



**Addendum**  
**Minnetonka Park Board**  
**Meeting of March 2, 2022**

---

**ITEM 7A – Draft POST Plan Public Comment Review**

- **Draft POST Plan feedback received after the distribution of the Park Board packet.**
  - Minnetonka Matters
  - Comment Table
  - Resident Emails

# Chapter 1: Introduction

---

## **SURVEY RESPONSE REPORT**

25 February 2022 - 28 February 2022

### **PROJECT NAME:**

Plan Your Park System



SURVEY QUESTIONS

**Q1** | **What are your comments for Chapter 1: Introduction?**

Anonymous

2/28/2022 11:31 AM

The key take-aways at the end seem accurate. The list of Areas Identified for Improvement seems skewed to built recreation and downgrades the majority community interest in improvement of natural areas. It's unclear what "natural surface trails" refer to. If it's for mountain biking that's a problem. We already have a mountain bike course built at significant expense and community discord. Members of the community were told the built course would reduce the occurrence of mountain biking on rogue trails.

Anonymous

2/28/2022 01:58 PM

Areas identified for improvement (second paragraph) fails to mention the need for funding the ecological restoration of the park system (and its current degraded state as identified in the NRMP). Park improvements and future investments should refer to new and the revamping of existing amenities, in addition to ecological restoration. The language mentions a wholistic planning approach and this is a welcome change to randomly putting new amenities with no master planning process and multiple variables. There are no 'unmaintained areas' in the community parks so use and ordinances such as the leash law should be reviewed for compliance. Provide an appropriate balance between resource preservation, recreational use and community growth. Balance is an absolutely nebulous term unless it is clearly defined how balance will occur. If 5 acres of high quality natural resources are lost with the addition of a new amenity, balance would imply mitigation and restoration of 5 acres elsewhere (not chipping away at the remaining natural resources in our park systems). Replace what is lost, one for one = balance.

**Optional question** (2 response(s), 0 skipped)

**Question type:** Essay Question

# Chapter 2: Trends

---

## **SURVEY RESPONSE REPORT**

25 February 2022 - 28 February 2022

### **PROJECT NAME:**

Plan Your Park System



SURVEY QUESTIONS

**Q1** | **What are your comments for Chapter 2: Trends?**

Anonymous

2/28/2022 02:05 PM

Planning for change and building flexibility into the city's parks, open space and trail facilities will position Minnetonka to better adapt to current trends and future demands. Example: convert existing underutilized tennis courts or ice rinks into pickleball rather than building new pickleball courts where a community picnic area and gathering space is eliminated, a space that was frequently used by residents of color. How does the new park at Ridgedale build in resiliency to climate change? How much energy use is predicted for that park or the large developed complex proposed in Opus. These 'new' parks don't seem to be planned or constructed with climate resiliency or low energy use in mind. Add native plants to a largely hardscaped park doesn't count! There will be greater emphasis on more natural areas and balancing environment with recreational needs. Please stop using the word balance in the context of natural resources unless this is clearly defined. This is antiquated terminology.

**Optional question** (1 response(s), 0 skipped)

**Question type:** Essay Question

# Chapter 3: Existing Conditions

---

## **SURVEY RESPONSE REPORT**

25 February 2022 - 28 February 2022

### **PROJECT NAME:**

Plan Your Park System





SURVEY QUESTIONS

**Q1 | What are your comments for Chapter 3: Existing Conditions?**

Anonymous

2/28/2022 12:12 PM

The plan talks about "minor changes to some of the classifications" yet some of the parks have been downgraded from Community Preserve to Community Park. I consider this a major change and don't know where the impetus for this came from. I observed changes to classification already occurring on the website during the past year. This is concerning. The survey seems fairly accurate. The Imagery Boards were clearly skewed to built recreation. Balance of our preserved nature with every new flavor of built recreational will be a huge challenge. Our parks that were once preserves will end up looking like amusement parks. The nature of a Preserve is to preserve not to accommodate every special interest. By downgrading the status of community preserves you eke away at years of restoration efforts and expense.

Anonymous

2/28/2022 02:19 PM

Pg 37: In this POST System Plan update, the park classification system was updated from the 2001 Minnetonka POST Plan. New parks that were built since the creation of the last plan were added and classified. Minor changes to some of the classification descriptions were implemented. Please provide the specific data that prompted the change in the park classifications. What community feedback was received to downgrade preserves to community parks? This does not meet the mission of 'balancing' recreation and the preservation of natural resources. Our natural resources have been mismanaged and allowed to degrade for twenty years. That is not a reason to downgrade the parks. Nature play areas don't belong in high quality preserves. Any addition of an amenity will degrade the natural resources. This does not follow wholistic planning mentioned in the other parts of the plan. Put new amenities in low quality sites. Park name is incorrect - Cullen Nature Preserve (not Ann Cullen-Smith Property. Same for maps pp. 82-85. p. 39 map is the same as the downgraded map published by staff pre POST plan community feedback process. The downgrading of the park designations is baked. For what reason? How does that benefit the community to have fewer areas where natural resources are preserved? This is counter to the survey results on p. 56. The dot preference poster with new additional amenities is 'leading' at best. How is this statistically significant serving up options to residents that they didn't come up

with on their own accord? Same comment for p. 73 summary.

**Optional question** (2 response(s), 0 skipped)

**Question type:** Essay Question

# Chapter 4: Vision

---

## **SURVEY RESPONSE REPORT**

25 February 2022 - 28 February 2022

### **PROJECT NAME:**

Plan Your Park System



SURVEY QUESTIONS

**Q1** | **What are your comments for Chapter 4: Vision? Please note that this chapter was previously available for public comment, reviewed by the Park Board and edited based on feedback.**

Anonymous

2/28/2022 12:58 PM

It's a good idea to engage volunteers but part of engagement is a sense of collaboration. Volunteers want to feel a part of the process not just dictated to or asked to jump through excessive hoops. Restoration volunteers want to see the results of their work. They don't want to be part of a process that isn't based on restoration science and that perpetuates the invasive species cycle.

**Optional question** (1 response(s), 0 skipped)

**Question type:** Essay Question

# Chapter 5: Systems Plan

---

## **SURVEY RESPONSE REPORT**

25 February 2022 - 28 February 2022

### **PROJECT NAME:**

Plan Your Park System



SURVEY QUESTIONS



**Q1 | What are your comments for Chapter 5: Systems Plan? Please note that this chapter was previously available for public comment, reviewed by the Park Board, and edited based on feedback.**

Anonymous

2/28/2022 01:15 PM

You talk about "limiting development in park preserves" yet since this document recommends downgrading current Community Preserves it's hard to tell which areas are considered preserves. There is ambiguity that will lead to contention. You emphasize "native plant materials" which is good. The city needs to be vigilant that it not introducing non native and invasive species into our parks. For example, it seems like each year the city tree sale has had less native species available and more cultivars or non native species, Unclaimed trees are often planted in city parks. This is not a good practice.

Anonymous

2/28/2022 02:30 PM

"Limit development in park preserves to improvements that support passive uses or address water quality and habitat." How will you balance recreation and natural resources by developing park preserves? Park Preserves need restoration investment, not more development. Twenty years of degradation and mismanagement reinforces the urgency for swift intervention, adaptive management, and funding. Goal 3: Provide opportunities for people to connect with nature. This needs to be combined with well-defined use and guidance or the high quality natural areas will continue to be degraded by misuse and overuse. Goal 3: Strengthen collaboration with neighborhoods, associations, agencies, schools, community groups and volunteers. This needs serious work and attention by staff. Community members are ready to collaborate but staff need to be willing to provide a welcoming environment and experience that maintains volunteers. Goal 5: Model sustainable practices in park construction, maintenance and operations. Initiatives: > Incorporate sustainable best practices in the operations and maintenance of park facilities. Develop a smart salting training session. The overuse of salt on roadways and in park parking lots is aggregious. > Continue to manage invasive plant species in parks and open spaces as guided by the City of Minnetonka Natural Resources Master Plan. Rephrase: restore ecological plant communities using best management practices, current science, and adaptive management.

Anonymous

2/28/2022 09:43 PM

The comments below reflect the views of 5 residents as they relate to Goal 3 for Lake Rose Park. We felt the Goals and Initiatives language might be too broad to be applied to this unmaintained, undeveloped city park and wanted to clarify why.: Since Lake Rose Park was dedicated to the city in 1974 by the developer of Lake Rose Estates,

it has not been maintained by the City (other than mowing the grass at the Randall Lane park access). As a result, for over 30 years two long-time park-adjacent residents volunteered to maintain the park's packed dirt trail, keeping it presentable and passable by mowing and raking it periodically, especially to protect the neighborhood children using it as a short-cut to Gatewood Elementary. This arrangement was agreed upon at an informal outdoor neighborhood meeting coordinated by and with the blessing of Public Works management. If the city were to maintain the park trail, they said they would have to install an 8-foot-wide asphalt trail that could accommodate their maintenance equipment. Neither the neighborhood nor the city wanted anything to do with that. Lake Rose Park has never been developed either; it remains identical to how it was in 1974, except for the very successful natural resources restoration which has greatly enhanced the park preserve. We believe there must have been reasons this small, almost landlocked preserve was never on the city's radar as a candidate for providing enough benefit to the community at large. Recently, there's been much talk by volunteers and residents about developing the park by expanding the trail, adding a boardwalk, introducing more formalized access for uses like skating, canoeing, skiing, fishing, etc. Many of these are activities that residents readily enjoyed years ago, before the invasive weeds started choking the north side of the lake and shoreline. None of us are opposed to exploring if and how passive human use activities might be considered for LRP, but we respectfully request that the city conduct a feasibility study for what makes sense for both the preserve and for the neighborhood before any action is taken. Some pertinent questions to ask for this unmaintained park: Who would expand the trail and how, using what materials, specifications or keep a packed-dirt path integral to the character of the park? Is a boardwalk appropriate in this setting? Who would build and install it and where would it be placed to minimize negatives to adjacent property owners? Who will maintain expanded trail and/or other passive use development infrastructure, if any? Recently, there have been several instances of attempts by residents to alter their own "piece of the park" to fit personal needs/desires, possibly without considering how it might affect the lake, the park or other neighbors. Because the park isn't maintained, some may believe it's OK to do this. We've been encouraged by the new "application" process that Leslie and Sara shared with us whereby no development or alterations to the park will be authorized without neighborhood involvement in the planning process. If possible to do here, we'll attach the 2001 POST Plan Primary Program Focus document for Lake Rose Park, where the City / Park Board outlined the characteristics, ecological issues and types of development, if any, should be considered. Because Lake Rose Park hasn't changed since 1974 or 2001, we think this document is still relevant for guiding any future development efforts. Notable comments from the 2001

POST Plan document which we'd like to preserve for future reference in planning: "The primary function of Lake Rose Park is to preserve the natural character of the lake and the surrounding shoreline and open space in a developed part of the city." "Lake Rose works in concert with Purgatory Park to provide open space in this NPSA. With Boulder Creek relatively close, active uses in this park are not needed nor perhaps appropriate." "Lake Rose Park is an appealing natural area, with the lake and adjacent shoreline being the primary features...there is no development in the park...views from this area across the lake are very scenic, as are the views from many of the adjacent properties." "Protection of the ecological values of the lake and shoreline are of high concern and warrant close review. Managing stormwater runoff into the lake and working with adjacent property owners on maintaining buffer zones and managing the use of fertilizers top the list of issues." "As a nature preserve, maintenance activity will be focused on stewardship of the resource itself...programmed use of the park is not expected." "While Lake Rose Park is set aside for preservation, a few potential improvements are worth considering. Expanding the trail along the lake where feasible and developing a sitting area/lake overlook are simple additions that would be appealing to the nearby residents, yet not take away from the character of the site. Given the adjacency of the residential properties, neighborhood involvement in developing a master plan for the park is critical." PS: We think both the 2020 POST System Plan and Natural Resources Master Plan are impressive!

**Optional question** (3 response(s), 0 skipped)

**Question type:** Essay Question

# Chapter 6: Implementation

---

## **SURVEY RESPONSE REPORT**

25 February 2022 - 28 February 2022

### **PROJECT NAME:**

Plan Your Park System



SURVEY QUESTIONS

**Q1** | **What are your comments for Chapter 6: Implementation?**

Anonymous

2/26/2022 05:12 AM

{Page 5} Facilities Item - Add Item "Recognize informal trails as trails" - Ongoing, \$0  
Facilities Item - Add Item "Revise City ordinances regarding passive use of all trails" - Ongoing, Staff Time / \$0  
{Page 7} Operations and Maintenance Item - Add Item "Maintain all trails" - Ongoing, \$0

Anonymous

2/28/2022 01:42 PM

The Facility Guidelines Table shows that anything goes at what are currently Community Preserves. How was the decision made to downgrade our Community Preserves and allow for any type of built development? Did the community ask for this? What supports this decision? This is not a "minor change to some of the classifications" as you say early in the plan. It is a major change. The community needs to weigh in on such a major change.

Anonymous

2/28/2022 02:34 PM

p. 118 - Cullen Nature Preserve (not Cullen Smith property) Park and Trail Dedication - currently used for development only. Reallocate funds for general maintenance and natural resources restoration.

**Optional question** (3 response(s), 0 skipped)

**Question type:** Essay Question

# Appendix A: Glossary

---

## **SURVEY RESPONSE REPORT**

25 February 2022 - 28 February 2022

### **PROJECT NAME:**

Plan Your Park System



SURVEY QUESTIONS



**Q1** | **What are your comments for the Appendix: Glossary?**

Anonymous

Where did these definitions come from? Please provide citations.

2/28/2022 02:36 PM

**Optional question** (1 response(s), 0 skipped)

**Question type:** Essay Question

## Addendum: Draft POST Plan - Public Comments received between Feb. 25 - 28, 2022

Highlighted rows indicates proposed edits to the final draft.

Chapter	Comment	Staff Response/Clarification
Chapter 1: Introduction	The key take-aways at the end seem accurate. The list of Areas Identified for Improvement seems skewed to built recreation and downgrades the majority community interest in improvement of natural areas. It's unclear what "natural surface trails" refer to. If it's for mountain biking that's a problem. We already have a mountain bike course built at significant expense and community discord. Members of the community were told the built course would reduce the occurrence of mountain biking on rogue trails.	Natural surface trails are crushed limestone, compacted soil and mulched. This language will be added to the definition of Formal Trail to be defined as "A city-approved purposefully built trail maintained by the city that can be asphalt, natural surface (crushed limestone, compacted soil, mulched), or boardwalks."
Chapter 1: Introduction	Areas identified for improvement (second paragraph) fails to mention the need for funding the ecological restoration of the park system (and its current degraded state as identified in the NRMP). Park improvements and future investments should refer to new and the revamping of existing amenities, in addition to ecological restoration. The language mentions a wholistic planning approach and this is a welcome change to randomly putting new amenities with no master planning process and multiple variables. There are no 'unmaintained areas' in the community parks so use and ordinances such as the leash law should be reviewed for compliance. Provide an appropriate balance between resource preservation, recreational use and community growth. Balance is an absolutely nebulous term unless it is clearly defined how balance will occur. If 5 acres of high quality natural resources are lost with the addition of a new amenity, balance would imply mitigation and restoration of 5 acres elsewhere (not chipping away at the remaining natural resources in our park systems). Replace what is lost, one for one = balance.	Add "ecological restoration" in paragraph two on page 11 in the list of areas of identified improvement.
Chapter 2: Trends	Planning for change and building flexibility into the city's parks, open space and trail facilities will position Minnetonka to better adapt to current trends and future demands. Example: convert existing underutilized tennis courts or ice rinks into pickleball rather than building new pickleball courts where a community picnic area and gathering space is eliminated, a space that was frequently used by residents of color. How does the new park at Ridgedale build in resiliency to climate change? How much energy use is predicted for that park or the large developed complex proposed in Opus. These 'new' parks don't seem to be planned or constructed with climate resiliency or low energy use in mind. Add native plants to a largely hardscaped park doesn't count! There will be greater emphasis on more natural areas and balancing environment with recreational needs. Please stop using the word balance in the context of natural resources unless this is clearly defined. This is antiquated terminology.	Comment received. Thank you.

Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	The plan talks about "minor changes to some of the classifications" yet some of the parks have been downgraded from Community Preserve to Community Park. I consider this a major change and don't know where the impetus for this came from. I observed changes to classification already occurring on the website during the past year. This is concerning. The survey seems fairly accurate. The Imagery Boards were clearly skewed to built recreation. Balance of our preserved nature with every new flavor of built recreational will be a huge challenge. Our parks that were once preserves will end up looking like amusement parks. The nature of a Preserve is to preserve not to accommodate every special interest. By downgrading the status of community preserves you eke away at years of restoration efforts and expense.	All of the parks have now been given a Mini Park, Neighborhood Park or Community Park designation based on size and service. The preserve areas in the Community Parks have not changed and additional preserves were added to the park system.
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	Pg 37: In this POST System Plan update, the park classification system was updated from the 2001 Minnetonka POST Plan. New parks that were built since the creation of the last plan were added and classified. Minor changes to some of the classification descriptions were implemented. Please provide the specific data that prompted the change in the park classifications. What community feedback was received to downgrade preserves to community parks? This does not meet the mission of 'balancing' recreation and the preservation of natural resources. Our natural resources have been mismanaged and allowed to degrade for twenty years. That is not a reason to downgrade the parks. Nature play areas don't belong in high quality preserves. Any addition of an amenity will degrade the natural resources. This does not follow wholistic planning mentioned in the other parts of the plan. Put new amenities in low quality sites. Park name is incorrect - Cullen Nature Preserve (not Ann Cullen-Smith Property. Same for maps pp. 82-85. p. 39 map is the same as the downgraded map published by staff pre POST plan community feedback process. The downgrading of the park designations is baked. For what reason? How does that benefit the community to have fewer areas where natural resources are preserved? This is counter to the survey results on p. 56. The dot preference poster with new additional amenities is 'leading' at best. How is this statistically significant serving up options to residents that they didn't come up with on their own accord? Same comment for p. 73 summary.	All of the parks have now been given a Mini Park, Neighborhood Park or Community Park designation based on size and service. The preserve areas in the Community Parks have not changed and additional preserve designations were added to the to the park system. The Cullen Smith property has not been formally named. It is considered a preserve area and will be formally named during the master planning process.
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	I find it disturbing that 20% of the people who filled out the park survey do not feel safe in the park due to loose dogs. Purgatory Park is partially bad. People still refuse to follow the rules at Purgatory Park with the signage in place. I think it's time to require all dogs in the city parks to be on a leash in both maintained and unmaintained areas. Those who wish to have their dog off leash should go to a designated enclosed dog park.	The priority initiatives includes "Study the feasibility of adding a dog park" as a high priority.
Chapter 4: Vision	It's a good idea to engage volunteers but part of engagement is a sense of collaboration. Volunteers want to feel a part of the process not just dictated to or asked to jump through excessive hoops. Restoration volunteers want to see the results of their work. They don't want to be part of a process that isn't based on restoration science and that perpetuates the invasive species cycle.	Comment received. Thank you.

Chapter 5: Systems Plan	You talk about "limiting development in park preserves" yet since this document recommends downgrading current Community Preserves it's hard to tell which areas are considered preserves. There is ambiguity that will lead to contention. You emphasize "native plant materials" which is good. The city needs to be vigilant that it not introducing non native and invasive species into our parks. For example, it seems like each year the city tree sale has had less native species available and more cultivars or non native species, Unclaimed trees are often planted in city parks. This is not a good practice.	All of the parks have now been given a Mini Park, Neighborhood Park or Community Park designation based on size and service. The preserve areas in the Community Parks have not changed and additional preserve designations were added to the to the park system.
Chapter 5: Systems Plan	"Limit development in park preserves to improvements that support passive uses or address water quality and habitat." How will you balance recreation and natural resources by developing park preserves? Park Preserves need restoration investment, not more development. Twenty years of degradation and mismanagement reinforces the urgency for swift intervention, adaptive management, and funding.	Please refer to the newly adoption Natural Resources Master Plan, located at <a href="https://www.minnetonkamn.gov/our-city/natural-resources/resources-and-information">https://www.minnetonkamn.gov/our-city/natural-resources/resources-and-information</a> for more information that addresses priorities for habitat restoration in parks, including adaptive management strategies and restoration funding.
Chapter 5: Systems Plan	Goal 3: Provide opportunities for people to connect with nature. This needs to be combined with well-defined use and guidance or the high quality natural areas will continue to be degraded by misuse and overuse.	Comment received. Thank you.
Chapter 5: Systems Plan	Goal 3: Strengthen collaboration with neighborhoods, associations, agencies, schools, community groups and volunteers. This needs serious work and attention by staff. Community members are ready to collaborate but staff need to be willing to provide a welcoming environment and experience that maintains volunteers.	Comment received. Thank you.
Chapter 5: Systems Plan	Goal 5: Model sustainable practices in park construction, maintenance and operations. Initiatives: > Incorporate sustainable best practices in the operations and maintenance of park facilities. Develop a smart salting training session. The overuse of salt on roadways and in park parking lots is aggregious.	Comment received. Thank you.
Chapter 5: Systems Plan	> Continue to manage invasive plant species in parks and open spaces as guided by the City of Minnetonka Natural Resources Master Plan. Rephrase: restore ecological plant communities using best management practices, current science, and adaptive management.	It is important to cross-reference the Natural Resources Master Plan in the POST plan. The NRMP addresses ecological restoration using current science and adaptive management.

<p>Chapter 5: Systems Plan</p>	<p>The comments below reflect the views of 5 residents as they relate to Goal 3 for Lake Rose Park. We felt the Goals and Initiatives language might be too broad to be applied to this unmaintained, undeveloped city park and wanted to clarify why.: Since Lake Rose Park was dedicated to the city in 1974 by the developer of Lake Rose Estates, it has not been maintained by the City (other than mowing the grass at the Randall Lane park access). As a result, for over 30 years two long-time park-adjacent residents volunteered to maintain the park's packed dirt trail. Keeping it presentable and passable by mowing and raking it periodically, especially to protect the neighborhood children using it as a short-cut to Gatewood Elementary. This arrangement was agreed upon at an informal outdoor neighborhood meeting coordinated by and with the blessing of Public Works management. If the city were to maintain the park trail, they said they would have to install an 8-foot-wide asphalt trail that could accommodate their maintenance equipment. Neither the neighborhood nor the city wanted anything to do with that. Lake Rose Park has never been developed either; it remains identical to how it was in 1974, except for the very successful natural resources restoration which has greatly enhanced the park preserve. We believe there must have been reasons this small, almost landlocked preserve was never on the city's radar as a candidate for providing enough benefit to the community at large. Recently, there's been much talk by volunteers and residents about developing the park by expanding the trail, adding a boardwalk, introducing more formalized access for uses like skating, canoeing, skiing, fishing, etc. Many of these are activities that residents readily enjoyed years ago, before the invasive weeds started choking the north side of the lake and shoreline. None of us are opposed to exploring if and how passive human use activities might be considered for LRP, but we respectfully request that the city conduct a feasibility study for what makes sense for both the preserve and for the neighborhood before any action is taken. Some pertinent questions to ask for this unmaintained park: Who would expand the trail and how, using what materials, specifications or keep a packed-dirt path integral to the character of the park? Is a boardwalk appropriate in this setting? Who would build and install it and where would it be placed to minimize negatives to adjacent property owners? Who will maintain expanded trail and/or other passive use development infrastructure, if any? Recently, there have been several instances of attempts by residents to alter their own "piece of the park" to fit personal needs/desires, possibly without considering how it might affect the lake, the park or other neighbors. Because the park isn't maintained, some may believe it's OK to do this. We've been encouraged by the new "application" process that Leslie and Sara shared with us whereby no development or alterations to the park will be authorized without neighborhood involvement in the planning process. If possible to do here, we'll attach the 2001 POST Plan Review.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comments regarding Lake Rose Park. The POST Plan is a high level planning document for entire the park and trail system. Staff will continue to work with interested residents regarding specific concerns and interests for Lake Rose Park.</p>
------------------------------------	---	---

involvement in the planning process. If possible to do here, we'll attach the 2001 POST Plan Primary Program Focus document for Lake Rose Park, where the City / Park Board outlined the characteristics, ecological issues and types of development, if any, should be considered. Because Lake Rose Park hasn't changed since 1974 or 2001, we think this document is still relevant for guiding any future development efforts. Notable comments from the 2001 POST Plan document which we'd like to preserve for future reference in planning: "The primary function of Lake Rose Park is to preserve the natural character of the lake and the surrounding shoreline and open space in a developed part of the city." "Lake Rose works in concert with Purgatory Park to provide open space in this NPSA. With Boulder Creek relatively close, active uses in this park are not needed nor perhaps appropriate." "Lake Rose Park is an appealing natural area, with the lake and adjacent shoreline being the primary features...there is no development in the park...views from this area across the lake are very scenic, as are the views from many of the adjacent properties." "Protection of the ecological values of the lake and shoreline are of high concern and warrant close review. Managing stormwater runoff into the lake and working with adjacent property owners on maintaining buffer zones and managing the use of fertilizers top the list of issues." "As a nature preserve, maintenance activity will be focused on stewardship of the resource itself...programmed use of the park is not expected." "While Lake Rose Park is set aside for preservation, a few potential improvements are worth considering. Expanding the trail along the lake where feasible and developing a sitting area/lake overlook are simple additions that would be appealing to the nearby residents, yet not take away from the character of the site. Given the adjacency of the residential properties, neighborhood involvement in developing a master plan for the park is critical." PS: We think both the 2020 POST System Plan and Natural Resources Master Plan are impressive!

Chapter 6: Implementation	{Page 5} Facilities Item - Add Item "Recognize informal trails as trails" - Ongoing, \$0	Comment received. Thank you.
Chapter 6: Implementation	Facilities Item - Add Item "Revise City ordinances regarding passive use of all trails" - Ongoing, Staff Time / \$0	Comment received. Thank you.
Chapter 6: Implementation	{Page 7} Operations and Maintenance Item - Add Item "Maintain all trails" - Ongoing, \$0	Comment received. Thank you.
Chapter 6: Implementation	The Facility Guidelines Table shows that anything goes at what are currently Community Preserves. How was the decision made to downgrade our Community Preserves and allow for any type of built development? Did the community ask for this? What supports this decision? This is not a "minor change to some of the classifications' as you say early in the plan. It is a major change. The community needs to weigh in on such a major change.	The definition of a Preserve can be found in Table 1 and states that preserves provide passive use opportunities. Any added amenities/facilities to preserve areas would go through a public approval process.

Chapter 6: Implementation	p. 118 - Cullen Nature Preserve (not Cullen Smith property)	The Cullen Smith property has not been formally named. It is considered a preserve area and will be formally named during the master planning process.
Chapter 6: Implementation	Park and Trail Dedication - currently used for development only. Reallocate funds for general maintenance and natural resources restoration.	Park and Trail Dedication fees are governed by state statute 462.358 Subd. 2b. (g). The definition in the glossary will be updated to the statute language of "Cash payments received must be used only for the acquisition and development or improvement of parks, recreational facilities, playgrounds, trails, wetlands, or open space based on the approved park systems plan. Cash payments must not be used for ongoing operation or maintenance of parks, recreational facilities, playgrounds, trails, wetlands, or open space."
Appendix A: Glossary	Where did these definitions come from? Please provide citations.	Multiple sources were used.

**Submitted on March 1, 2022****Name**

Rose Klein

**Full Address**

17101 Stodola Road

minnetonka, MN 55345

Hennepin

**Phone****Email****Meeting date**

March 2nd

**Agenda item**

Park Survey

**Comment**

I find it disturbing that 20% of the people who filled out the park survey do not feel safe in the park due to loose dogs. Purgatory Park is partially bad. People still refuse to follow the rules at Purgatory Park with the signage in place. I think it's time to require all dogs in the city parks to be on a leash in both maintained and unmaintained areas. Those who wish to have their dog off leash should go to a designated enclosed dog park.

Thank you,

**City of Minnetonka, MN**

---

**Submitted on March 2, 2022**

Hi Kathy,

It was brought to my attention that the issue of Purgatory Park will be coming up during today's meeting. I've already sent this but did not receive any response. So here it is

I wanted to comment on the issue of the unleashed dogs at Purgatory Park. Basically, a very large group of dog owners are not in control of their unleashed dogs. I understand that unleashed dogs are allowed in the center of the park, and (for the most part) it is fine. However:

-Too many dogs owners are not leashing their dogs on the way from the center of the park to the parking.

-Too many people are not leashing their dogs on the path that goes around the park. Not only it is illegal



(at least I hope so), but most of those dogs are not properly trained.

-Too many dogs who are unleashed on the park paths are not properly trained to be so.

-Most unleashed dogs (other than the ones who go to the center of the Purgatory park) are NOT trained to be under voice command.

-Their owners are too lax following the rules. And too entitled to even consider doing so. I can't count times when I would ask the dog owner to leash their dog and get a rude reply, a proverbial "stink eye" and complete indifference to the rules and wellbeing of other dogs, children, and adults who are not comfortable with unleashed dogs.

-I live right by Purgatory Park and often walk my friend's dog there. He has been attacked in the park by unleashed dogs multiple times. He is ALWAYS properly leashed and we only use the paths designated for leashed dogs. The sheer number of dog owners who flagrantly disregard the rules is astounding!!! I use the designated paths because I don't want my dog around unleashed dogs. People can't control their animals, and when their dogs run to mine, and I have to scream for them to get their dog away, all they do is yell at me that their dog is "friendly". I DON'T CARE!!! If I wanted my baby around other "friendly" dogs, I would do so myself.

Also, quite a few parents here are not comfortable bringing their kids to the park for the same reason - unleashed and untrained dogs.

Also, I know quite a few adults who are afraid of dogs as well and have a hard time utilizing our beautiful park even though they contribute their taxes to the maintaining of that park.

Please, please, please!!! Something has to be done!

Thank you,  
Marina Mirman