

305

Dear Edina City Council Members;

We, the Commissioners of the Edina Energy and Environmental Commission (EEC), support the proposed Nine Mile Creek Regional trail through Edina, specifically the planned creek park route. We ask you to do the same.

We believe the trail will provide many benefits to our great community. Benefits will include:

- A trail for people of all ages, specifically children, to recreate and enjoy safely *without the risk of automobile traffic*. This trail system would signal support of resident desires to make the immensely popular activity of biking safer and more accessible to all – nobody wants to ride a bike with an automobile passing them only a few feet away.
- The trail would be a large community asset and finally provide a regional trail connection through the city. Edina is currently deficient in bike trails for its citizens in comparison to surrounding communities. This trail would finally integrate Edina into the very well used and supported regional bike trail system, fostering use by both bike commuters and recreational users alike. The Twin Cities area has one of the largest percentages of bike commuters in the nation. Every bike commuter keeps an automobile's exhaust fumes out of the air.
- The trail would allow access to public land that is currently inaccessible to the vast majority of our residents. It will let everyone enjoy the beautiful creek area.
- This trail will provide consistency with City plans for a healthy and livable community, encouraging recreational exercise. It will provide a crucial part of plans that have been developed as part of the City's Comprehensive Plan, ICLEI and the Green Step Cities Program.

There are obviously concerns about the impact the trail will have along the creek. However, the trail will be routed through an area that has already been impacted by years of urbanization, including chemical runoff from the lawns adjacent to the creek as well as road salt. This project will open the possibility of reversing some of that damage as Nine Mile Creek Watershed District (9MCWSD) will be responsible for upkeep of this creek. The EEC's Air and Water Quality Working Group will continue to work with 9MCWSD for continuous improvements.

In addition, no adverse environmental impacts have been identified by the 9MCWSD to flora and fauna. Grass and brush in this wetland area has already been heavily impacted and overrun by non-native species. This project may give the 9MCWSD the opportunity to repair some of this damage.

Promoting and building bike and pedestrian trails, especially regional trails, is a great action item in helping Edina Go Green, and makes our community less dependent on auto transportation and the associated environmental detriments.

Again, we ask you to support the Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail along the creek park route.

Sincerely,

The Edina Energy and Environmental Commission

306

My name is Bob Schwartzbauer. I'm a member of the Community Assessment Team. I represent Route or section 3. This is a map of Route 3 given to us by 3RPD. It's page 81 in the Community Assessment book. I have added a few things to make it complete as I'll describe in a minute. Please read this statement in conjunction with the map I've provided. Route 3 would extend from the intersection of Lincoln Dr. and Duncan Lane near the Caribou Coffee Shop at Hwy.169 and the Londonderry exit on the Northwest, to the intersection of Vernon Ave. and Gleason Rd. on the Southeast.

I've highlighted Nine Mile Creek in blue. It runs from the border with Hopkins on the Northwest to the intersection of Vernon Ave. and Gleason Road on the Southeast. The creek roughly forms one leg of a triangle the other two sides of which are Vernon Ave. and Lincoln Drive.

What is interesting about this area, is that there are no automobile bridges or streets that cross the Creek. That means that everyone who lives or works within this triangle, in order to enter or leave their homes or work, must do so via Vernon or Lincoln Drive. The proposal for section 3 is to put the trail on the North and East side of the street along this entire section. It could not be put on the other side of the street because Edina doesn't have enough land. That means that everyone who lives or works in this triangle would have to cross the proposed trail in order to leave or enter their homes or work.

Now let's take a look at what's inside the triangle. Most of this is not shown on the map that's in the Community Assessment book. Starting in the Northwest corner, is United Healthcare's World HQ. According to UHC's director of properties, approximately 1100 cars park in UHC's facility every weekday. That means that there will be about 2200 cars crossing the proposed trail from UHC every weekday. In addition there are at least 800 residents within this triangle. 144 in Manor Homes, 160 in Edina West Condominiums, 28 families in twin homes in The Habitat, 8 units here in Wellesly Place and 360 condo units in Fountain Woods, 35 single family homes on Walnut Drive and 38 in this section that exits on Tamarac Ave. Nine families live in the Chapel Hills neighborhood. There are 4 twin homes on this Eastern most segment of Section 3. Every one who works at UHC or lives in any of these neighborhoods or condominium complexes would have to cross the trail to enter or leave. If you do the math, assuming only one person leaves each residence once per day, factoring for weekends, on an average, there would be approximately 3 to 4,000 Trail crossings per day. This creates a very serious safety concern.

Recognizing this safety problem, 3RPD proposes to place 8 sets of stop signs for bicyclists in this one and one-quarter (1.25) mile Section of the Trail. These would be at Langford, Waterford Ct., Habitat Ct., Wellesly Place, Walnut Drive, Tamarac Ave., Ivy Lane and the intersection of Vernon Ave. and Gleason Rd.

There are 3 primary groups that might use the trail: (1) Commuter cyclists; (2) Family and Recreational bikers and (3) Walkers. Any council member that bikes knows what is likely to happen: Commuter bicyclists either won't stop, creating an even greater safety risk or they won't use the trail at all; they will ride in the street rather than stop every approximately 800 feet; Family and Recreational users are unlikely to use the Trail because the Trail would abut a heavily trafficked street and contain many road crossings. According to the Department of Natural Resources seminal work on trails: "Trail, Planning, Design and Development Guidelines", 2007: "**[a] sense of physical and personal safety is the most important trail value in that without it people are disinclined to use a trail irrespective of how many other values it might provide.**" DNR Guidelines 2.2. Family bicyclists "**[w]ill not routinely use busy roads**" DNR Guidelines 4.40 According to 3RPD surveys, most trail users "**prefer trails ... separated from traffic and with limited road crossings.**" In short, family and recreational users are not likely to use a trail on section 3 any more than Commuter bicyclists. As you may know from reading some of the letters and petitions from section 3 residents, walkers are strongly against the trail. Most of the residents in section 3 are seniors. We are very afraid that we will be injured because of our hearing and balance problems when bicyclists are using the same path as we would. Now, we have a sidewalk on which to walk which will be removed if the trail goes on section 3.

In addition to the danger at trail crossings, there is danger from passing traffic. Vernon Ave/Lincoln Drive is a collector road. Traffic counts indicate that 7 to 9,000 cars use this route daily. Three bus routes use Vernon/ Lincoln plus the Edina School bus system.

Finally, if a trail is built on Route 3, not only will it be dangerous it will not attract Edina residents. That is especially true because nearly all of the 20 to 30 year old trees that now line Vernon and Lincoln will be removed or destroyed by trail construction. You will have an unattractive trail that is dangerous to all who come in contact with it that no one, not even avid bicyclists will use and you will have driven seniors from their chosen method of exercise.

THANK YOU

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'P. H. H.', written in a cursive style.

307

To: Edina Park Board

CC: Edina Mayor and City Council

Regarding: Proposed regional bike trail in Edina.

I am writing this letter as the CAT member elected to represent the people along segment 2 of the proposed Edina Regional Bike Trail. The Mayor/City Council has requested that the Park Board provide a recommendation on this topic.

My concern is that several issues have not yet been adequately addressed. Below are those issues in outline form. I trust they will be part of the conversation at the meeting on Tuesday evening.

1. Economics – stated construction costs = \$17 to \$20 million plus \$185,000 annual maintenance which generates a NPV cost of \$23MM to \$26MM (excluding undisclosed indirect costs).
  - a. Cost is huge to build and maintain 7 miles of trail.
    - i. What are the potential consequences if Three Rivers Park District defaults after the construction is complete.
      1. Consequences could include TRPD coming back to its tax base (suburban Hennepin County) and threatening to shut down all the parks unless the tax levy is increased.
      2. TRPD has already reduced staffing costs. It is not clear how TRPD will generate the funds to pay debt service and operating expenses associated with multiple projects over the long term.
  - b. Sources and amounts of construction financing (debt and grant amounts by \$ and source) have not been made clear.
  - c. Indirect expenses of running the operation have not been disclosed.
  - d. Is proceeding with this project consistent with Edina's priorities?
    - i. How about during a recession when the long term expectation for property values is either flat or declining?
    - ii. Is there a more cost effective way to serve the needs of the community?
2. Impact on nature and character of neighborhood due to increased access and parking from trail users
  - a. Danger to kids and elderly due to increased vehicle traffic near Walnut Ridge Park.
  - b. Increased vehicle traffic on currently quiet streets.
3. Changes to the nature and use of Walnut Ridge Park.
  - a. Safety concerns for the park's existing users and its neighbors.
  - b. Trail passes within 20 feet of tennis courts, children's play areas and Lacrosse fields.
    - i. Option across the southern portion of the park will pass adjacent to the warming house and restrooms creating a different safety hazard.
4. Parking issues for neighborhood surrounding Walnut Ridge park.

5. Wisdom of providing a long term easement of Edina park and natural areas to a 3rd party.
6. Policing/security issues – who pays and what level of service will be provided?
  - a. Hopkins is paying for police activity on their portion of the route.
  - b. What is Edina’s plan and how much will that cost?
7. Elevated platform or bridges across wetlands
  - a. Impact on risk of flooding to the area
    - i. Raised boardwalk is planned to be built parallel to flow of creek
    - ii. Does TRPD have experience building a raised platform trail, in a flood way that runs parallel to the flow of water?
      1. I would like to see the engineering analysis on this topic.
  - b. Collection of debris caught by platform and supporting structure – how will it be handled?
  - c. What materials will be used in constructing the platform
    - i. If Edina plans to plow in the winter – will it hold up to regular plowing?
      1. Any additional maintenance or capital needs to the city as a result?
    - ii. What is the impact of chemicals used to de-ice on the wetlands and its habitat?
    - iii. What is the impact of using chemically treated lumber (or other product) on the wetlands and its habitat?
  - d. Visual impact of a 10’ to 12’ high bridge – will it be aesthetically pleasing to existing neighbors.
    - i. How will an elevated trail change level of privacy to homeowners?
  - e. Noise generated by traveling across a timber trail.
    - i. Please provide estimated decibel readings on asphalt vs. proposed elevated surface.
8. Property value impact to citizens adjacent to the park vs. a few blocks away.
9. Refusal to date to consider alternative routes
  - a. 3 alternative routes (that I know of) have been submitted.
    - i. What is the status of the alternative proposals?
    - ii. Attached is another copy of the alternative that I forwarded to the Mayor/City Council.
  - b. I would like to re-open the idea of building along the west side of Lincoln drive (segment 3).
    - i. This action will keep the existing sidewalk on the east side of the street for the residents
    - ii. It will eliminate at least 4 street crossings making it a safer option than the current one for segment 3.
    - iii. No residential property exists on that side of the road.
    - iv. TRPD deleted this option without reviewing the potential right of way issues with MNDOT.
      1. I believe that curbs and gutters could be moved to accommodate user and MNDOT needs.

Feel free to call if you have questions or need additional information.

Regards,

Bob Lubar

Robert N. Lubar

Phone: 612-396-3285

Fax: 866-521-6018

Email: [rlubar@comcast.net](mailto:rlubar@comcast.net)

308

John Keprios  
Edina Park Board Director  
Edina City Hall  
4801 W. 50<sup>th</sup> St.  
Edina, MN 55424

September 15, 2010

RE: Nine Mile Creek Trail

Dear John,

Parks were set aside to be used and enjoyed by everyone . . . not a select few.

We can leave no greater legacy to future generations than to expand a park system that provides access to outdoor recreation to all and at the same time protects and improves vital natural areas. We have the opportunity now with the proposed Three Rivers Park District walking and biking trail along Nine Mile Creek in Edina.

I have walked the entire length of Nine Mile Creek that flows through Edina. In many places it is just a drainage ditch. The creek is on the state's impaired water list because its muddy flow doesn't support the fish species that a creek of this type should.

Nine Mile Creek Watershed is proposing to restore Nine Mile Creek through the City which may include constructing gentle curves thus making a natural habitat for fish and wildlife. If a Creek-based trail route is chosen, the Park District and Watershed District will collaborate efforts and conduct stream restoration in conjunction with trail construction. The staff at Three Rivers Park District are professionals in designing paths that are ecologically sound as well as taking into account and respecting near-by homes.

I have biked most of the existing Three Rivers Park District Bike and Walking Trails. Along the way I have observed deer, turkeys, ducks, egrets, song birds and a turtle laying her eggs all living in harmony with the trail.

The trail would provide safe and convenient biking and walking routes connecting homes to work places, schools, recreation and shopping.

The proposed path through Edina is a critical part of a larger regional trail system, connecting the western suburbs and beyond. Is the City of Edina going to have the path stop at its borders thus making us an island?

Some have proposed that the trail be put on city streets. Biking on streets creates a safety problem and the recreational value would be lost.

Public health advocates urge us to get more exercise. "Many studies show that people living in walkable neighborhoods walk and cycle more for recreation and transportation and are less likely to be obese". (Jim Sallies, Director of Childhood Obesity Prevention Group)

The Three Rivers Park District reports that there are typically six Police Officers and six PSO's on duty at any given time within the park district. These numbers can vary day to day, depending on special events.

The Park District has not had any violent crimes such as rape, robbery or assaults occur on the Park District Regional Trail System.

The Park District will use a variety of funding sources to pay for the development of the proposed trail including its own bonding authority, regional grants from the Metropolitan Council, State grants and Federal grants.

"Each year Edina residents pay more than 3.5 million in taxes to the Three Rivers Park District yet the City Of Edina has no trails or other district owned park facilities within our borders". (Star & Tribune, January 31<sup>st</sup>, 2009)

If we don't act at this time to approve the Three Rivers Park District path proposed along Nine Mile Creek in Edina, it will be a lost opportunity to improve the lives of future generations.

I urge your support.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Steve Sando". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Steve Sando (68 year Edina resident)  
5133 Juanita Ave  
Edina, MN 55424  
(952) 927-7830

309

to: Edina City Council [edinamail@ci.edina.mn.us](mailto:edinamail@ci.edina.mn.us)  
John Keprios [jkeprios@ci.edina.mn.us](mailto:jkeprios@ci.edina.mn.us)  
from: Diane A Fansler [dianefansler@yahoo.com](mailto:dianefansler@yahoo.com)  
date: October 5, 2010  
re: tonight's Edina City Council meeting "to discuss process for Bike Trail proposal"

Exactly one year ago today, Oct 5, 2009, Edina Paramedics from Fire Station One saved my life by quickly transporting me with advanced life support to Fairview Southdale Hospital Emergency Room. I urge you to not deny other Edina residents that same opportunity to live. If Routes 7 and 5F as proposed by ThreeRiversParkDistrict had been in place one year ago, I very likely would not be alive today.

Later in this letter I will present significant, accurate information on Routes 7 and 5F that definitively prove that 3RPD has failed to 1-consider decreased safety and 2-denied access to input from legal route residents throughout the process to date (including on CAT and failure to respond to input residents provided within the 30day input periods) while 3-relying on information that is out-dated, incomplete, inaccurate, inconsistent, and biased including both current route and proposed trail specifics such as location, size, components, and costs and 4-failing to correct the numerous, significant errors proven and communicated to them. In fact, if Routes 7 and 5F as proposed by 3RPD were adopted, the entire length of Route 7 would be located .3 miles east on the wrong road, along Tracy instead of VALleyViewRd (Appendix p128 and presented to StarTribune on 9/29/10) 3 intersecting streets would not be included on Route 7, and the trail would have a gap of no coverage of .4-.5 mile south of on-ramp Hwy62 on Route 5F.

However, since tonight's ECC meeting's agenda item is to discuss process in proceeding with 3RPD's proposal, I offer the following recommendation for your consideration. Please consider that it is more important to get this trail right than to get it now. I firmly believe that 3RPD's proposal has failed to date to present sufficient, accurate, timely facts that would warrant the adoption of their proposal, has failed to sufficiently consider the negative impacts that would accrue from adoption of their proposal, has failed to study viable alternatives, and has been "deductive" rather than "inductive" with 3RPD presenting proposed routes and then attempting to justify them.

**My proposal for the next step in the process of the BikeTrail:**

- 1-Divide the 14 3RPD segments (routes) among the EdinaCityCouncil members;
- 2-who will conduct and record a thorough on-ground information/fact-finding inspection of each route;
- 3-including the accompanying physical presence and verbal/ document/photographic input of **all** of the following members
- 4-3RPB representative(s) selected by 3RPB,
- 5-resident(s) who are legally and directly on the selected segment as selected by all residents who are legally and directly on the selected segment (**not** as selected for the CAT by 3RPD)
- 6-Edina Park Board representative(s) as selected by them,
- 7-Edina Bike Trail Task Force representative(s) as selected by them,
- 8-Edina City personnel with expertise in areas such as finances, engineering, city rules and regulations, etc.
- 9-additional members to be invited by ECC who have knowledge, expertise, and interest in this specific 3RPB proposal, Edina's current and future bike/walking/recreational facilities, etc.

This would meet the expressed goals of "inductive process (Mayor Hovland 9/29/10)," would fulfill the goals and obligations of providing a "clear and transparent process (Mayor Hovland, ECC, Representative Keith Downey, and all of us)", would resolve the frustrations of impacted, knowledgeable Edina residents that they have been and are being denied input into the process, and would keep the process honest.

In addition, I urge the ECC to seek answers from 3RPD on their proposal that are more specific, directly applicable to the routes and designs proposed by 3RPD, and are supported by more than such vague assurances as those presented on 9/29/10 by 3RPD personnel Carlson and Blackstad (including "we can work that out ((numerous issues, problems, and concerns)) during design process," "we will work with Edina to minimize impact on...", "we will resolve residents' concerns about...", "we have a good record

pleasing residents," "there is very little crime to be concerned about on our trails," "we have a good record responding to crime and cooperating with local law enforcement," "we can adapt trail design to incorporate," "we're considering several 'opportunities' for securing funds," and "having an 'as needed' speed limit works well so we don't require specific speed limits on our trails." Please require 3RPD to present specific applicable responses that directly address these questions. Also, I advise that 3RPD be required to provide answers within acceptable maximum and minimum ranges and standards such as cost over-runs, financing charges, additional expenses to Edina, distance from residences/commercial properties, number of crossings, number of vehicles/properties/driveways etc affected.

I urge ECC to carefully and completely consider the 3RPD proposal as one possibility for increasing bike trails and walkways in Edina, but not to be bullied and rushed by their assistance that "3RPD is not interested in studying any other possible route options...(including) ThreeRivers will never consider routes like those some residents have proposed along Hwy 169 and Hwy 62 corridors because I personally would not want to bike with those poor esthetics, no matter what the safety issues are (Kelly Grissman 10/1/10)," "Edina City Council must select among these 14 segments while connecting point A to point B (Kelly Grissman 10/1/10)," and "the latest Edina City Council could approve adopting this proposal is early March in order to qualify for federal 80% matching funds (Larry Blackstad 9/29/10)" and "currently 3RPD has a high priority on this trail, near #2,3,or 4, but if EdinaCityCouncil doesn't approve this by early March, we'll put it at the bottom of the list and it would be another 2 years before we could build the trail and we would lose out on these 80% federal matching funds (Larry Blackstad 9/29/10)." I am not a financial expert, but I offer the following for your further consideration on federal funding: 1-not only is there no guarantee that this project would secure these federal funds, 2-there is no indication that alternative opportunities would not exist for federal funding in the future, and 3-Blackstad omitted that these STP and TE programs to which he referred offer **maximums** of \$1million and \$7 million.

Like most Edina residents, I support increasing bike trails and walking paths in Edina. However, it is evident to me that 3RPD's proposal is in their best self-interest alone whereas the Edina City Council's stated interests and responsibilities are first "to provide for the health, safety and well-being of its citizens" (City Code 421.01 and other citations) for current and future residents.

And how would adopting 3RPB's Routes 7 and 5F so severely decrease safety as to endanger the lives of residents (as well as trail users, EHS/VVMS/EPAC/Playing fields students/personnel/visitors, pedestrians, emergency vehicles, city employees/maintenance personnel, drivers and passengers using both routes and intersecting streets, MTC passengers and personnel, Edina School bus passengers and personnel, utility workers, and private service companies)?

3RPD's proposal for Route 7 is to eliminate the sidewalk on the east side of Valley View Road along the entire length from Antrim connecting with Route 5F, eliminating the shoulder/park lane, and constructing a 10ft asphalt trail (to be shared by bikers going 2 directions, walkers, etc.) with 3ft green areas on both sides of trail to extend to the end of city Right-of-Way. Route 5F (which was revealed for the first time on 9/29/10), is proposed to begin at Bredesen Park, proceed on south side of Olinger through Countryside Park, proceed south on Tracy, traversing Tracy at a point where 10,000 vehicles pass daily, cross Hwy 62 on a bridge to be constructed east of current road bridge, cross 62 entrance ramp, and link with Route 7. (Note .4-.5 miles are not accounted for on the east side of Valley View Rd where there is **no** sidewalk, **no** parking lane, and **no** even surface; the entire .4-.5 mile segment would have to be another aerial bridge constructed above 9milecreek, a steeply inclined ravine, and pond.)

Please be aware that both ValleyViewRd and Tracy are: 1-classified by Edina as collector roads due to their high traffic volume and use to gather traffic from neighborhood local roads; 2-are 2 of the 5 streets cited by Edina Police last week for highest speeding violators; and 3-are already highly congested, including several times daily total stoppage of all traffic along Route 7 for schools including stop-start times.

Adopting Routes 7 and 5F would severely narrow both ValleyViewRd and Tracy to one narrow lane each for all traffic (N-bound ValleyView and S-bound Tracy). Limiting to one-lane would 1- prevent traffic to pull over for emergency vehicles, 2-prevent vehicles from making left-hand turns both onto or off ValleyViewRd or Tracy, 3-eliminate shoulder used by MTC buses, who use it for driving as well as stops

for 2 routes, and 4-eliminate shoulder use by Edina school buses on the route used by the highest number of Edina school buses in the city.

Additional increased dangers would result from the increased congestion resulting in total traffic stoppages and long-lines of congestion in both directions in adherence with State and City laws for Edina School bus stops picking up/dropping off students.

There are additional, significant decreased safety issues resulting from FireStationOne and proposed Route 5F, (which was revealed by 3RPD for the first time on 9/29/10 and has had **no** input from residents directly affected by and most knowledgeable about the route). Route 5F trail would pass within 15ft of FireStation building, including in front of **all** doors that provide exit/entrance for 2 ambulances and 5 firetrucks up to 61'long, 12'+ high, 9'+ wide. This would directly endanger Trail users and Fire Station personnel, who currently back across the proposed trail to enter the garage and would result into reduced response times, further endangering the rest of us cited above. It would also eliminate or greatly reduce the parking area provided for ADA and other visitors to the station. At the end of the FireStationbuilding, Route 5F traverses Tracy Avenue at a point where 10,000 vehicles pass daily and again blocking station emergency vehicles headed south, east, or west. Then, Route 5F is proposed to cross 62 entrance ramp, within the ramp (which is already frequently congested causing stoppages and blocked traffic along Valley View Rd.

Thank you for considering this recommendation.

Sincerely,

Diane A. Fansler

310

---

**From:** Bonnie J. Scott [mailto:bsnanatoo@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 05, 2010 3:28 PM  
**To:** Lynette Biunno  
**Subject:** NO TRAIL THROUGH EDINA

LET THE PEOPLE VOTE ON IT! NOT JUST THE FEW.

311

---

**From:** Fred Gregory [mailto:rfgjpg@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 11, 2010 4:52 PM  
**To:** Lynette Biunno  
**Subject:** Bike Trail

Dear Sirs:

Please forward this letter to the Edina City Council members and the Edina Park Board. I live in Minnesota in the summer time. I have been reading about the proposed Nine Mile Creek Bike Trail. I understand that in order to build the trail over the wetlands that you will have to give valuable land away to the Park District and spend 35 million dollars of Federal, State, and local monies. I am opposed to spending my tax dollars to build a recreational bike trail that will destroy valuable wetlands. The presence of wetlands within the city is a gift not to be taken lightly. I hope you will do the responsible thing and not let this project proceed.

Yours Truly,

R.Fred Gregory.

October 15, 2010

Three Rivers  
Park District  
Board of  
Commissioners

Mr. Richard Zielke  
5720 Lois Lane  
Edina, MN 55439

RE: Questions regarding Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail

Dear Mr. Zielike:

Sara Wyatt  
District 1

I received your questions from the Joint Work Session on September 29, 2010 between the Edina City Council and Three Rivers Park District Board of Commissions from John Keprios, City of Edina (City) Park and Recreation Director.

Marilynn Corcoran,  
District 2

Responses to your questions are summarized below.

***My home is one of those that is 25' from the inside edge of the sidewalk. I have 5 trees that might need to be cut/removed – would you replace them?***

Mark Haggerty  
District 3

The Park District will work with the City to design the trail in a manner that minimizes potential trail impacts on adjacent property owners, and with adjacent property owners to determine the most appropriate ways to preserve privacy along the trail. The Park District has previously employed a variety of methods to preserve privacy, including slightly shifting the trail away from adjacent properties, planting a vegetative screen, or installing a fence.

Dale Woodbeck,  
Vice Chair  
District 4

***Would you reduce the width of Valley View? How close would the trail be to my home?***  
In order to accommodate the regional trail within the public right-of-way of Valley View Road, narrowing of the road shoulder is proposed.

Rosemary Franzese  
District 5

The exact trail location is unknown and will be determined in the design phase of the project. At this time, preliminary planning indicates that the edge of the trail would likely be located two to three feet from the public right-of-way and private property boundary.

***Would my tax structure change or would there be compensation?***  
Your question was forwarded to the City for their review and response. The City's response indicates that you will not face a special assessment and it is uncertain if your property value would change as a result of regional trail construction along Valley View Road. Please follow up with the City with additional questions pertaining to tax structure and compensation.

Larry Blackstad, Chair  
Appointed

Thank you for your interest in the Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail planning efforts.

Sincerely,

Barbara Kinsey  
Appointed



Kelly Grissman, Senior Manager of Planning

Cris Gears  
Superintendent

C: John Keprios, City of Edina Park and Recreation Director  
TNM 0802 A-E

J:\PROJECTS\Regional Trails\TNM 0802 Nine Mile Edina Master Plan\A-E\Response Letters\10-15-2010  
Zielke.doc

313

October 15, 2010

Emelie Helou  
efhelou@comcast.net

RE: Questions regarding Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail

Dear Ms. Helou:

I received your questions from the Joint Work Session on September 29, 2010, between the Edina City Council and Three Rivers Park District Board of Commissions from John Keprios, City of Edina (City) Park and Recreation Director.

Responses to your questions are summarized below.

***Any consideration to modify route 5F to a safer route involving a pedestrian/bike bridge over 62 west of Tracy and church (This would not cross hwy entrance/exit or be along a steep hill).***

An alternative to a new pedestrian/bicycle bridge along the east side of the Tracy Avenue bridge and on/off ramp are Routes 5 and 5E (creek-based option). Routes 5 and 5E include a new pedestrian/bicycle bridge over Highway 62 from Bredesen Park to Creek Valley Elementary School and a trail along the creek from the elementary school to the Creek Valley Baptist Church.

***Please clarify - Three Rivers Park District representative said Route 5F involves a boardwalk. Where will this be? There is no wetland along Route 5F (Tracy Avenue)?***

There are no boardwalks proposed along Route 5F. I apologize if I or another Park District representative did not communicate this correctly.

Thank you for your interest in the Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail planning efforts.

Sincerely,

Kelly Grissman  
Senior Manager of Planning

C: John Keprios, City of Edina Park and Recreation Director  
TNM 0802 A-E

J:\PROJECTS\Regional Trails\TNM 0802 Nine Mile Edina Master Plan\A-E\Response Letters\10-15-2010 E.  
Helou.doc

314

**From:** Leslie Helou, Pharm.D. [mailto:lhelou@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 18, 2010 2:29 PM  
**To:** Heather Gates  
**Cc:** John Keprios; KGrissman@threeriversparkdistrict.org  
**Subject:** Re: Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail

Dear Ms. Grissman,

Thank you very much for your attempted response to my questions posed at the Edina City Council/Three Rivers meeting last month. I would appreciate if you could provide further clarity to my first question, as the answer you provided does not provide an answer.

My question: *In regards to the road based route, why is alternate 5F the preferred segment 5 route when it was the least assessed, last proposed segment 5 route?*

The answer you provided recapped what was discussed at the meeting, that three options were provided to the city; road-based, creek-based, and no-route. However my question was only in regards to the road-based option. Route 5F was proposed after all other Route 5 options were proposed (either creek- or road-based), and did not go through the same rigorous assessment process as the other routes, as indicated in City meeting minutes earlier this spring. My question is why Route 5F is included in the proposed road-based route presented to the City of Edina? There are many limitations to this route, and it requires a proper assessment. Impacted residents of this route were not asked to be part of a community assessment, as with the other routes, but the Church representation for 5D was asked for input even though that land is not impacted by 5F as it was with the other options that led to him being asked to participate.

I am sorely disappointed at the lack of assessment that went into the final section 5 recommendation. I am a fan of the Regional Trail, but am disenchanted by the way this was done, as well as the blatantly clear attempt to avoid directly answering the question I posed.

Sincerely,

Leslie Helou

On Fri, Oct 15, 2010 at 1:52 PM, Heather Gates <[HGates@threeriversparkdistrict.org](mailto:HGates@threeriversparkdistrict.org)> wrote:

This correspondence is being sent on behalf of Kelly Grissman, Senior Manager of Planning.

Heather R. Gates

Planning and Development Secretary

Three Rivers Park District

3000 Xenium Lane North

Plymouth, MN 55441

Phone: 763-694-7649

Fax: 763-557-5248

[www.threeriversparks.org](http://www.threeriversparks.org)



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

October 15, 2010

Leslie Helou

[lhelou@gmail.com](mailto:lhelou@gmail.com)

RE: Questions regarding Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail

Dear Ms. Helou:

I received your questions from the Joint Work Session on September 29, 2010, between the Edina City Council and Three Rivers Park District Board of Commissions from John Keprios, City of Edina (City) Park and Recreation Director.

Responses to your questions are summarized below.

***In regards to the road based route, why is alternate 5F the preferred segment 5 route when it was the least assessed, last proposed segment 5 route?***

Route 5F is included in the road-based option, one of three options presented at September 29, 2010 Joint Work Session. There are two alternates to the road-based option including a creek-based route that utilizes Routes 5 and 5E in lieu of Route 5F or a no route option which does not provide a regional trail corridor through the City and therefore, does not include Route 5F.

***Can other route 5 options still be suggested/considered or is 5F the only option?***

At this time, the Park District is not reviewing additional routes which are not already included in one of the three options presented at the Joint Work Session.

Thank you for your interest in the Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail planning efforts.

Sincerely,

Kelly Grissman

Senior Manager of Planning

C: John Keprios, City of Edina Park and Recreation Director

TNM 0802 A-E

J:\PROJECTS\Regional Trails\TNM 0802 Nine Mile Edina Master Plan\A-E\Response Letters\10-15-2010 L. Helou.doc

315

---

**From:** Carol Dubay [mailto:caroldubay@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 19, 2010 3:02 PM  
**To:** Lynette Biunno  
**Subject:** NINE MILE CREEK REGIONAL TRAIL

Edina City Council,

I am writing to voice my support for the proposed Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail through Edina. My husband and I are recreational bikers and are so glad that this trail is under consideration. My family and I lived in Edina for over 20 years. It is well past time for the City of Edina to participate in the regional trail system.

The trail should be safe, comfortable, and inviting for all ages and skill levels. That is why I strongly recommend the parks alternative rather than existing roadways. I am particularly concerned about the huge hill on Tracy Ave. Use of this route will certainly severely limit use of the trail. As seniors, my husband and I would not use the trail if the route includes this hill.

In summary, I urge you to approve the proposed regional trail and select routes through parks.

Sincerely,

Carol Dubay

(952) 922-5695

13975 Saint Andrew Dr

Eden Prairie, MN 55346

[caroldubay@comcast.net](mailto:caroldubay@comcast.net)

316

---

**From:** Sally Kelly [mailto:sally\_kelly@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2010 10:22 AM

**To:** Lynette Biunno

**Subject:** Please forward this to the head of the Edina Bike Routes Council OR the Park Board (a person who supports the Creekside Bike Plan)

To whoever reads this first:

I'm not sure what it's actually called, but there is a volunteer council that is involved in this issue of where to put the proposed bike route linking Hopkins to Richfield. OR, if it's easier, please forward this to a Park Board person who SUPPORTS the Nine Mile Creek route.

Thank you!

Dear Supporter of Nine Mile Creek biking route:

Please feel free to contact me as a person who is in a minority — a person who actually lives on Nine Mile Creek in the "controversial" area who supports the bike route that would, yes, go through my husband's and my backyard area.

I have not yet spoken up because I respect that everyone who surrounds me feels differently. Not to say I'd get TP'ed, but ... ☺

But as an A-plus avid biker, I see things differently than everyone else around here feels. I just thought it might be time to speak up in support of the creek recommendation — if you are looking for this sort of support.

Sally Kelly  
5512 Hillside Court  
Marketing / The Shamrock Group

317



October 27, 2010

To: Mayor Hovland, and Council Members Bennett, Brindle, Housh, and Swenson:

We the members of the Bike Edina Task Force (BETF) have been asked by you to facilitate the implementation of the City of Edina Comprehensive Bicycle Transportation Plan ("Bike Plan"). A major piece of infrastructure described in Bike Plan is the Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail.

We have passed a resolution of support for the Three Rivers Park District's efforts to create this trail as a joint project with the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District. We have also passed a resolution supporting an alignment through natural areas as much as possible. Now that the final alignments have been developed, the Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) completed, and full information on the potential alignments have been provided to the community, **we recommend that you select the creek alignment for the Nine Mile Creek multi-use trail. Our reasons for preferring this alignment include:**

- **Safety:** The road-based option includes 91 crossings of roads and driveways along the 7 mile route compared to only 42 crossings for the creek-based route. Each of these intersections can result in conflicts between trail users and motorists. The off-road option gives the greatest separation from automobile traffic and a much smaller number of intersections. This will result in a trail that is safe for children and other users who are uncomfortable with automobiles in close proximity.
- **Connectivity:** Edina currently has no connection to the regional trail system. The Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail will provide connectivity to an extensive automobile-free network that can accommodate walking, biking, running, and rollerblading. All levels of activity will be supported, from beginners to experienced users. An obvious opportunity to improve the health of residents through increased exercise will result.
- **Popularity:** The results of the public comment period clearly indicate the residents' preferences for the creek-based alignment. Aesthetics are an important factor in attracting people to a trail, and a trail through a natural area is substantially more appealing than a trail along a road, and will result in higher usage. The need for trails for walking and biking has been well documented by the Edina Park Needs Assessment Survey.
- **Environment & Synergy:** The combination of input from the Watershed and the Park District will lead to a multifaceted project that will create a needed trail and clean up a degraded environment. The resulting new 14-acre park that will become available to all residents will replace the currently inaccessible and neglected corridor, improve water quality, and promote environmental stewardship of that environment that has been lacking due to its isolation from the public.

- **Funding:** A greater number of potential funding sources exist for an off-road trail than for trails along the road. The Three Rivers Park District is assuming complete responsibility for the acquisition of funds for this project, and the off-road alignment will allow the group more flexibility in obtaining those funds. The District tax levy on the City will not be affected by this project, and it will allow us to obtain one of the major pieces of infrastructure described in the Bike Plan at no cost to the City.
- **Partnership with the School District:** The creek-based route will be available for use by approximately 60% of students enrolled in Edina Public Schools, including students at Creek Valley Elementary, Valley View Middle School, and Edina High School. It will become a significant amenity to support the Safe Routes to School program, and will supplement athletic facilities used by middle and high school teams. Athletes will no longer need to run or rollerski in the streets near the school campus, which in many areas have no sidewalks. The creek-based option will also offer the opportunity to expand the environmental sciences outdoor classroom area that is currently located close to the proposed creek alignment. School staff can enjoy the same benefits.
- **Zoning and Planning:** The creek alignment is an allowed and appropriate use of the public land located along the creek. The alignment is consistent with the City Comprehensive Plan, the Bike Plan, and has resolutions of support from our neighboring cities of Hopkins and Richfield.
- **Mission Statement Support:** This alignment is also consistent with the Mission Statement of the City of Edina Parks Department, the Minnesota Fit Cities initiative, and the Greenstep Cities program.

The benefits of this alignment greatly outweigh the short term concerns, and with mitigation provided by Three Rivers Park District, will allow Edina to create a major new park facility. Discussion of mitigation is beyond the scope of our mission and is best left to elected officials.

Respectfully submitted,



*Kirk Johnson, on behalf of the Bike Edina Task Force*

*Questions or comments, contact Kirk Johnson, BETF Chair, or Alice Hulbert, Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail BETF Lead*

Copy:

Jonathan Vlaming, Chief of Planning for Three Rivers Park District  
Wayne Houle, City Engineer/Public Works Director for City of Edina  
John Keprios, Park & Recreation Director for City of Edina  
Bike Edina Task Force

318

Nov 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2009

John Keprios  
Park & Recreation Director  
Edina City Hall  
4801 W. 50<sup>th</sup> St.  
Edina, MN 55424

I oppose building a bike trail on 9 Mile Creek because:

**Habitat, environment** – From Valley Lane to Creek View Lane to 70th St., the woods and wetlands are home to many species of birds, frogs, turtles and more. Blazing a 16-foot-wide trail would destroy habitats and add to pollution.

**Flooding** – The creek often overflows into yards. A trail would damage or ruin wetlands and floodplains and likely exacerbate flooding woes for homeowners.

**Safety** – If a path is built, we question the safety for adjacent homes and schools. Estimated number of trail users is 500,000 per year, which would bring many visitors close to our schools, and thus add safety concerns for parents.

**Budget and priorities** – This isn't the time for such a big-ticket project. The state budget deficit stands at more than \$4.27 billion, much of that affecting our schools. As budget cuts loom for Valley View Middle School and Edina High, a bike trail isn't a necessity.

This proposal jeopardizes the environment of one of the city's most pristine wildlife areas and it would negatively affect the people and wildlife along its path.

Sincerely,



Tracy A. Earl  
6721 Cahill Rd.  
Edina, MN 55439

319

Susan Howl

Subject: FW: email to Three Rivers Park District

RECEIVED

OCT 25 2010

**From:** WESTERDAHL WILLIAM [mailto:westyw2@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Sunday, October 24, 2010 10:16 AM

**To:** Lynette Blunno

**Subject:** email to Three Rivers Park District

Att: Mayor James Hovland

For your information please see the attached copy of an email sent to Three Rivers Park District.

Wm Westerdahl  
5912 Walnut Dr.  
Edina, Mn 55436  
[westyw2@gmail.com](mailto:westyw2@gmail.com)

Ms Grissman,

The "Boardwalk questions and answers" section of the Three Rivers Park District web site contained the following.

"Boardwalk design, location, and elevation are reviewed by a Technical Evaluation Panel (TEP) consisting of water resource experts. The TEP is responsible for determining potential wetland and floodplain impacts and necessary mitigation measures. The TEP review and recommendations will play a critical role in determining final boardwalk design, location, and elevation."

The Corps of Engineers, Nine Mile Creek Watershed District, MN-DNR, FEMA, City of Edina, and perhaps several other agencies, seem to have some regulatory authority concerning structures located in the Nine Mile Creek wetlands, floodplain, or floodway. Will these agencies all be included in the TEP? Will names and contact information for members of the TEP be available to the public?

Residents living adjacent to the creek will be the ones most affected by "potential wetland and floodplain impacts". In elections conducted by Three Rivers Park District, the residents living adjacent to the creek elected representatives (the CAT) to represent their interests in "potential wetland and floodplain impacts". Will the elected CAT representative for each section participate in the TEP?

The Edina City Council will be holding a hearing on this matter on Dec. 7, 2010 so your prompt reply would be appreciated.

Wm Westerdahl  
5912 Walnut Dr.  
Edina, MN 55436  
[westyw2@gmail.com](mailto:westyw2@gmail.com)

320

Hello there,

This message has been forwarded to the Mayor and Council members and John Keprios.

Lynette Biunno, Receptionist  
952-927-8861 | Fax 952-826-0389  
[lbiunno@ci.edina.mn.us](mailto:lbiunno@ci.edina.mn.us) | [www.CityofEdina.com](http://www.CityofEdina.com) ...For Living, Learning, Raising Families & Doing Business

-----Original Message-----

From: Audrey Kingstrom [mailto:akingstrom@comcast.net]  
Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2010 11:01 AM  
To: Lynette Biunno  
Subject: bike trail

To Whom It May Concern:

Since I am unable to attend next week's City Council meeting regarding the bike trail, I am writing in support of the creek-side route. I realize that many residents who live along the creek are upset about this proposal but I do think we need to think about the long-term implications of our decisions. Off-road, dedicated biking trails will be most successful in the long run and will greatly increase the "live-ability" and "desire-ability" of Edina now and in the future.

Of course, residents who are negatively impacted by the creek-side route should be fairly compensated and their issues be addressed as reasonably as possible. I doubt few current affected residents will see the benefits of a trail in their backyards, but for future owners, such a nearby trail could be viewed as an asset.

I am in complete support of the trail route that follows the creek as much as is logistically feasible. I urge our city leaders to adopt this plan.

Thank you for your attention.

Audrey Kingstrom  
3529 West 54th St.  
Edina  
952-924-1039

321

-----Original Message-----

From: Duncan Sinclair [mailto:duncsin@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2010 2:10 PM

To: Lynette Biunno

Subject: Bike Trail Hearing on December 7

I am in favor of the Nine Mile Creek Trail through Edina. As a 31 year Edina resident and an avid biker, I have enjoyed the bike paths through the other parts of the Western Suburbs and think it is time for Edina to step up and do its share to support these valuable recreational facilities. I support the Creek-side alternative as it appears to be safer, more user-friendly, and more scenic. I request that the Council support the trail and specifically, the creek-side option. Thank you.

Duncan Sinclair  
6220 Loch Moor Dr.  
Edina 55439

Comments to the Edina City Council  
December 7, 2010

I am aware that I am sounding like a broken record when I continue to write on the financial problems facing Three Rivers Park District in building and maintaining a "creek route" regional trail through Edina. It is my continued hope that someone will listen and not subject the citizens of Edina to future unfunded financial liabilities.

For your information I am attaching a copy of the Three Rivers Park District 2011 General Fund Operating Budget. Several things in the Budget are worth noting.

TRPD is dependent on a statutory limit of .03224% of assessed valuation for 83% of its operating revenue. Assessed valuation and collections are declining. These decreases will "severely limit the Park Districts ability to raise tax revenues to maintain existing operations."

The Park District has received over a million dollars in State Grants for operations in the past. Given the Minnesota six billion dollar deficit, Republican controlled State legislature, and results of the 2010 election reflecting the publics mood to reduce unnecessary spending, receiving grants from the State or Federal Government will be very difficult.

The Park district has only \$1,838,445 of unused tax levy authority, this is down from \$4,241,822 in 2010, a reduction of 56%. If this same reduction occurs in 2011 the Park District will not be able to fund any additional operations, including additions to the system.

The Park District has eliminated the "contingency fund" and "capital outlays" from its 2011 budget. These are the funds an organization would use to fund unforeseen events, such as flood damage, and replace worn equipment. These eliminations are being made while salaries and administration costs are being increased. These are the classic actions of an organization which has expended during economic upturns beyond its capacity to fund its operations during economic downturns.

When considering whether to grant an easement to TRPD to build a trail along the "creek route" it is my hope the city council would consider the following:

The information contained in the 2011 TRPD General Fund Operating Budget indicates there is a high probability TRPD will not have the financial resources in the future to maintain and provide security on the Edina section of the trail. This is especially true when one considers the Edina Trail is only one of a number of Trails that TRPD plans to add to its system. With 6000' of raised wooden boardwalk the Creek Route section of the trail will have a high maintenance coefficient. If TRPD is financially unable to provide maintenance and security, will that burden be transferred to the City of Edina?

The creek route contains a large number of engineering, permitting, and funding questions which are unanswered and which could greatly increase the cost and time necessary to construct a creek route trail. Among these are: How does one construct 6000' of boardwalk in a floodway parallel to the stream flow without restricting the flow? The project will likely require an individual 404 Corps of Engineers permit which opens the permitting process to public comment and inquiry. Will the Corps issue a permit if a viable alternative route exists? Permits are also required by the DNR, FEMA, the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District, etc. Will these permits be approved?

The results of the 2010 election, both local and national, indicate the voting public wants a reduction in public spending. Is a creek route regional trail through Edina a "necessary" expenditure of public funds? Are grant funds likely to be available?

It is obvious from their operations budget that TRPD has expanded beyond its ability to adequately fund its operations with existing revenues.

I would hope the city council would consider very very carefully before ceding control of its park lands and entering into a partnership with an organization which, according to its own statements, is facing sever financial difficulties.

Wm Westerdahl  
5912 Walnut Dr.  
Edina, MN 55436

**From:** Lorenzo Tunesi [mailto:lorenzo.tunesi@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 02, 2010 8:00 AM  
**To:** Lynette Biunno  
**Subject:** Upcoming Council Meeting on Regional Trail

323

Dear members of the Edina City Council,

I am taking the liberty to write to you today to express very strong support in favor of the proposed "Creek Based Route" and my hope that you will vote in favor of it. I would normally be at the 12/7 meeting however I will be prepping for a surgical procedure that I will undergo the next day, hence my email.

In short, here is why Edina should chose the Creek-Site Route:

#### **Benefits of the Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail - Creek-Site Route**

The creek-side route of Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail will be a tremendous asset to Edina. It represents the best and safest option for all of our citizens. The construction of the creek-side trail provides several benefits. It will:

**Create a new park.** By constructing the creek-side trail through Edina, Three Rivers Park District will create a beautiful new park that links together many of our existing parks in Edina. It will be a wonderful amenity for all Edina residents to enjoy, and a superior addition to our renowned Three Rivers regional trail system.

**Provide the safest route.** The creek route is the safest route for children and families to enjoy. The street routes are much less safe for children, given the driveways and busy intersections the trail would follow.

**Enhance Nine Mile Creek.** Nine Mile Creek is not the pristine natural resource it once was, long ago. Today it's on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's impaired waters list, given the years of agricultural and yard waste (including ongoing fertilizer runoff from surrounding yards). It is full of invasive, non-native species of plants. Construction of the new park and planned creek restoration will add in native plants, and actually help improve water quality.

**Open up public land for the public to enjoy.** The multi-use regional trail will be built on public land – areas that previously have only been enjoyed by the property owners whose yards adjoin that property. It will become a beautiful park that can be enjoyed by everyone!

**Promote a healthy lifestyle.** A regional trail encourages healthy outdoor aerobic activities such as walking, jogging and biking by people of all ages and skill levels in a safe, park-like setting.

**Be built at no additional cost to the community.** Some people have expressed concerns about the cost of the Edina trail. we do not share those concerns. The trail will be underwritten by Three Rivers Park District through a variety of funding sources – not by increased taxes. Like all of the cities that surround us, Edina has been paying a \$3.5 million annual fee to Three Rivers Park District for years. Other communities, such as Hopkins, Minnetonka and Bloomington, have benefited from construction of trails through their communities; now it's Edina's turn!

Best regards,  
Lorenzo Tunesi  
4413 Ellsworth Dr  
Edina, MN 55435

324

-----Original Message-----

From: Bob [mailto:bobader@comcast.net]

Sent: Wednesday, December 01, 2010 12:33 AM

To: Lynette Biunno

Subject: Nine Mile Creek Trail - I support the creek-side route

Dear Mayor Hovland and Council Members:

I'm writing because I will be out of town next Tuesday and will not be able to attend the hearing on the Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail route.

I want to let you know that I support the creek-side route. As an avid cyclist, I look forward to having an off-road bike trail that connects many of our parks as well as a larger system. It's a bit ironic, I think, that I have to go to Minneapolis for such amenities. The more we create accessible opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors, get exercise, and enjoy our parks, the better off we will all be.

I am sympathetic to property owners that will be most directly affected by a creek-side route. Those that are most vocal have emphasized adverse impacts. I believe there are many positive impacts for property owners not to mention the myriad of benefits for the larger community that they too can enjoy.

I commend you and the other leaders of our community for the very thoughtful, diligent process that has brought us to this point. Now is the time to take a very forward-looking stand for the benefit of all in our community.

Regards,

Bob Aderhold  
3529 West 54th Street  
Edina 55410

325



# *Three Rivers*

PARK DISTRICT



## 2011 General Fund Operating Budget

*November 18, 2010*



# *Three Rivers*

## PARK DISTRICT

### 2011 GENERAL FUND OPERATING BUDGET

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction .....	1
Challenges Facing the Park District in 2011 and Beyond .....	1
Priorities of the 2011 General Fund Operating Budget .....	2
Funding for the 2011 General Fund Operating Budget .....	3
Financial Summaries	
Revenue Summary by Source.....	5
Expenditure Summary by Type.....	6
Expenditure Summary by Function .....	7
Comparison of Actual 2010 and Proposed 2011 Property Tax Levy .....	9
Full Time Equivalent Positions by Division .....	11

## **Introduction**

Development of the Park District's 2011 General Fund Operating Budget was a cooperative effort between the Board of Commissioners and Park District staff. The budget process began with an overview of the economic issues confronting the taxpayers of suburban Hennepin County. The Board subsequently called for the 2011 budget to include no increase in the property tax levy. Based on this direction, staff reviewed the 2010 budget and, where appropriate, reallocated resources to align funding and expenditures with activities that furthered the organization's goals. In addition, staff prepared plans for new initiatives with the understanding that they could only be funded if new park use revenue was available. The Board reviewed and discussed the parameters and priorities used in preparing a preliminary draft of the Budget before authorizing staff to prepare the 2010 General Fund Operating Budget.

The budget can be viewed as a set numbers showing what resources are available and how an organization is planning to use them. However, the real value of a budget comes from understanding the organization's goals and priorities that helped determine how the resources would be used, as well as how the organization is impacted and plans to react to various external factors. In other words, the budget should be a policy document defining how and why the organization will function. By preparing the Park District's 2011 General Fund Operating Budget as a policy document, the Park District hopes that readers of this budget will gain insight into what the Park District is attempting to accomplish and the challenges it faces.

## **Challenges Facing the Park District in 2011 and Beyond**

In light of the costs associated with providing services for an ever-increasing number of park and trail users, the economic slowdown that started in 2008 continues to be the major challenge facing the Park District. Property tax revenues, which comprise 83% of the budgeted revenue, have been impacted by a reduced collection rate combined with a shrinking tax base. The Park District is required by state law to levy taxes based on a 98% collection rate. While the average collection rate for the past decade has been closer to 99%, the rate has dropped closer to 98% over the past two years. Should the rate fall below 98%, there would be the potential for a revenue shortfall that could impact operations.

In addition to decreasing collection rates, the valuation of the Park District's tax base decreased for a second straight year after more than two decades of steady, sometimes double digit, growth. The decrease in valuation is a combination of the slowing housing market and the increase in foreclosures over the past several years. The Park District's ability to levy taxes for operations is limited to .03224% of this valuation, meaning that as the valuation decreases, the levy limit for the Park District also decreases. While Park District tax levies have not approached this limit in the past, continued decreases in valuation will severely limit the Park District's ability to raise tax revenues to maintain existing operations.

The economic slowdown also impacted Minnesota state government. The state legislature spent much of the 2010 legislative session dealing with budget issues, and projections from the state indicate that the 2011 legislature will need to deal with balancing a budget that starts with a deficit greater than six billion dollars. The solution to this problem could include a number of cuts in funding to local governments. The Park District, which receives over one million dollars

in operating funds from the State, certainly could be impacted by reductions in state funds for 2011 and/or 2012. The Park District will need to closely monitor the state's handling of future deficits to best manage the impact to operations.

Park and trail usage for Three Rivers continues to increase substantially each year, which is in contrast to park and trail use throughout the balance of the metropolitan Minneapolis/St. Paul area which has slightly decreased in recent years. The Park District's growth in visitors can be traced to increased usage of regional trails and higher than anticipated use of Silverwood Park. While increased park use is clearly a major goal for the Park District and has benefits to the public, there are also maintenance costs that increase as park use increases. The 2011 budget includes some minor revenue and expenditure increases to account for increased usage and increasing costs.

In order to ensure that Three Rivers can set meaningful priorities as funding becomes more difficult, the Board of Commissioners adopted a vision plan in July of 2010 that outlines the Park District's commitment to maintain natural resources and promote recreation over the next ten years. The vision includes 31 specific actions that the Park District will undertake during the next decade, including both major construction and system-wide operational changes. The plan and its actions, which is an extension of the Park District's mission, are designed to guide future resource allocation decisions and ensure that funds are appropriated to activities and functions that further the Park District's mission.

The Park District's Proposed 2011 General Fund Operating Budget totals \$34,804,060, which is a decrease of \$11,079, or 0.03%, from the 2010 budget. The proposed 2011 General Fund budget provides funding for the priorities identified below through a combination of increased park guest fees, reprioritization of costs and other sources.

### **Priorities of the 2011 General Fund Operating Budget**

Maintain high standards for quality facilities, programs and recreational opportunities without increasing property taxes paid by the taxpayers of suburban Hennepin County.

The 2011 General Fund Operating Budget continues to provide the public with the high quality facilities, programs and recreational opportunities for which the Park District is known and respected. Accordingly, priority for funding in 2011 was given to those budget initiatives that maintain and support the level of service provided in past years. With clear Board direction that there would be no increase in the property tax levy, any increase in "base budget" costs (including employee wages and benefits, utilities and other fixed costs) needed to be offset by either additional park use revenues or reduced operating expenses. To help offset these increases, the Park District has eliminated the budgeted contingency and reallocated funds previously identified for capital equipment and the publication of the system map. These reallocations will be reviewed and reconsidered in 2011 and beyond if adequate park use revenues are available.

Continue to address natural resource management issues.

Management of open space and the natural resources contained in almost 27,000 acres is a primary function of the Park District. It is also an issue that continues to grow in importance to the public. The 2011 General Fund Operating Budget will continue to provide the resources necessary to fund water quality testing and studies, wildlife study and management, reforestation, prairie restoration and maintenance of landscaped areas.

Begin implementation of actions in the Park District's Vision Plan

The Park District's Vision Plan includes 31 policy, collaboration, education and development actions designed to meet the following goals:

- Protect the regions water and natural resources
- Inspire people to recreate
- Connect people to nature
- Create vibrant places
- Collaborate across boundaries

The 2011 General Fund Operating Budget includes reallocation of existing staff time required to begin working on the highest priority actions.

Continue to coordinate with neighboring cities, townships and counties.

The Park District's Vision Plan includes a number of actions that are specifically focused on collaboration across boundaries. With the Park District's jurisdiction including 45 cities and townships, coordination with these entities is required to efficiently and effectively operate and maintain the Park District's 20 regional parks and park reserves and more than 100 miles of regional trails. Efforts to coordinate and work together will continue to provide public benefits, including higher quality land and resource management and increased recreational and educational opportunities.

Promote the Park District's mission through programming and service to park guests.

Education and recreation experiences designed to promote increased knowledge and appreciation for nature along with environmental stewardship will continue to be the focus of programming in 2011. Demand for individual and group education remains strong, and in areas such as cultural history, historic re-creation and farm education, Three Rivers will work to develop and expand program offerings.

**Funding for the 2011 General Fund Operating Budget**

Funding for the 2011 General Fund Operating Budget, which totals \$34,804,060, is provided by property taxes, user fees, intergovernmental revenues and other miscellaneous revenues. The following table summarizes the sources of funding over the last 4 years:

Source of Revenue	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Budget	2011 Budget	2011 Budget Over/(Under) 2010 Budget	
					Dollars	%
Property Taxes	\$27,122,682	\$28,763,269	\$29,101,148	\$29,101,148	\$ ---	--- %
Park Use	3,556,192	4,149,296	3,999,047	4,089,243	90,196	2.26%
Grants-Met Council Operations and Maintenance	892,055	871,442	764,372	764,372	---	---
Grants-Other	241,201	283,063	152,910	165,910	13,000	8.50%
Interfund Transfers	524,542	305,305	374,525	299,525	(75,000)	(20.03%)
Interest Income	586,924	249,187	220,000	220,000	---	---
Other Revenue	355,378	365,088	203,137	163,862	(39,275)	(9.28%)
Total Revenue	\$33,278,974	\$34,986,650	\$34,815,139	\$34,804,060	(\$11,079)	(0.03%)

With the Board of Commissioners instructing staff to prepare the 2011 budget with no property tax increase, efforts were focused on preparing more accurate estimates of park use and other revenues. The additional park use revenue is a combination of increased fees and changes to budgeted amounts based on past history. **The most significant of the fee increases is a twenty cent per participant increase in scheduled group fees.** During 2010, the Park District will be completing an analysis of potential alternative revenue sources. While this analysis will not impact the 2010 budget, it could provide additional revenue streams to fund future operations.

A more detailed listing of revenues in the 2010 budget can be found on the Revenue Summary by Source table included in the following section.

**2011 GENERAL FUND OPERATING BUDGET  
REVENUE SUMMARY BY SOURCE**

Source of Revenue	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Amended Budget	2011 Budget	2011 Budget Over/(Under) 2010 Budget	
					Dollars	%
<b>Property Taxes</b>						
Current	\$26,855,251	\$28,479,308	\$29,031,148	\$29,031,148	\$ --	--
Delinquent	267,431	283,961	70,000	70,000	--	--
Total Property Taxes	27,122,682	28,763,269	29,101,148	29,101,148	--	--
<b>Park Use</b>						
Special Use Fees	676,711	690,085	679,939	760,939	81,000	11.91%
Public Programming	357,042	429,318	416,373	502,124	85,751	20.59%
Group Education	405,295	408,929	448,851	413,511	(35,340)	(7.87%)
Reservations	213,396	213,253	219,755	219,755	--	--
Rental	202,077	213,104	191,256	222,980	31,724	16.59%
Camping	250,239	265,807	250,000	250,000	--	--
Tubing and Alpine Skiing	560,211	667,239	544,671	615,000	70,329	12.91%
Cross Country Ski Fees	215,314	324,109	215,000	240,000	25,000	11.63%
Facility Use Fees	206,474	380,748	405,059	412,056	6,997	1.73%
Other	469,433	556,704	628,143	452,878	(175,265)	(27.90%)
Total Park Use	3,556,192	4,149,296	3,999,047	4,089,243	90,196	2.26%
<b>Grants</b>						
Federal	4,840	--	--	--	--	--
State - Oper. & Maint	892,055	871,442	764,372	764,372	--	--
State - PERA Aid	45,910	45,910	45,910	45,910	--	--
State - Public Safety	172,583	187,525	95,000	120,000	25,000	26.32%
State - Minnaqua	6,822	--	4,000	--	(4,000)	(100.00%)
State - Pollution Control	--	37,940	--	--	--	--
Hennepin Parks Foundation	--	--	8,000	--	(8,000)	(100.00%)
Other Local Grants	11,046	1,000	--	--	--	--
Total Grants	1,133,256	1,143,817	917,282	930,282	13,000	1.42%
<b>Transfers</b>						
Operating Transfers From:						
Noerenberg Trust Fund	91,265	69,790	131,810	56,810	(75,000)	(56.90%)
Enterprise Funds	35,887	35,887	43,087	43,087	--	--
Park Maintenance Fund	196,000	199,628	199,628	199,628	--	--
Total Transfers	323,152	305,305	374,525	299,525	(75,000)	(20.03%)
<b>Other</b>						
Interest Income	438,923	330,581	220,000	220,000	--	--
Unrealized Gain/(Loss) on Investments	148,001	(81,394)	--	--	--	--
Charges for Services	181,302	164,743	102,275	74,000	(28,275)	(27.65%)
Court Fines	88,673	103,725	69,000	69,000	--	--
Miscellaneous Revenue	85,403	96,620	31,862	20,862	(11,000)	(34.52%)
Total Other	942,302	614,275	423,137	383,862	(39,275)	(9.28%)
Total Revenue	\$33,077,584	\$34,975,962	\$34,815,139	\$34,804,060	(\$11,079)	(.03%)

**2011 GENERAL FUND OPERATING BUDGET  
EXPENDITURE SUMMARY BY TYPE**

Type of Expenditure	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Amended Budget	2011 Budget	2011 Budget Over (Under) 2010 Budget	
					Dollars	Percent
Personal Services	\$ 22,761,931	\$25,053,267	\$26,144,503	\$26,902,519	\$ 758,016	2.90%
Commodities and Supplies	1,095,387	1,377,666	1,295,113	1,214,940	(80,173)	(6.19%)
Contracted Services	4,455,682	5,250,201	5,025,246	4,899,191	(126,055)	(2.51%)
Other Charges	1,611,854	1,605,664	1,547,159	1,633,159	86,000	5.56%
Capital Outlay	623,989	595,089	398,867	--	(398,867)	(100.00%)
Contingency	--	--	250,000	--	(250,000)	(100.00%)
Transfers to Other Funds	159,383	161,176	154,251	154,251	--	--
<b>TOTAL</b>	<u>\$ 30,708,226</u>	<u>\$34,043,063</u>	<u>\$34,815,139</u>	<u>\$34,804,060</u>	<u>\$ (11,079)</u>	<u>(0.03%)</u>

**2011 GENERAL FUND OPERATING BUDGET  
EXPENDITURE SUMMARY BY FUNCTION**

	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Amended Budget	2011 Budget	2011 Budget Over/(Under) 2010 Budget	
					Dollars	%
<b>Office of the Board of Commissioners and Superintendent</b>						
Board of Commissioners	\$ 281,533	\$ 323,984	\$ 289,853	\$ 294,545	\$ 4,692	1.62%
Office of the Superintendent	600,842	614,362	533,067	585,413	52,346	9.82%
Finance	2,006,526	1,981,013	1,834,370	1,895,160	60,790	3.31%
Planning & Development	1,435,897	1,651,180	1,650,621	1,666,519	15,898	0.96%
Total Office of the Board Commissioners and Superintendent	4,324,798	4,570,539	4,307,911	4,441,637	133,726	3.10%
<b>Recreation and Education</b>						
Division Management	473,442	551,075	445,106	445,465	359	0.08%
Park Facility Management	290,767	341,113	377,496	383,726	6,230	1.65%
Park Facility Services	1,914,496	1,999,606	2,151,394	2,034,011	(117,383)	(5.46%)
Recreation Programming Management	114,660	120,348	146,870	153,095	6,225	4.24%
Recreation Programming & Baker Near Wilderness Settlement	635,269	723,759	686,707	723,814	37,107	5.40%
Cultural History Interpretation	--	--	78,631	81,780	3,149	100.00%
Outdoor Education Management	111,783	121,207	130,426	131,019	593	0.45%
Outdoor Education	1,877,248	2,039,833	2,119,613	2,161,181	41,568	1.96%
Special Facilities	1,134,986	1,474,136	1,838,319	1,930,473	92,154	5.01%
Volunteers	256,033	262,195	284,145	296,049	11,904	4.19%
Visitor Services	436,000	536,995	569,339	575,080	5,741	1.01%
Group Sales	192,369	197,404	201,521	208,420	6,899	3.42%
Total Recreation and Education	7,437,053	8,367,671	9,029,567	9,124,113	94,546	1.05%

**2011 GENERAL FUND OPERATING BUDGET  
EXPENDITURE SUMMARY BY FUNCTION**

	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Amended Budget	2011 Budget	2011 Budget Over/(Under) 2010 Budget	
					Dollars	%
<b>Parks and Natural Resources</b>						
Division Management	404,809	420,014	344,995	346,517	1,522	0.44%
Natural Resources Management	148,354	186,025	189,271	194,243	4,972	2.63%
Park Maintenance Management	154,543	181,306	205,873	227,242	21,369	10.38%
Park Maintenance	6,476,479	7,013,338	7,255,599	7,342,835	87,236	1.20%
Central Services Management	115,849	293,376	189,029	193,264	4,235	2.24%
Carpentry	621,834	637,922	658,177	680,913	22,736	3.45%
Administrative Center	105,367	103,153	111,050	111,050	--	--
Horticulture	112,683	155,998	169,673	170,755	1,082	0.64%
Forestry	1,355,802	1,483,134	1,494,059	1,511,332	17,273	1.16%
Wildlife	460,912	536,043	525,260	516,084	(9,176)	(1.75%)
Water Quality	409,509	530,010	478,692	494,080	15,388	3.21%
Public Safety	3,376,973	3,755,155	3,922,032	4,119,805	197,773	5.04%
Total Parks and Natural Resources	13,743,114	15,295,474	15,543,710	15,908,120	364,410	2.34%
<b>Administration</b>						
Division Management	318,904	366,951	443,355	459,202	15,847	3.57%
Research & Evaluation	334,687	239,862	275,261	271,115	(4,146)	(1.51%)
Marketing & Communications	1,187,333	1,668,995	1,590,060	1,526,713	(63,347)	(3.98%)
Governmental Relations	189,498	157,530	174,407	180,714	6,307	3.62%
Information Technology	1,249,865	1,262,202	1,301,088	1,308,984	7,896	0.61%
Human Resources	1,083,368	1,239,012	1,218,792	1,298,038	79,246	6.50%
Training	56,234	118,562	127,870	131,173	3,303	2.58%
Total Administration	4,419,889	5,053,114	5,130,833	5,175,939	45,106	0.88%
<b>Capital Outlay</b>	623,989	595,089	398,867	--	(398,867)	(100.00%)
<b>Operating Transfers</b>	159,383	161,176	154,251	154,251	--	--
<b>Contingency</b>	--	--	250,000	--	(250,000)	(100.00%)
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE:</b>	<u>\$ 30,708,226</u>	<u>\$ 34,043,063</u>	<u>\$ 34,815,139</u>	<u>\$ 34,804,060</u>	<u>\$ (11,079)</u>	<u>(0.03%)</u>

**THREE RIVERS PARK DISTRICT  
COMPARISON OF ACTUAL 2010 AND PROPOSED 2011 PROPERTY TAX LEVY**

	OPERATING BUDGET		DEBT SERVICE		TOTAL	
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Gross amount required from Property Tax	\$29,004,148	\$29,004,148	\$10,869,597	\$10,869,597	\$39,873,745	\$39,873,745
Percent Increase		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%
Divided by collection rate of 98.0% (Operating Budget only)	98%	98%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Amount required from Property Tax Levy	\$29,596,069	\$29,596,069	\$10,869,597	\$10,869,597	\$40,465,666	\$40,465,666
(Operating Budget=73.13%) (Debt Service=26.87%)	(2,428,639)	(2,529,284)	(917,055)	(928,917)	(3,345,694)	(3,458,201)
Less: Fiscal Disparities						
<b>LOCAL LEVY NEEDED</b>	<b>\$27,167,430</b>	<b>\$27,066,785</b>	<b>\$9,952,542</b>	<b>\$9,940,680</b>	<b>\$37,119,972</b>	<b>\$37,007,465</b>
Value used for levy rate	\$1,065,058,494	\$984,066,450	\$1,065,058,494	\$984,066,450	\$1,065,058,494	\$984,066,450
(x) Net Tax Capacity Rate	0.02551	0.02751	0.00934	0.01011	0.03485	0.03762
<b>LEVY BY HENNEPIN COUNTY</b>	<b>\$27,169,642</b>	<b>\$27,071,668</b>	<b>\$9,947,646</b>	<b>\$9,948,912</b>	<b>\$37,117,289</b>	<b>\$37,020,580</b>

Tax Levy for Operations Limit	
Total Market Value	\$97,501,595,700
Percentage	0.03224%
2011 Property Tax Levy	31,434,514
Unused Tax Levy Authority	29,596,069
	<b>\$1,838,445</b>

**THREE RIVERS PARK DISTRICT**  
**COMPARISON OF 2010 AND PROPOSED 2011 PROPERTY TAX AMOUNTS**  
**FOR SELECTED RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES**

	OPERATING BUDGET		DEBT SERVICE		TOTAL	
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
If market value = \$250,000	\$250,000	\$232,250	\$250,000	\$232,250	\$250,000	\$232,250
Tax Capacity @ 1.00%	\$2,500	\$2,323	\$2,500	\$2,323	\$2,500	\$2,323
(x) Net Tax Capacity Rate (decimal)	0.02551	0.02751	0.00934	0.01011	0.03485	0.03762
Three Rivers Park District Tax	<b>\$63.78</b>	<b>\$63.91</b>	<b>\$23.35</b>	<b>\$23.49</b>	<b>\$87.13</b>	<b>\$87.39</b>
If market value = \$325,000:	\$325,000	\$301,925	\$325,000	\$301,925	\$325,000	\$301,925
Tax Capacity @ 1.00%	\$3,250	\$3,020	\$3,250	\$3,020	\$3,250	\$3,020
(x) Net Tax Capacity Rate (decimal)	0.02551	0.02751	0.00934	0.01011	0.03485	0.03762
Three Rivers Park District Tax	<b>\$82.91</b>	<b>\$83.08</b>	<b>\$30.36</b>	<b>\$30.53</b>	<b>\$113.27</b>	<b>\$113.61</b>
If market value = \$400,000:	\$400,000	\$371,600	\$400,000	\$371,600	\$400,000	\$371,600
Tax Capacity @ 1.00%	\$4,000	\$3,716	\$4,000	\$3,716	\$4,000	\$3,716
(x) Net Tax Capacity Rate (decimal)	0.02551	0.02751	0.00934	0.01011	0.03485	0.03762
Three Rivers Park District Tax	<b>\$102.04</b>	<b>\$102.23</b>	<b>\$37.36</b>	<b>\$37.57</b>	<b>\$139.40</b>	<b>\$139.80</b>

For each example, it is assumed that the market value of the property from 2010 to 2011 will decrease by 7.1% which is the decrease in valuation for the Park District as a whole.

**2011 GENERAL FUND OPERATING BUDGET  
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT POSITIONS**

<b>BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS AND OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT</b>		
Positions	Full-Time Equivalents	
	2010	2011
Superintendent (1)	1.00	1.00
Executive Assistant (1)	1.00	1.00
Secretary (2)	1.50	1.50
Senior Manager of Planning (1)	1.00	1.00
Legal Counsel (1)	0.70	0.70
Chief Financial Officer (1)	1.00	1.00
Finance Manager (1)	1.00	1.00
Accountant (1)	1.00	1.00
Accounting Technician (2)	2.00	2.00
Payroll Coordinator (1)	1.00	1.00
Revenue Supervisor (1)	1.00	1.00
Revenue Analysts (5)	4.30	4.30
Records Management Clerk (1)	1.00	1.00
Clerk Typist (1)	0.50	0.50
Director of Planning and Development (1)	1.00	1.00
Senior Manager of Civil Engineer (1)	1.00	1.00
Senior Engineering Technician (1)	1.00	1.00
Engineer (1)	1.00	1.00
Graduate Engineer (1)	1.00	1.00
Senior Manager of Landscape Architect (1)	1.00	1.00
Landscape Architect (2)	2.00	2.00
Designer (1)	1.00	1.00
Senior Manager of Planning (1)	1.00	1.00
Planner (1)	1.00	1.00
Intergovernmental Relations Manager (1)	1.00	1.00
GIS Manager (1)	1.00	1.00
GIS Database Administrator (1)	1.00	1.00
GIS Technician (1)	1.00	1.00
Administrative Assistant (1)	1.00	1.00
Department Secretary (1)	1.00	1.00
<b>Total – Regular Full Time Equivalent Positions</b>	<b>35.00</b>	<b>35.00</b>
<b>Total – Temporary/Intermittent Hours</b>	<b>2,929</b>	<b>3,158</b>

Note: Positions shown are for the General Fund Operating Budget Only. Some positions may be funded by other sources or split between the General Fund Operating Budget and other budgets.

**2011 GENERAL FUND OPERATING BUDGET  
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT POSITIONS**

<b>DIVISION OF RECREATION AND EDUCATION</b>		
Positions	Full-Time Equivalents	
	2010	2011
Associate Superintendent for Recreation and Education (1)	1.00	1.00
Administrative Assistant (1)	1.00	1.00
Director of Outdoor Education (1)	1.00	1.00
Cultural Resources Program Coordinator (1)	1.00	1.00
Program and Facility Coordinator (1)	1.00	1.00
Senior Manager of Facility Services (1)	0.80	0.80
Senior Manager of Alpine Services (10)	0.35	0.35
Park Operation Supervisor (5)	4.60	4.60
Golf Operations Supervisor (1)	0.20	0.20
Facility Supervisor (7)	6.50	6.50
Facility Attendant (10)	4.89	4.43
Shift Leader (1)	2.00	0.46
Facility Coordinator (3)	0.75	2.75
Golf Program Supervisor (1)	0.20	0.20
Division Secretary (3)	2.80	2.80
Senior Manager of Outdoor Education (1)	1.00	1.00
Recreation Supervisor (1)	1.00	1.00
Recreation Program Specialist (4)	3.20	3.30
Program Secretary (1)	0.63	0.63
Receptionist/ Secretary (1)	0.50	0.50
Near Wilderness Supervisor (1)	1.00	1.00
Interpretive Naturalist (2)	1.60	1.60
Farm Operations Supervisor (1)	1.00	1.00
Specialist I - Farm Operator (1)	1.00	1.00
Farm Program Coordinator (1)	1.00	1.00
Farm Educator (2)	1.80	1.80
Community Supported Agriculture Coordinator (1)	0.80	0.80
Program/Facility Secretary (2)	1.80	1.80
Historic Murphy's Landing Supervisor (1)	1.00	1.00
Cultural Heritage Interpreter (2)	1.60	1.60
Historical Program Coordinator (1)	1.00	1.00
Program/Facility Secretary (2)	1.40	1.40
Silverwood Park Outdoor Education Supervisor (1)	1.00	1.00
Arts Educator (2)	1.60	1.60
Facility Supervisor (1)	1.00	1.00
Program/Facility Secretary (2)	2.00	2.00
Volunteer Services Manager (1)	1.00	1.00
Volunteer Coordinator (1)	1.00	1.00
Volunteer Services Assistant (1)	1.00	1.00
Receptionist/ Secretary (1)	0.50	0.50

Note: Positions shown are for the General Fund Operating Budget Only. Some positions may be funded by other sources or split between the General Fund Operating Budget and other budgets.

**2011 GENERAL FUND OPERATING BUDGET  
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT POSITIONS**

<b>DIVISION OF RECREATION AND EDUCATION (Continued)</b>		
Positions	Full-Time Equivalents	
	2010	2011
Senior Manager of Outdoor Education (1)	1.00	1.00
Outdoor Education Supervisor (4)	4.00	4.00
Interpretive Naturalist (22)	16.95	16.95
Nature Center Secretary/Receptionist (10)	5.69	5.69
Guest Services Manager (1)	1.00	1.00
Reservationist (3)	3.00	3.00
Receptionist/Switchboard Operator (3)	2.35	2.35
Group Program Sales Coordinator (2)	2.00	2.00
Group Sales Assistant (1)	0.50	0.50
<b>Total – Regular Full Time Equivalent Positions</b>	<b>95.01</b>	<b>95.11</b>
<b>Total – Temporary/Intermittent Hours</b>	<b>120,138</b>	<b>125,175</b>

<b>DIVISION OF PARKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES</b>		
Positions	Full-Time Equivalents	
	2009	2010
Associate Superintendent for Parks and Natural Resources (1)	1.00	1.00
Administrative Assistant (1)	1.00	1.00
Park and Natural Resources Coordinator (1)	1.00	1.00
Director of Maintenance (1)	0.50	0.50
Central Services Manager (1)	1.00	1.00
Central Services Coordinator (1)	1.00	1.00
Specialist II - Electrician (1)	1.00	1.00
Construction Services Supervisor (1)	1.00	1.00
Specialist II - Carpenter (5)	4.70	4.70
Senior Manager of Parks and Trails Maintenance (1)	0.80	0.80
Park Maintenance Supervisor (6)	6.00	6.00
Ski and Golf Maintenance Supervisor (1)	0.35	0.35
Golf Maintenance Supervisor (1)	0.20	0.20
Crew Chief (10)	8.10	9.10
Park Technician (12)	12.90	11.90
Park Keeper (10)	9.60	9.60
Park Worker (14)	13.37	13.37
Nursery Workers (1)	0.23	0.23
Specialist I – Coon Rapids Dam (1)	1.00	1.00
Specialist I - Golf (1)	0.20	0.20
Specialist I/Crew Chief – Swim Pond (2)	2.00	2.00
Specialist I/Crew Chief - Skiing	1.00	1.00
Specialist I - Ski Hill (1)	0.65	0.65
Specialist II - Ski Hill (1)	0.25	0.25
Golf Technician (2)	0.75	0.75
Custodian (14)	13.20	13.20

Note: Positions shown are for the General Fund Operating Budget Only. Some positions may be funded by other sources or split between the General Fund Operating Budget and other budgets.

**2011 GENERAL FUND OPERATING BUDGET  
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT POSITIONS**

<b>DIVISION OF PARKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES (Continued)</b>		
Positions	Full-Time Equivalents	
	2010	2011
Director of Natural Resources Management (1)	1.00	1.00
Senior Manager of Forestry (1)	1.00	1.00
Horticulture Operations Supervisor (1)	1.00	1.00
Spec 1 Landscape Specialist (1)	1.00	1.00
Spec I Gardener (1)	1.00	1.00
Forestry Operations Manager (1)	1.00	1.00
Natural Resources Specialist – Forestry (1)	1.00	1.00
Spec I Forestry (1)	1.00	1.00
Spec I Nursery Operations (1)	1.00	1.00
Spec I Nursery Propagation (1)	1.00	1.00
Technicians (4)	4.00	4.00
Nursery Workers (4)	3.52	3.52
Senior Manager for Wildlife (1)	1.00	1.00
Natural Resources Specialist – Wildlife (2)	2.00	2.00
Natural Resources Technician – Wildlife (1)	0.80	0.80
Specialist I-Wildlife (1)	1.00	1.00
Senior Manager for Water Resources (1)	1.00	1.00
Natural Resources Specialist-Water Resources (2)	2.00	2.00
Natural Resources Technician-Water Resources (2)	2.00	2.00
Secretary	1.00	1.00
Director of Public Safety (1)	1.00	1.00
Administrative Assistant (1)	1.00	1.00
Public Safety Coordinator (1)	1.00	1.00
Park Police Lieutenant (1)	1.00	1.00
Investigator (1)	1.00	1.00
Sergeant (4)	3.75	3.75
Police Officers (20)	20.00	20.00
Park Service Officer Supervisor (1)	1.00	1.00
Park Service Officers (14)	15.00	15.00
Equine Worker (1)	0.75	0.75
Clerk Typist (1)	0.50	0.50
<b>Total – Regular Full Time Equivalent Positions</b>	<b>157.12</b>	<b>157.12</b>
<b>Total – Temporary/Intermittent Hours</b>	<b>75,101</b>	<b>75,101</b>

Note: Positions shown are for the General Fund Operating Budget Only. Some positions may be funded by other sources or split between the General Fund Operating Budget and other budgets.

**2011 GENERAL FUND OPERATING BUDGET  
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT POSITIONS**

<b>DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION</b>		
Positions	Full-Time Equivalents	
	2010	2011
Associate Superintendent for Administration (1)	1.00	1.00
Fundraising and Development Manager (1)	1.00	1.00
Administrative Assistant (1)	1.00	1.00
Secretary (1)	1.00	1.00
Intergovernmental Media Relations Coordinator (1)	1.00	1.00
Public Affairs Coordinator (1)	1.00	1.00
Senior Manager-Research and Evaluation (1)	1.00	1.00
Research Technician (2)	2.00	2.00
Director of Marketing and Communications	1.00	1.00
Communications Manager (2)	2.00	2.00
Senior Graphic Designer (1)	1.00	1.00
Graphic Designer (1)	1.00	1.00
Photographer (1)	1.00	1.00
Web Specialist (1)	1.00	1.00
Public Relations Copywriter (1)	1.00	1.00
Copy Writer (1)	1.00	1.00
Marketing and Communication Assistant (1)	1.00	1.00
Administrative Assistant (1)	1.00	1.00
Director of Human Resources	1.00	1.00
Senior Human Resources Generalist (1)	1.00	1.00
Human Resources Generalist (1)	1.00	1.00
Human Resources Assistant (2)	2.00	2.00
Human Resources Specialist (1)	1.00	1.00
Human Resources Receptionist/Secretary (1)	1.00	1.00
Director of Information Technology (1)	1.00	1.00
System Program Analyst (1)	1.00	1.00
Computer Network Manager (1)	1.00	1.00
Computer Network Technician (1)	1.00	1.00
Computer Operator (1)	1.00	1.00
Computer Help Desk/Trainer (1)	1.00	1.00
Computer Technician (1)	1.00	1.00
Clerk Typist (1)	0.50	0.50
<b>Total – Regular Full Time Equivalent Positions</b>	<b>34.50</b>	<b>34.50</b>
<b>Total – Temporary/Intermittent Hours</b>	<b>3,041</b>	<b>3,041</b>

<b>TOTAL GENERAL FUND 2010 OPERATING BUDGET</b>		
<b>Total – Regular Full Time Equivalent Positions</b>	<b>321.63</b>	<b>321.73</b>
<b>Total – Temporary/Intermittent Hours</b>	<b>201,209</b>	<b>206,475</b>

Note: Positions shown are for the General Fund Operating Budget Only. Some positions may be funded by other sources or split between the General Fund Operating Budget and other budgets.



*Three Rivers*

PARK DISTRICT