

Greenway Technical Committee Meeting April 9, 2002

In attendance: Dave Manthei (GFFD), Marty Egeland (NDGF), Helen Cozzetto (MN DNR), Greg Boppre (Floan-Sanders), Dennis Topp (MN DNR Fisheries), Scott McNamee (www.invoman.com), Ben Ehreth (GF Greenway), Earl Haugen (MPO), Will Gosnold (UND), Steve Renslow (Red River Snowmobile Club), Randy Sorenson (Options), Corey Birkholz (Options), Mark Edwards (Options), Stephen Mullally (GF Park District)

Introduction

Steve Mullally

Non-paved Trail Plan Update – Earl Haugen, MPO and Will Gosnold, Trail Planner

Will – Seeking input, anything you would like to see added or changed? Randy – Couldn't distinguish between the various trails (paved vs. non-paved). Will – You did not receive a color copy. Ben – Yes we made color copies to distribute. Will – That's not what I provided. That's a Xerox copy and that's the reason you cannot tell the difference. One of them is red and one black so you should be able to distinguish. Anyone have a recommendation on the color they would like to see the paved trail? No response. Will - I could go with black for paved. Randy – Where could I come to see a map of the trails? Will – My office. The trees show up on the paved trail's file and can't separate. Anyone know how? Ben – Just created new layer by tracing Phase I and II levees layer so trail appears as single line. Offered to send Will the file.

Randy – Any discussion regarding the surface of the non-paved trails? Will – Report I gave to Earl offers four different options. It is not my decision just options. Randy – Spoke with the National Center on Accessibility and stated the trail would need to be firm and stable. We would have to look at a surface other than grass. Will – That is up to the MPO. Randy - What meeting do I go to, to ensure that? Earl – We were using this group that takes what comes from the consultant and either agree or asking it to be changed to what this committee wants. That was the purpose of sending out the drafts to the committee ahead of time. Randy – What routes that extend along the length would be firm and stable compared to what routes would be grass. You can have one area that has an accessible route with another area that has grass as long as a person in a wheel chair can get from point A to point B. Earl – There will be three parallel routes the paved trail and the other two as recommended by this plan. They are all parallel. There won't be a non-paved trail that won't have a paved trail parallel to it. Randy – Just need to see a map of that. Cory – Not only talking about trails but also access to features like picnic tables, fishing sites, etc. Those elements need to be accessible. Earl – A lot of your concerns would be addressed in the Corps project. Randy – Not sure if can access every point in a wheelchair. Concerned about accessibility throughout the Greenway. Will – Paved trail will be accessible at points throughout and what we have done is to connect the non-paved trail everywhere there is a connection through the dike.

Will - Did not include any paved trails on the east side because did not have the designs, but imagine there planning on putting something over there. Greg – Yes they are. Helen – DNR Fishing access stuff needs to be included. Will – We will modify the trails to make sure they connect to all of the fishing points on GF and EGF side.

Steve – Three trails, one hard surface, one running trail, and one snowmobile trail? Will – Yes the snowmobile trail is basically just clearing brush. Steve – Issues about trail placement. When areas are developed, they will have to be somehow connected to the hard surface trail. Earl – Non-paved trail plan is above and beyond what the Corps is doing. No funding has been identified for it yet. It's just a plan it might not happen yet. Greg – Most of the Corps paved trails will be at an elevation of about 825 ft. Steve – I think what Will was trying to do is just identify spots for trails. Then when we get to the step of connecting them somebody has done the research and we're all in consensus about trail placement.

Preliminary Plan for Mapping – Greg Boppre, Floan & Sanders

Steve - next issue is compiling all the technical information and getting into a map. The question is compiling all the resources that the various agencies have been working on (Flink, City of Grand Forks, etc...) to try to get a uniform map to use. Question to Greg – do you have something for us to see if this can all be tied together. Greg – We had a meeting after the last meeting (Helen, Myself, Steve, Melanie, and Dale) and Melanie had mentioned that she talked to the Grand Forks staff and the Grand Forks staff can do the Grand Forks side in-house. I suggested meshing the Corps data with Grand Forks and East Grand Forks data. Our goal is to have some sort of idea for the next meeting (May 14th) as to how were going to get to that point. Hopefully, by then we can bring a sample back to the group to see if that's the direction you want to go. Steve – My understanding is that this might not be as costly as we originally thought.

Request of the Cities for MPO Greenway Mapping (2003) – Greg Boppre, Floan & Sanders

Greg – Earl is there a request to the MPO that we could do for funding for next year for mapping? Earl – Yes. By September, we finalize our work program for 2003. The possibility of this year exists. The big thing I was hearing is interest in having aerials flown again. Depending on price that probably falls next year, unless it is a real cheap price. Greg – I think the aerials would be important because the last one we had was two years ago and a lot has changed. Do you have a feel what the cost would be? Earl – Yes. We would have to put it out for bids. Coverage would include both communities and the Greenway would be a bonus.

Fishing Sites (Not on the Agenda)

Steve – Handed out document with the Minnesota DNR fishing site locations. Greg – Are these potential sites for fishing sites? Helen – I think some of the sites are based on the fact that the rapids (on the Red Lake River) may be modified. Dennis – I think those sites are good sites regardless of whether the dam is modified. Sites were selected because they have historically been spots that people choose to fish because they're good. The basis for our decision was historical use and good spots. Greg – Does not mean you're going to have all the sites just potential?

Helen – We have had the discussion before with the Corps that some areas may not be accessible by vehicles any longer. Greg – All that means is that the Corps is not going to build it. Helen – Yes, and their concern is the stability of the slope. There is no reason the Corps couldn't place a gravel road there. Greg – A structure such as pavement will have the potential for slippage. Helen – Right now it is programmed that the Corps will do a trail that a wheelchair can use but not a vehicle.

Steve – Is the Corps going to build any fishing sites? Helen – No. They don't supply any accessibility to the river. Steve – What about North Dakota? Marty – We do a cost match for boat ramps. For boat ramps, if an area wants a boat ramp NDGF will pay for 75% of the funding. Whoever does it does not necessarily need to put in 25% of the money they could simply donate equipment or labor with an agreement to maintain the ramp. Steve – What about fishing sites? Marty – We don't do a lot of that and haven't in the past. Not saying it couldn't be an option but not something we've historically done. Steve – That's something we could pursue? Marty – It does not hurt to ask. Steve – The sites that were identified are they reasonably accessible? Dennis – The sites on our side are generally accessible do to the fact there is already a beaten path to them. The Red River is characterized as an urban bank fishery. 75% of the fishing takes place in three urban areas along the river, Wahpeton-Breckenridge, Fargo-Moorhead, and Grand Forks-East Grand Forks is more than ¾ is bank fishing. Grand Forks and East Grand Forks is the biggest area for fishing. Marty – Lynn's made it a priority to himself to keep fishing access. Your certainly going to have him on your side as far as funding is concerned. Dennis – Funding from the DNR was requested last year but did not do very well. Last year everything went to the Metro area and asked our director last fall at a regional meeting and stated that this year the out-of state areas are going to have a higher priority so we're hopeful to have money through fisheries. Marty – What types of things are you looking at incorporating into the sites? Steve – Mainly access and hard-surfacing. Need hard-surface trail from main trail to sites for handicap accessibility. Marty – Probably need a certain amount of hard-surfaced trails to the river and people will make their own trails off of those to fish where they want, much like how it exists now.

Corey – Spoke with the DNR a couple of years back about fishing platforms where individuals can wheel out onto them (passed around a conceptual drawing of what the platforms might look like). Steve – Something that could be put in in the spring and taken out in the fall? Corey – Yes, something simple. Scott – How would platform work with the river fluctuating so much? Corey – Need to look at average level and only useable certain times of the year. A lot of sites will be high enough so would be above water line even in times of high water. Scott – Bad on the fish to pull it up out of the water. Randy – Described a contraption they rigged up to capture the fish. Corey – Other options include a floating dock. Scott – Like the idea because it would accommodate more anglers. East Grand Forks' floating docks are a good example. Dennis – Lot of good ideas in Winnipeg as to how to deal with fluctuating water levels.

Red Lake River Greenway Planning – Helen Cozzetto, MN DNR

Helen – The LCMR proposal was submitted by communities along the Red Lake River, on March 28. Communities include East Grand Forks, Fisher, Crookston, Red Lake, Thief River Falls, St. Hilaire, and the Red Lake Band of Chippewa. The proposal was for inventory of the river system, land use, existing infrastructure, improving boat facilities, and suggesting acquiring new boat facilities, fish habitat, angler spots, and a long range plan to garner community support for Greenway development along the Red Lake River. Drawn up as a 10-year plan. Interest in ecological restoration and looped trails systems between the communities along the Red Lake River and how and if it would be possible using rail beds. Need lobbying from the communities to start to lobby the LCMR so some of the money comes to this area.

Other Issues

Corey – Questions about signage (passed around copy of signage requirements for Minnesota and North Dakota). Question about motorized vehicles in the Greenway, three wheelers and motorized wheelchairs. Steve – Must be some terminology if it is for that purpose then it is permissible. Earl – GF City code states something like personal mobility equipment is allowed, not sure if EGF is the same but codes are very similar. Steve – DNR has specific signage and I think North Dakota is going to adopt the same signage for North Dakota side parks so everything is universal. Getting into the hard-surface trail, I think you follow federal regulations. Corey – There are rules as far as colors and use of Braille. Slope and length of trails could be indicated on trailhead signs. Steve – Signage issues to work out but should be uniform on both sides. Like the idea of indicating slope. Can put that on the Agenda for one of the upcoming meetings.

Next meeting: May 14, 2002

Minutes submitted by Ben Ehreth, Greenway Specialist
City of Grand Forks