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Background

The Rum River Regional Trail as proposed in the Met Council approved Master Plan from 2013 is an eight to ten-foot wide bituminous trail approximately 20 miles long that follows the Rum River corridor from the confluence of the Rum and Mississippi Rivers’ in the City of Anoka north to the Anoka/Isanti County border, as shown in Figure A.

The trail corridor starts at the City of Anoka’s Akin Riverside Park, near the confluence of the Rum and Mississippi Rivers. From there the trail follows the river through Anoka, Andover, Ramsey, Oak Grove and St. Francis, connecting to Rum River Central and Lake George Regional Parks. In the City of Francis the trail currently crosses CSAH 24/Bridge Street at grade and continues through Rum North County Park. On the north side of the park, the trail currently travels east on 235th Avenue to County Road 72/Rum River Boulevard where it follows the County Road 72/Rum River Boulevard road corridor east and north to the Isanti County line.

This master plan amendment proposes to change the at grade crossing at CSAH 14/Bridge Street to a trail underpass and realign the trail north of the county park to be adjacent to the Rum River.

The proposed Rum River Regional Trail is anticipated to be around 20 miles long once it is complete.
Boundaries and Development Concept

Boundary changes for the proposed amendment are limited to within the City of St. Francis. The first change is a trail underpass at Bridge Street located just south of the Bridge Street bridge, immediately adjacent to the Rum River on the east side. The second change is a proposed trail realignment located north of Rum River North County Park adjacent to the east side of the Rum River as highlighted on Figure B.

Bridge Street Underpass

The proposed trail underpass will address the safety concerns related to the current at-grade crossing of Bridge Street, which is a two-lane, 40 mile per hour roadway. The proposed project will reroute the regional trail to traverse under the vehicular bridge for Bridge Street as show in Figures C-E. This construction includes a retaining wall to stabilize the slope and allow the 10-foot wide paved trail to meet ADA requirements. Once under the bridge the trail will connect to the existing regional trail within Rum River North County Park.

Since this section of new trail will fall within the 100-year floodplain, the intent is to construct the trail in such a way that there is a net zero impact to the floodplain.

As shown in Figure C, the at-grade crossing at Bridge Street will be removed and a new 10-foot wide paved trail will be built and extended about 500 LF east along the south side of the road. This will
connect into an existing trail just east of 3480 Bridge Street. While this segment is intended to be built at the same time as the trail underpass, it is not part of the regional trail system and does not qualify for regional funding and therefore would be constructed using other County funding sources. Since the trail underpass is already located within County owned land, no acquisition costs will be required. The bridge underpass and trail project is scheduled to be completed in the next 3-5 years, depending on available funding.
Figure D  Graphic illustration of trail underpass concept looking north

Figure E  Graphic illustration of trail underpass concept looking south
There are no changes planned for the existing Rum River Regional Trail through Rum River North County Park. On the north side of the park, the trail connects to an existing residential development. The current regional trail alignment travels east along 235th Avenue to County Road 72/Rum River Blvd. This was constructed as part of the residential development and no regional funds were used for its construction and therefore should be considered for realignment without issue.

**Trail Realignment**

The proposed realignment would utilize an existing eight-foot wide paved city trail that runs west along 235th Avenue and Quay Street north to a future redevelopment area. This trail segment already exists and can be used as is, but it is the County’s desire to widen the trail to ten feet. Widening the trail is anticipated to occur within the existing road right of way so no acquisition costs will be required.

As shown in Figure F, from Quay Street the proposed 10-foot wide paved trail will make its way toward the Rum River and follow adjacent to the river north to tie into Isanti County’s trail system. The Rum River is a designated as a Scenic River by the State and as such has setback and visual impact requirements. Therefore, the trail is proposed to be constructed back from the bluff between 75-100 feet to prevent visual and bluff impacts. There is a minimum of two proposed scenic overlooks and rest stops along the trail.

**Proposed overlooks will provide views of the Rum River.**
Development Concept for Rum River Regional Trail Master Plan Amendment

Figure F
The intent with these areas is that they will not intrude on the scenic visual quality from the river. With input from the residence along 244th and coordination with Isanti County, there are two routes proposed for the northernmost section of this trail, as shown in Figure G. This will allow the most flexibility in developing the trail connection with Isanti County. The preferred alignment is near the river, but because that will require Isanti County to obtain easements, Anoka and Isanti County are proposing an alternate route that will be used if Isanti County is unable to obtain an easement. This alternate route will traverse east and connect to an existing residential development. Input from the residents determined that the trail through this development will be a signed on-street bike route east to Verdin Street. At Verdin Street, a 10-foot wide grade-separated paved trail is proposed to follow adjacent to Verdin Street to meet with a proposed Isanti County trail.

Currently, there are only 5 parcels that the trail realignment is proposed to cross. Based on 2020 assessed values, the total acquisition costs are estimated to be $4,300,000 and in discussions with the City of St. Francis on the trail plan, the City will help to implement the trail as part of the overall development project(s) for the area and could require developer(s) to grant the County a minimum of a 20’ trail easement over the trail corridor, keeping acquisition costs to a minimum. If for some reason, this scenario could not occur, the County would be required to purchase either real property or easements from individual land owners. If that is the case, market rate appraisals will be conducted on any parcel impacted by the proposed trail development. There is not a schedule for acquisition at this time, as the County is hoping to avoid that by working with the City of St. Francis as the area develops. More information about the parcels can be found in Table 1 of the Appendix.

The proposed trail alignment is more than suitable for the trail. While the existing alignment along Rum River Boulevard (CSAH 72) is located adjacent to two MPCA monitored sites, the proposed alignment contains only construction stormwater monitored residential development sites, which will not impact the trail. One parcel adjacent to the trail proposed along Bridge Street project is being monitored for water quality and hazardous waste for an industrial facility that was demolished several years ago, but does not impact the trail.
The development concept for the trail realignment will help provide a connection between Anoka County and Isanti County, as well as help tie the northeast corner of St. Francis to the rest of the city. In addition, the City of St. Francis’ draft 2040 Comprehensive Plan identifies two neighborhood park search areas along the route of the proposed trail realignment. The plan also shows the local existing and proposed trails that would connect to the realigned regional trail. Refer to the Exhibit A in the Appendix for more information on the City’s draft comprehensive plan map for the area. Although there is no identified schedule for completion as this time, it is anticipated that the trail will be constructed as the development occurs, which is projected to occur within the next 10-20 years.

**Wayfinding**

The wayfinding signage plan for the trail will provide users with orientation and location information to access amenities and services along the trail route. Wayfinding typically includes the following:

**Trailhead Kiosks**

These types of signs are provided at trailhead locations where parking lots, restrooms and trail access is provided. These signs give trail users a view of the overall regional trail alignment, local trail connections and other destinations, amenities, and parks and trails that can be accessed from the trail. These signs also include trail rules and etiquette, as well as trail partner information.

**Intersections Signs**

These types of signs are located at intersections where a decision is to be made and provide much of the same information as the Trailhead Kiosk, but in a smaller format and on a single post. These signs also contain a location marker for easy map orientation.

**Confirmation Signs**

These types of signs are located along the regional trail, but specifically several hundred feet after a decision point to provide confirmation to user they are still on the regional trail.
Directional Signs
These signs are used when further clarification is needed to direct users to certain regional or local destinations or amenities.

Wayfinding outside of Anoka County jurisdiction will be dependent on partner agency concurrence and approval. Locations for these wayfinding signs have not been determined yet but will follow the locations and standards outlined above.

Development Costs
Design, engineering and construction related costs anticipated with this master plan amendment is approximately $3.7 million. If the County is unable to work with the City of St. Francis in securing trail easements for the realignment, acquisition costs could be as much as $4.3 million (based on 2020 assessed property values).

Demand Forecast
According to the Outdoor Foundation’s *Outdoor Participation Report, 2018*, 49% of the U.S. population participated in an outdoor activity at least once in 2017, this is slightly higher than 2016. Outdoor participation among Hispanics increased by an average of 1% of the past five years and among Asians by .9%.

Of the five most popular outdoor activities by participation rate, three of the five involve trails. Running and jogging were the most popular activities among Americans both by number of participants and number of total outings. Walking for fitness was the most popular crossover activity, meaning 45.8% of all outdoor participants also walked.

These national trends show the overall enthusiasm for trails and is indicative of the recreational demand for trails nation-wide.

Looking at the metropolitan regional area, according to the Metropolitan Council’s 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan, the metropolitan region is expected to gain more than 888,000 residents between...
2010 and 2040, for an estimated total population of more than 3.7 million people by 2040. Anoka County’s population is expected to grow approximately 30-35% between 2010 and 2040, with a total population estimate of 440,420 in 2040. The City of St. Francis’s population is anticipated to grow from 7,218 in 2010 to 12,600 in 2040. There are still many large developable tracts of land within the City that will allow the City to continue to grow. The increase in population throughout the metropolitan area, Anoka County and the City will increase demand for recreational trail opportunities. This increase is illustrated by the significant increase in regional trail use in Anoka County between 2013 and 2018. The 2013 visitor estimate was approximately 959,000 while 2018 was approximately 1,562,704 visits, which is a 38% increase in use in just five years.

### Conflicts

The proposed projects within this master plan amendment will have relatively few conflicts with the existing land use or proposed projects in the area. The proposed realignment will be included in the design of the residential development keeping conflicts to a minimum. Typical vehicle/pedestrian conflicts at intersections or street crossings will occur, but by following the Minnesota Uniform Traffic Control Device standards those types of conflicts should minimized.

The biggest conflict for the Rum River Regional Trail is the current at-grade crossing at Bridge Street. The installation of the trail underpass, as proposed in this master plan amendment, will eliminate this conflict. An additional conflict is the trail underpass construction within the 100-year floodplain in order to pass under the vehicular bridge. Design of the trail will include mitigation for floodplain impacts, so the net impacts to the floodplain is zero.

Lastly, the Rum River is a state designated Wild and Scenic River, therefore, trail development will be designed to avoid being visually intrusive in the landscape and the County will work with the Department of Natural Resources to address any concerns they may have about the design prior to construction.
Public Services

There are no non-recreational public services or facilities required to accommodate the proposed trail. Public services, such as parking, restroom facilities and drinking fountains are located within Rum River North County Park.

Operations

The Anoka County Ordinance dated January 30, 2018 regulates parks and trails under the jurisdiction of Anoka County. The County will continue to encourage safe and enjoyable user experiences through education, monitoring and collaboration between the Park Services Unit, local police departments, and the Anoka County Sheriff’s Office.

Current practice partners Anoka County with the local cities through either a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) to provide for the maintenance of regional trails. Typically, the MOU or JPA is executed prior to trail construction and outlines which agency is responsible for general routine maintenance and capital improvements of the trail.

The County is typically responsible for the routine maintenance of trails within regional or county park lands. This includes mowing, sweeping, plowing, clearing, debris removal, and patching for example. Outside of regional and county park facilities, the local cities are generally responsible for routine trail maintenance. Solid waste is typically collected from trash receptacles located along the trail at regular intervals as part of routine maintenance. Anoka County inspects trails annually and provides the capital improvements and long-term maintenance required, such as bituminous overlays, and trail reconstruction. Trail signage is provided and maintained by either the City or the County as determined in the MOU or JPA.

Annual maintenance costs for the existing and proposed trail once completed are estimated to be approximately $20,000. This includes funding for sign replacements, minor bituminous repair and crack-sealing. Revenue for the operation and maintenance of the trail comes from the Anoka County Parks Department’s annual operations and maintenance budget, which includes revenues from picnic shelter rentals, room rentals, programs, parks entrance fees and the County general fund. Supplementary funding is provided through the Regional Park Operations and Maintenance Grant Program.
Public Awareness

Public awareness is an important component of the regional parks and trails system. The County will partner with the Metropolitan Council on their regional-wide awareness program, their Parks Ambassador program, and provide information maps, websites, social media postings, publications and brochures in cooperation with Commute Solutions, the County's Transportation Management Organization (TMO).

Previous partnerships with the local cities and the County TMO resulted in a free bike/walk map for the entire County that is updated regularly. This map promotes the ease of access the regional parks and trails system and it provides education regarding health, wellness and outdoor recreation. Anoka County is continually updating and installing way-finding maps throughout the system.

While transit in the region is limited, the Anoka County Travelers Transit Line and Metro Mobility dial-a-ride services provide service for a minimal fee. These vehicles are equipped with bike racks for multi-modal access to the area.

Public Engagement and Participation

In developing an engagement plan for this master plan amendment, the County looked at the demographics within the City of St. Francis, Anoka County and Isanti County to determine underserved population groups with which to engage during the planning process.

Equity Analysis

First, in looking at age in the City of St. Francis, the City has been shifting from a younger population to an older population. In 2017, the American Community Survey show that the over 40 age cohort for the City has basically doubled since 1990. This helps support the basis for the Metropolitan Council's 2040 forecast¹ that by 2040 one in five residents of the regional will be 65 years or older. In addition, the City of St. Francis is anticipating a senior living facility to be developed within a half-mile of the subject trail. These projects will benefit people of all ages, but specifically children and older adults by providing the easy access to the river and a safe way to cross a high-speed road. This provides a basis to seek out older adults and seniors for engagement on these projects.

¹ Metropolitan Council Regional Forecast (June 2017)
The proposed trail projects are located within a census block where the percentage of those below the poverty line is at approximately 9.2\%, which is higher than the surrounding areas by a few percentage points, including Athens Township in Isanti County, which is 7.5\%. Since there is not regular transit service in the area, these projects can provide alternative mode for transportation from the residential areas to schools, commercial/business areas and other amenities in the City and region. The regional trail will provide better access the natural resource of the Rum River and Lake George Regional Park, which is a 2-4 mile bike ride from the project areas. For these reasons, the engagement plan should include populations below the poverty line and students unable to drive.

The racial and ethnic make-up of the City of St. Francis and Anoka County is primarily Caucasian, as shown by Figures H and I. These figures show that for the projects outlined in this master plan amendment, whites alone may benefit more when compared to other races, based on population numbers alone. For that reason, the County tried to reach out to some of the other population groups to receive input and feedback on the master plan amendment.

![Population by Race and Ethnicity in Anoka County](image)

**Figure H**

---

2 2013-2017 American Community Survey
3 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Metropolitan Council
Public Engagement Plan
During the planning process, a plan was developed to engage those identified above, partners and the general community in the development of this master plan amendment.

The goals for the engagement process were threefold; first, to build positive relationships with local communities and residents; build community ownership and understanding of the County’s planning process, and not only receive community input on the master plan amendment but make it easy for the public to participate. Engagement strategies were identified as:

**Build Relationships**
Work closely with local jurisdictions and community members and groups to start building relationships. Value differing opinions and listening creates trust which allows for meaningful input and feedback for everyone’s mutual benefit.

**Use a Variety of Engagement Methods**
Use a variety of engagement methods to make it easy for the community to participate. Community members can choose how, when and where they participate.

**Go to the People**
Go to local community events and provide opportunities to engage people that might not know about or typically participate in engagement activities.
By using the different three strategies for engagement, the County was hoping to be able to increase the number of people engaged and the diversity of those engaged to receive meaningful input on the projects and take the findings from the current engagement efforts to help inform future engagement efforts.

**Engagement Results**

Building Relationships with local partners is always important. This allows the planning process to be more collaborative in nature and give a voice to local, regional, state and national agencies.

Partners were identified early in the process and sent initial concepts of the trail changes for discussion. These partners included:

1. Isanti County
2. Athens Township (Isanti County)
3. Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
4. Army Corps of Engineers
5. Upper Rum River Watershed Management Organization
6. City of St. Francis

Isanti County provided input on the potential layout of the trail as it connects county to county. In developing the concept, it was determined that there should be two options for connecting to Isanti County. Figure G illustrates these two options. First, the preferred county to county connection, which is located closer to the river and second, an alternate route that is proposed to run along to 244th to CSAH 72/Verdin Street and connect to Isanti’s proposed trail at the county line. The alternate is proposed if Isanti County cannot negotiate with the landowner for an easement to make the connection near the river; if not, there is still a viable route to make a connection between the two counties. Athens Township was invited to comment on the plan. They had no comments but did offer support for the trail.

The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources provided input on the trail prior to and during the public engagement process and advised on potential impacts to Rum River as a Scenic River and
from a Public Water’s standpoint. The Army Corps of Engineers and the Upper Rum River Watershed Management Organization were provided an opportunity to comment on the project, although no comments were received.

The City of St. Francis has served as the main partner for this amendment as both proposed projects are within their jurisdiction. The County has worked closely with city staff to determine the feasibility of the underpass and the proposed trail realignment and how the trail route can be coordinated with the future development that will be occurring north of the county park. The City was also asked and provided a resolution of support for this master plan amendment.

The biggest issues identified in the planning process with partners were the requirements for the state designated Scenic Rivers, the potential floodplain impacts of the trail underpass and the potential need for a Public Water’s variance. These issues have been identified and are addressed in the development concept of this plan and are summarized below:

1. The trail realignment will be setback far enough to meet the required setbacks and any overlooks constructed will be minimal in nature and will blend with the surrounding landscape so as to avoid impacting views from the river to the landscape.
2. Impacts to the floodplain for the underpass will be mitigated as part of the project, so there will be an overall net zero impact to the floodplain.
3. A Public Waters Permit may be required for the underpass, but final determination will be made after plans and specifications have been created, but prior to construction.

In trying to build relationships with community groups, the County was able to participate in the Spring Gathering of Families, an American Indian Education Program, where the County was able to share the proposed projects and receive feedback. There were about 30 attendees and included seniors, adults, teens and children. Most attendees liked the projects, but a few attendees voiced concern about the trail being routed through their neighborhood and in their front yards along 244th. To help alleviate their concerns, the County worked with Isanti County to determine a preferred county to county connection closer to the river, so that ideally the trail will follow the river from Anoka County into Isanti County. But, because the preferred alignment depends on Isanti County obtaining a trail easement from a private land owner, both counties felt an alternate route east through the 244th neighborhood to the previous proposed trail connection should be considered. With this alternate and adjusting the concept to be an on-street bike route instead of a grade separated trail through the 244th neighborhood, the County felt this was the best way to achieve the county to county connection while addressing the concerns about the trail from the neighbors.
To engage with seniors and children in the area, as well as lower income populations, the County targeted the local library, grocery store and a fixed income senior housing development. While the County was unable to make a connection at the housing development, engaging seniors and adults with children at the library and grocery store provided additional support for the projects with no other feedback or concerns about the projects being voiced.

Since this involves trail projects, the County also reached out to several bike clubs in the metro area, including: Birchwood, Twin Cities Spoke, Major Taylor, Ramsey, Spoke-n-Folks, but no comments were received.

By using a variety of engagement methods, the County was able to engage many more people than normally engaged. Engagement methods included using our Plan Your Parks webpage to post information about the project and social media to advertise it and solicit feedback; attending local community events, just as the Spring Gathering of Families Dinner, a pop-up event at the local library and attendance at a local community festival. These different methods provide a variety of ways the community can participate in providing input and feedback on the projects.

The County utilizes a Plan Your Parks website (https://www.anokacounty.us/2932/Plan-Your-Parks) and social media to provide information on the projects and to help solicit input, since social media has the capacity to reach the largest number of people as opposed to the community and pop-up events, and it did. The social media posts about the projects reached 17,750 people, but only 77 people engaged with the post and provided feedback through reactions, sharing of the post or clicking through the links. Social media fundamentally lacks the one on one communication that is necessary to develop relationships and engage the public in a meaningful way. Staff participation in community and pop-up events, as well as building relationships with community groups is the best way to connect with a wide variety of people and provide that one on one communication and feedback. For example, when attending the American Indian Spring Gathering of Families, the County was able to connect with neighbors from the 244th neighborhood to learn they did not want the trail impacting their property, which caused the County to propose and on-street trail design for that low-density development area.

While social media posts may not provide the one on one dialog with the public, it does provide an easy way to communicate opinions. The County created a short three question survey to receive input on the projects through social media and at community pop-up events. The results are listed below in Figures J-L.
Figure J

Do You Feel Safe Crossing Bridge Street?

No

Yes

Figure K

The Bridge Street Underpass should be completed in what timeframe?

1-3 years: 78%
3-5 years: 4%
5+ years: 18%
While the County cannot attest to the demographics of those that participated in the survey, the results do show overwhelming support for the project. The first question, do you feel safe crossing Bridge Street, shows definitively that an underpass would help alleviate the fears of crossing Bridge Street. The second question regarding the timeframe to complete the project shows the overall importance of getting the underpass completed in a relatively quick timeline and the last question regarding scenic or direct routes, show the overwhelming desire for the trail to be rerouted to be more scenic in nature.

For the pop-up and community events, the majority of the public engagement participants were residence of St. Francis or nearby cities. The demographics were close to being split by gender with slightly more females than males; the majority of participants were adults, but it varied from young adults to seniors; and some teens and younger children provided input as well. Anecdotally, races engaged included American Indian, Asian and Caucasian.

Overall, the Go to People strategy was the most successful in receiving meaningful input from the community. The County was able to engage more than 400 people with this strategy and a few themes did emerge. A summary of those themes and how they are addressed in the plan are shared below:
1. Regarding the proposed underpass:
   a. Most seniors, adults and parents/adults with children:
      i. Expressed concern about crossing Bridge Street at grade. The safety concerns regarding the Bridge Street crossing are addressed through the underpass project.
      ii. Believe an underpass for Bridge Street will make it safer.
      iii. Thought the underpass should be constructed sooner than later.
   b. Some students did not see the at-grade crossing as an issue but did acknowledge that it could be a problem for younger children and older adults that move slower.
   c. A few adults wondered if a trail underpass what the best use of taxpayer dollars with all the other needs out there. While it may be the opinion of some taxpayers that these projects may not be what the County should be spending money on, the County believes the underpass to be a priority and is planning to implement the project within the next five years.
   d. One person questioned what happens during high water and if the trail will flood. Due to the nature of the underpass being next to the Rum River, flooding of the trail is possible. While hydrologic studies have not been conducted yet, a hydrologic study will be conducted prior to the design phase of the trail to determine the correct elevation for the trail for minimal flooding. If the trail does flood, trail users will be able to follow Bridge Street east to the round about at Rum River Boulevard, where crosswalks are available to cross the road.

2. Regarding the proposed change to the trail alignment:
   a. The majority of those engaged thought the proposal was a good idea.
   b. Some wondered why the County would “waste taxpayer money” on building trail in the middle of nowhere. When an explanation was provided that this is a planning document for the future and that construction would occur with future development, they understood and generally supported it.
   c. Some adult neighbors along the 244th development did not want the trail through their property, but other neighbors thought the trail would be a great amenity, so to compromise, an on-street bike route is proposed through this section, which will only be implemented if Isanti County is unable to make the county to county connection close to the river.
   d. A few of the female neighbors along 244th commented that it would be nice to be able to take the trail to the park and elsewhere in St. Francis.
Accessibility

Anoka County continually strives to provide equal access to all residents of Anoka County and the region. Park and trail use is open to any and all citizens. While there is a nominal parking fee in some of the regional parks, there is not a fee for trail use. This eliminates any economic barriers for trail users and since there are no regular transit routes in the St. Francis area, these trail projects become even more important to provide alternative transportation to vehicles. The County does provide the Anoka County Traveler Transit Link and Metro Transit’s Mobility Link for a minimal fee. Currently, all of the vehicles are equipped with bike racks so passengers wishing to bike on the trail could use Transit Link to preschedule a drop-off and return trip.

The proposed projects will conform to or exceed the standards mandated by the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The County does not currently offer programs related to or using the regional trails. Most trail related programs are offered on trails within a regional park.

Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area

While the Rum River Regional Trail does connect to the Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area (MRCCA) in the City of Anoka, the portion of the trail outlined in this amendment is in the City of St. Francis and therefore is not necessary to meet MRCCA requirements.
RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE APPROVAL AND ADOPTION OF THE RUM RIVER REGIONAL TRAIL MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT

WHEREAS, it is necessary and in the public interest for the County of Anoka to provide open space recreational facilities within the county; and,

WHEREAS, the County of Anoka has through studies and evaluations developed a park and trail development program which has been approved by the Metropolitan Council; and,

WHEREAS, the County of Anoka and the Metropolitan Council have designated a regional trail corridor through the cities of Andover, Anoka, Oak Grove and St. Francis; and,

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Council requires an accurate master plan for this regional trail corridor; and,

WHEREAS, the County of Anoka has worked with the City of St. Francis in a cooperative effort to locate and develop a regional trail corridor route through the city; and,

WHEREAS, the local city representatives have reviewed and commented on the master plan amendment and provided their own resolution of support:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Anoka County Board of Commissioners hereby adopts the Rum River Regional Trail Master Plan Amendment, a copy of which is on file in the office of the Anoka County administrator, and authorizes its submission to the Metropolitan Council for its approval so that the trail facilities will be eligible for future Metropolitan Council grant funding.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Metropolitan Council, Anoka County Parks Department and the local jurisdictions.

STATE OF MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF ANOKA

I, Rhonda Sivarajah, County Administrator, Anoka County, Minnesota, hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing copy of the resolution of the county board of said county with the original record thereof on file in the Administration Office, Anoka County, Minnesota, as stated in the minutes of the proceedings of said board at a meeting duly held on September 10, 2019, and that the same is a true and correct copy of said original record and of the whole thereof, and that said resolution was duly passed by said board at said meeting.

Witness my hand and seal this 10th day of September 2019.

[Signature]
Rhonda Sivarajah
County Administrator
CITY OF ST. FRANCIS
ST. FRANCIS, MN
ANOKA COUNTY

RESOLUTION 2019-31

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RUM RIVER REGIONAL TRAIL IN THE CITY OF ST. FRANCIS

WHEREAS, the County of Anoka is pursuing the development of a multi-purpose regional trail system that would link local and state trail systems, regional parks, and provide safe and convenient routes for non-motorized traffic to traverse the County, and

WHEREAS, in 2015, the Metropolitan Council adopted the 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan, which supports the implementation of corridors which provide access to high quality natural resources, regional parks, park reserves, and local areas of interest, and

WHEREAS, the proposed alignment of the Rum River Regional Trail Corridor would link together the cities of St. Francis and Athens Township in Isanti County and

WHEREAS, the Regional Trail Corridor is strategically located to provide pedestrian access to the recreational resources along its route.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the City of St. Francis, hereby offers its support to Anoka County in its effort to cooperatively develop the Rum River Regional Trail Corridor within the City of St. Francis.


APPROVED:

ATTEST:

Barbara I. Held, City Clerk

Steven D. Feldman, Mayor
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>% of trail impact on parcels</th>
<th>Total # of 2.5 acre lots/existing parcel</th>
<th>Total # of 2.5 acre parcels impacted by trail</th>
<th>SF of trail impact on 2.5acre developed lot</th>
<th>Total Acquisition Cost based on assessed value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>283424210001</td>
<td>SAINT FRANCIS</td>
<td>39.940000000000</td>
<td>27.82678737</td>
<td>15.976</td>
<td>4.44560755</td>
<td>193650.665</td>
<td>$ 445,396.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323424210033</td>
<td>SAINT FRANCIS</td>
<td>36.162777710000</td>
<td>30.20383091</td>
<td>14.46511108</td>
<td>4.369017692</td>
<td>190314.411</td>
<td>$ 437,723.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283424220001</td>
<td>SAINT FRANCIS</td>
<td>33.290000000000</td>
<td>18.33890709</td>
<td>13.316</td>
<td>2.442008868</td>
<td>106373.906</td>
<td>$ 244,659.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293424140002</td>
<td>SAINT FRANCIS</td>
<td>257.190000000000</td>
<td>29.35763487</td>
<td>102.876</td>
<td>30.20196045</td>
<td>1315597.4</td>
<td>$ 3,025,874.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293424340004</td>
<td>SAINT FRANCIS</td>
<td>32.505979940000</td>
<td>11.81266465</td>
<td>13.00239198</td>
<td>1.535928961</td>
<td>66905.0655</td>
<td>$ 153,881.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Estimated Acquisition Cost Developed Land**: $ 4,307,535.32

*Value is used based on an average of $250,000 ($2.30/SF) assessed value for developed homesteaded 2.5 acre parcel.