and areas of each depth contour as presented in Error! Reference source not found..
  - *Fetch (longest lake surface distance)*: Measured in Google Earth from 2018 aerial photography.

- **Climatic data** (Table 12). Sources:
  - *Precipitation*: Based on the assumptions used in the 2004 NMCWD XPSWMM model scenarios (EOR Hydrologic Assessment Technical Memo dated December 26, 2018). The closest long term precipitation record, located at the Flying Cloud Municipal airport, was used as the precipitation time series in the model (Midwest Regional Climate Center, 2018).
  - *Evaporation*: Average pan evaporation measured at the University of Minnesota St. Paul Campus (36.15 inches) modified by a 0.795 pan evaporation coefficient ([https://www.dnr.state.mn.us/climate/wxsta/pan-evaporation.html](https://www.dnr.state.mn.us/climate/wxsta/pan-evaporation.html)).
  - *Atmospheric Deposition*: Total Phosphorus Deposition Rate for the Red River Basin from Table 7 of the MPCA Detailed Assessment of Phosphorus Sources to Minnesota Watersheds – Atmospheric Deposition: 2007 Update ([https://www.pca.state.mn.us/sites/default/files/pstudy-2007updatememo.pdf](https://www.pca.state.mn.us/sites/default/files/pstudy-2007updatememo.pdf)).

- **Drainage areas, land cover, watershed flow and phosphorus load** (Table 13). Sources:
  - *Lake drainage areas*: 2004 Nine Mile Creek Watershed District (NMCWD) XPSWMM model.
- **Land cover**: USDA NASS Cropland Data Layer (CDL) raster dataset ([https://www.nass.usda.gov/Research_and_Science/Cropland/SARS1a.php](https://www.nass.usda.gov/Research_and_Science/Cropland/SARS1a.php)).
- **Total Phosphorus Export Coefficients (TPEC)**: TPECs are the phosphorus runoff yield (i.e., loading rate) for a given land use. The Lake St. Croix Total Phosphorus Loading Study summarized TPECs from published reports of runoff studies conducted by natural scientists and water resource managers in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and/or Upper Midwest landscapes. The Basin Team’s Implementation Committee pooled their collective knowledge of runoff behavior within in the St. Croix basin to develop a customized list of dry-, average-, and wet-condition TPECs for six land cover groupings. The TPECs used for this project were derived from these estimates ([https://www.pca.state.mn.us/sites/default/files/wq-iw6-04i.pdf](https://www.pca.state.mn.us/sites/default/files/wq-iw6-04i.pdf)).
- **Watershed phosphorus load**: Calculated from the sum of the area and TPEC for each land cover category.
- **Watershed flow**: Calculated from the direct drainage area multiplied by the NMCWD XPSWMM model scenario runoff depths.

### Table 10. 10-year growing season mean TP, Chl-a, and Secchi (2009-2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Phosphorus as P (µg/L)</th>
<th>Chlorophyll-a (µg/L)</th>
<th>Secchi disk depth (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = number of samples  
CV = BATHTUB coefficient of variation = Standard error divided by the mean

### Table 11. Lake physical characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Lone Lake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface area</td>
<td>16.8 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth</td>
<td>6.8 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>113 acre-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetch (longest surface distance)</td>
<td>1,110 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12. BATHTUB climate inputs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation (median, 1999)</td>
<td>28.39 in/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation (2016)</td>
<td>38.27 in/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaporation</td>
<td>29.28 in/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric Deposition</td>
<td>0.417 kg/ha/yr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Direct drainage area land cover, flow and phosphorus loads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USDA Category</th>
<th>NASS Land Cover</th>
<th>TPEC (kg/ha/yr)</th>
<th>2004 Area (ac)</th>
<th>Load (lb/yr)</th>
<th>2016 Area (ac)</th>
<th>Load (lb/yr)</th>
<th>Proposed Bike Trail Area (ac)</th>
<th>Load (lb/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Bike Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004 Load (lb/yr)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 Load (lb/yr)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Bike Trail Load (lb/yr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Open Space (&lt;20% impervious)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Low Intensity (20-49% impervious)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Medium Intensity (50-79% impervious)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed High Intensity (&gt;79% impervious)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrubland</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciduous Forest</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Forest</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbaceous Wetlands</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>106.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>105.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>105.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. RESULTS
The BATHTUB model was calibrated to the 2009-2011 growing season average total phosphorus concentration (Table 10). Typically, when the predicted in-lake total phosphorus concentration is lower than the average observed (monitored) concentration, an explicit additional load is added to calibrate the model. When the predicted in-lake total phosphorus concentration is higher than the observed (monitored) concentration, the TP sedimentation rate (or treatment capacity of the lake) is increased.

The Lone Lake models overpredicted the in-lake phosphorus concentrations and therefore the phosphorus sedimentation factor (the amount of phosphorus from the watershed that settles to the
lake bottom without flowing downstream) was increased from 1 to 1.06. An overprediction of the in-lake phosphorus concentration can result from an overprediction of phosphorus loads to the lake, or higher than normal phosphorus sedimentation in the lake compared to the BATHTUB model development lake dataset. Because the objective of this study was to model the predicted impacts of scenarios relative to one another, this uncertainty was considered acceptable.

To model the impacts of land cover changes on the water quality of Lone Lake, the Lone Lake BATHTUB model was calibrated based on 2016 conditions and the 2009-2011 growing season average in-lake phosphorus concentration. The 2016 calibrated model was then modified to reflect 2004 land cover conditions and land cover conditions under the proposed plans for a mountain bike trail in the park. The predicted change in Lone Lake phosphorus concentration for each scenario is presented in Table 14. BATHTUB predicted an increase in predicted in-lake phosphorus concentration due to increased imperviousness from the proposed plans for a bike trail in the park, 0.6 µg/L or a 2% increase.

### Table 14. BATHTUB phosphorus loads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phosphorus Source</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Proposed Bike Trail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lb/yr</td>
<td>% total</td>
<td>lb/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric Deposition</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Runoff</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted In-lake Phosphorus Concentration (µg/L)</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13. CONCLUSIONS

The results of the in-lake water quality modeling show that increasing development in the park slightly increases the watershed phosphorus loads to Lone Lake by 0.5 lb/yr (or 3%) which BATHTUB predict would increase long-term average in-lake phosphorus concentrations in Lone Lake by 0.6 µg/L (or 2%). A 2 percent increase in in-lake phosphorus concentration is within the year-to-year variability observed in Lone Lake between 2009 and 2011 (CV of 4% in Table 10). The state shallow lake eutrophication (pollution impairment) standard in the North Central Hardwoods Forest Ecoregion is 60 µg/L or less. The relatively low phosphorus concentration in Lone Lake (~30 µg/L measured during the 2009-2011 growing seasons) indicates that Lone Lake currently has very good water quality.

The estimated increase in watershed phosphorus loads in this analysis are based on average phosphorus land cover export values and do not account for localized sources of phosphorus to Lone Lake from erosion of trails that are located on steep, erodible soils near the lakeshore. Maintaining the aquatic plant community in the shallow, near-shore areas of Lone Lake will be important for mitigating the impacts of localized trail erosion on the water quality of Lone Lake. In addition, one
unknown factor in this analysis is the impact of the 2% increase in in-lake phosphorus concentrations on long-term sediment accumulation rates in the two deep basins of Lone Lake. Long-term increases in sediment accumulation may increase the rate of eutrophication in Lone Lake over long time-scales (decades), but at unknown levels presently. Deep sediment core analysis could be used in the future to predict changes in sediment accumulation from development compared to pre-development conditions in Lone Lake.
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Dear Geralyn Barone,

I am hoping to share one of the very important misses in the presentation to you from the Park Board last year regarding the survey done of Lone Lake Park.

The survey the park & recreation completed for Lone Lake Park was only done in the spring, the snow was still on the ground. So, the assessment was not thorough and flawed given the lack of time devoted to the park being assessed.

There are four seasons in Lone Lake Park and if you look at the Colony Cycle of the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee you will see that they utilize and move to different zones in the park. The Bike trails are proposed up the hill in the wooded area where the bee colony cycle is taking place:

Rusty Patched Bumble Bee
Colony Cycle
- Late Fall: Queen finds and underground nest
- Winter: Hibernation
- Late Spring:
  - Lays eggs, emerges
  - *Feeds Larvae by herself up to 5 weeks*
- Summer: Workers emerge, more eggs laid
- Fall: Mating, Workers and old queens die off

I am very troubled the city will look to a **TAKE** permit to eliminate any of the bees that come in the way of the trails.

I beg you please, look at other options for Mountain Biking, Lone Lake Park is the home for the Federally Endangered Rusty Patched Bee as well as the home for other pollinators such as the monarch and several bird species.

Please consider the other options to the residents of Minnetonka, who would like Mountain Biking in Minnetonka.

Please, put the money into developing a concept plan for sites, that may not have the perfect criteria for the mountain biking association, but they will not forever harm a beautiful park where the Federally Endangered Rusty Patched Bumble Bee and other cherished wildlife inhabit.

Thank you for your time,
Lyn Davis
Hi,
My name is Samantha. I am a 21-year-old College Student. I wanted to express my thoughts regarding the Mountain Bike Trail at Lone Lake Park.

Mountain Biking is great fun, and parks are for everyone. My three brothers and I have Mountain Biked for several years. It doesn't seem rational that the Mountain Bike trails created at Lone Lake Park will be for everyone (Multi Use). I am a Mountain Biker and also walk the current trails now with and without a leashed dog and find it hard to believe that walkers, runners and bikers can safely coexist on a trail.

We currently use the trails at Lebanon Hills, Elm Creek; I know first hand what these trails look like and the toll it has taken on the environment in both parks. We would love to have a trail near us but understand the damage that is created not intentionally but still created by biking on trails maintained by the city or an organization. There must be other options..... Lone Lake Park is already used for Basketball, Tennis, Soccer, Lacrosse, Pickleball and a Playground.

Let's be real, things happen and with best intentions volunteers have a life and if something needs to give in their personal life it would be volunteering to maintain a trail or a project.

It would be nice, if the park was taken care of the damaged nature kiosks and the restrooms facility repaired.

There must be another option in Minnetonka for a Mountain Bike Trail that would not destroy the fragile environment that is left in Lone Lake Park.

Please consider the other options to the residents of Minnetonka who would like Mountain Biking in Minnetonka.

Please don't forever harm a beautiful park for all of us to enjoy.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration;

Samantha Russell
5325 Dominick Drive
Minnetonka, Mn 55343
Big Woods Preserve

The Big Woods has existed for 700 years and once covered much of east-central Minnesota. In the west suburbs, there are only a few forest remnants of the Big Woods remaining. The west side of Lone Lake is old growth, Big Woods. But in the 1930’s, many of the hillsides at Lone Lake were cut by the raspberry farmers. **Some people say that the forest at Lone Lake is not Big Woods because it is second growth.**

Two State DNR plant ecologists and a forest ecologist from the U of Minnesota have all stated that Lone Lake Park qualifies as a Big Woods remnant. The trees and understory have regenerated and are now 70-80 years old. In 20 years, with continued restoration by the City, the trees at Lone Lake will be 100 years old. These trees were generated from the original seed and root stock of the Big Woods.

Having such a rare forest in our city generates new possibilities, but also creates greater responsibility for the stewardship of this land. The 54 acres of Big Woods at Lone Lake is important because there is so little left. Minnetonka has been a leader for stewardship for decades. This leadership is reflected in the The Open Space Preservation Policy (Sept. 1999) or POST expresses what the core values of our city has been for generations.

In that document, it gives specific guidelines for areas to preserve: “Sensitive environmental features particularly include wetlands but may also include unique stands of trees, water bodies, such as creeks, significant geological features, high quality natural resources, and unusual habitats”.

“The council got it right 20 years ago, my hope is that you will see the wisdom found in the POST document and re-evaluate the location of the bike path at Lone Lake.

We have a hidden gem right in front of us that we need to polish and nurture. This is an opportunity to create a lasting legacy that will be remembered for generations. I say yes to a preserve, yes to the rusty patch bumblebee and yes to the city of Minnetonka.