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Park Trend Data
Although swimming is not presently offered in Isanti County this statistic may be helpful in the future if swimming facilities are a consideration.

Figure B1. Visitor Data Trend Graphs, Park and Planning Guidelines, Fogg, 1992.
Visitor Data Trends

Activities at a given recreation area vary over the year with cool weather (spring and fall) high in sightseeing, hiking, fishing; fall, hunting; and summer, in much of the U.S., high in picnicking, water skiing, boating and swimming.

Length of stay in day-use areas averages 3 to 5.1 hours with parks closer to peoples’ homes, the visitors stay a shorter length of time, three to four hours. A typical state park user may experience a five to six hour stay, sightseeing only about 3.2 hours. Sundays average one-half hour longer than the rest of the week.

Length of stay for camping is three days and two night. (Although a camping is not presently offered in Isanti County this statistic may be helpful in the future if camping facilities are a consideration.)

Numbers of day-use visitors per car vary between Sunday, 3.3; all other 3.0; spring, 2.8 to 3.0; summer 3.0 to 3.6; and fall, 2.6 to 3.0.

Peak-use night for camping is Saturday -- approximately 10 to 20 percent more than Friday.

The average day-use party size has been declining steadily over the last several years from 6.7 in 1971 to 4.35 in 1977 (4.06 on week days and 4.80 on weekends). This is higher than the average car capacity --3.3. There was a steady decline in the number of people per car from a high of 4.0 in 1965 to a low of 2.82 in 1979. A major change to the current figure of 3.3 people per car occurred in 1980. It is projected that this figure will level off at approximately 3.3 to 3.5 people per car. The average picnic party size is steadily declining and now is six.

Park satisfaction increases with age.

Transportation is a significant limitation to teenagers’ attendance for parks at greater than walking/biking distance from their homes.

The major reason people do not attend parks is the availability of time. Over 90 percent of all people who say they would like to attend parks more often do not do so because, according to them, the do not have the time.

Visitor Data Trends Continued

Wildlife viewing is a year-round activity which usually peaks when the objects viewed are present in their greatest numbers (the migratory season for each species).

There are ten activities which account for most recreation time for “natural-type” park users: camping, fishing, hiking, picnicking, relaxing, sightseeing/pleasure driving, swimming, sunbathing. In addition, wildlife viewing (birds, animals, plants) is strongly involved both as a primary and secondary activity. (Although swimming and public camping is not presently offered in Isanti County these statistics may be helpful in the future if swimming and camping facilities are a consideration.)

In the teenage bracket the activities rank in this order: sunbathing (19.4%); swimming (15.3%); biking (10.3%); picnicking (8.9%); hiking (8.3%); sightseeing/pleasure driving (6.6%); camping (5.9%); relaxing (5.5%); fishing (4.8%); nature walk (4.8%).

In the 20-29 age bracket the activities rank in this order: sunbathing (43.5%); nature walk (33.3%); camping (31.0%); sightseeing/pleasure driving (28.9%); biking (28.2%); swimming (26.8%); picnicking (26.0%); relaxing (23.2%); hiking (22.7%); fishing (16.3%).

In the 30-44 age bracket the activities rank in this order: camping (42.5%); fishing (38.9%); relaxing (38.2%); hiking (37.0%); swimming (36.6%); picnicking (36.5%); sightseeing/pleasure driving (33.1%); nature walk (28.6); biking (25.6%); sunbathing (15.7%).

In the 45-64 age bracket the activities rank in this order: fishing (33.7%); biking (33.3%); relaxing (29.7%); hiking (26.0%); picnicking (25.4%); nature walk (21.4%); sightseeing/pleasure driving (20.7%); swimming (19.6%); sunbathing (19.4%); camping (17.6%).

In the 65+ age bracket the activities rank in this order: nature walk (11.9%); sightseeing/pleasure driving (10.7%); fishing (6.3%); hiking (6.1%); relaxing (3.4%); picnicking (3.2%); camping (2.6%); biking (2.6%); sunbathing (1.9%); swimming (1.8%).

APPENDIX C:
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PROCESS
INTRODUCTION

The Isanti County Parks and Recreation Plan (Parks Plan) includes: a parks and recreation inventory, goals and policies, financial support, benefits and management, maintenance and protection sections. This appendix is one of three appendices of the report and covers the public engagement process, the results of two public workshops and administrative questionnaires.

The public engagement process for the Parks Plan paralleled a similar effort with Isanti County Active Living (ICAL), a local organization that is part of the national Active Living by Design program of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The focus of the ICAL project was to identify bicycle connections between the County Parks and Recreation holdings, the Cities of Isanti, Cambridge and Braham and significant regional recreational opportunities.

Isanti County (along with the City's of Isanti, Cambridge and Braham) through the ICAL project, have identified the following goals for integrating physical activity into daily life:

1. Develop and maintain effective partnership to promote physical activity
2. Increase community awareness of the health and other benefits of active living
3. Increase access to and availability of diverse opportunities for physical activity
4. Enhance policy and organizational supports for physical activity
5. Improve built and natural environments to support active living

The public engagement process, as shown in the figure C1, began with the creation of the Isanti County Steering Committee and included three major phases: a research phase, a documentation phase and an analysis phase. The Steering Committee included community members from the Isanti County Parks and Recreation Commission, County Commissioners, Township Boards, local organizations and citizens at large. Efforts were made to have as diverse of a steering committee as possible. Steering committee diversity provides needed insight into multiple perspectives and opinions from people in the County. The role of the steering committee was to provide insight and guidance to the Center for Rural Design for both the Parks Plan and the ICAL project.

The research phase included four steering committee meetings, inventory of the natural resources and rural character and Public Workshop 1. The Steering Committee discussed the mission of the Parks Plan, significant and potential locations for park land expansion, likes and dislikes of the Parks Plan, financing, inter-jurisdictional collaboration and much more. Natural resources and rural character maps, show in figures 5 and 6, were used for inventory and analysis in both the steering committee meetings and in Public Workshop 1.
The Natural Areas Map shows areas within the County that have quality environmental integrity\(^1\). The Rural Character Map shows areas within the County that are visually pleasing. Public Workshop 1 focused on obtaining broad community values on natural resources and rural character, the Parks Plan’s purpose, services, and areas of significance.

The documentation phase included: results from Public Workshop 1 and the Comprehensive Planning process (figure C12a), a Steering Committee meeting, administrative questionnaires and Public Workshop 2. Public Workshop 1 and the Comprehensive Plan community input results provided insight into the importance and thrust of the Parks Plan in Isanti County. The steering committee meeting reviewed the results and helped to shape the format and activities for the second public workshop. Public Workshop 2 used the results of the previous workshop to provide a platform from which new questions were developed. This workshop focused on the prioritization of the community values and asked the community members to come to consensus about numerous issues. Similar to Public Workshop 1, a series of administrative questionnaires were presented to the County Commissioners, the Park Board and the Township Board. These questionnaires asked willing participants ques-

---

\(^1\) Environmental integrity reflects a state of the environment wherein air, water, and biologic systems function adequately to be self-sustaining. In this state the environment can also provide services that sustain human health and well-being (Steve Roos, Center for Rural Design, 2007).
tions about the mission, jurisdictional interest and finance of the Parks Plan.

The analysis phase included Public Workshop 2 documentation, two steering committee meetings, development of the Parks Plan and presentation of the Plans Plan to the Parks and Recreation Commission and the County Commissioners. The Steering Committee reviewed the results from Public Workshop 2. The public workshop results, administrative questionnaires and steering committee feedback was then combined, analyzed and interpreted in the creation of the Parks Plan. The Steering Committee worked hand in hand with the Center for Rural Design and reviewed the majority of the report.

The following is documentation from the public workshops and administrative questionnaires.

Figure C2. Image of Public Workshop One Participants, Tracey Sokolski. 2007.
Public Workshop 1 of the Parks Plan was the first of two public workshops. Both workshops were integral to the planning process and as such had separate exercises and results. The intent of Public Workshop 1 was to obtain broad community values on the natural resources and rural character of Isanti County, the Park Plan’s purpose, existing and proposed services and areas of significance. The Workshop utilized natural resource and rural character analysis maps to educate the public about their place in the world and to gain insight into areas of significance. The Natural Areas Map, shown in figure 5, shows areas within the County that have quality environmental integrity. The Rural Character Map, shown in figure 6, shows areas within the County that are visually pleasing.

The following are the descriptions and results of the four exercises for Public Workshop 1:

**Exercise 1: The Big Picture!** The intent of this exercise was to broadly determine what matters to individual community members. Each table of community members was given two maps: the Natural Areas and the Rural Character Map, and was asked to rate the importance of each to their quality of life in Isanti County. The results, as shown in the figure C3, suggest that the participating community of Isanti County values both rural character and natural areas. Rural character and natural areas were scored separately on a scale of 1-5 (1 being low, 5 being high). The results suggest that natural areas are more significant that rural character but the spread is so small that it is of little significance.

**Public Workshop 1: Exercise One Results.**

How important are natural areas and rural character to your quality of life in Isanti County? (1-5 points scored individually)

![Bar Chart](image.png)

Figure C3. Public Workshop One - Exercise One Results, CRD, 2007.
Exercise 2: One Size May Not Fit All! The intent of this exercise was to determine areas that are important to the community members and/or that may not work with the Community member’s quality of life values. Community members received three dots for the Natural Areas Map and three dots for the Rural Character Map. They then placed the dots on areas that mattered to them as related to the maps and explained their place selection on an attached sheet.

The areas of significance for the Natural Areas Map, located in figures C5, suggest an accumulation of dots along the Rum River Corridor, the Cedar Creek Natural History Area, a chain of lakes in the southeast (around Upper and Lower Birch Lakes), the Wildlife Management Areas (WMA) to the northwest, the area surrounding Mud Lake and the area by Little Stanchfield Lake. The areas of significance for the Rural Character Map, located in figures C6, suggests the Rum River Corridor, the area surrounding Green and Spectacle Lake, the area surround North and South Stanchfield Lakes, the northwest WMA, a large area in the north of the County, a stretch of highway on State Highway 65, an area in the central part of the County by Mud and Little Stanchfield Lake and various areas in the southeast portion of the County.

Exercise 3: OUR Great Outdoors! The Park’s Plan can serve many purposes and provide varied services based on the values of the citizens. The community members were asked: what should the purpose of the Isanti County Parks Plan be? They then rated the importance of that purpose on a scale of 1-5 (1=lowest, 5=highest).

The results of Exercise 3, shown in figure C7 shows that preserving and protecting the environmental resources ranked highest for the purpose of the Parks Plan at 4.60 out of 5.00 points. Protecting recreation and scenic resources could arguably be tied for second at around 4.37 points. And, preserving and protecting historic and cultural resources ranked last at 3.90 points.

Exercise 4: Living and Playing in Isanti! The Parks Plan can provide many services and opportunities for a wide range of activities. The community members were asked: what services do you currently use and what new services will attract you to the Isanti Park System? They then filled out a short questionnaire that asked about the corridors and site-specific activities and facilities that they participate in and use.

The results for Exercise 4, shown in figures C7-C11, consists of existing and proposed corridors and site-specific facilities. Walking and biking facilities are the most significant existing corridor facilities ranking in at 20 votes. Hiking facilities rank second at 12 votes.
The Natural Areas map identifies areas that have significant value to support environmental quality and health in Isanti County.

Natural areas do not represent pristine wilderness — they represent, in relative terms, those areas that provide ecological function and are somewhat less impacted by human activity. Therefore, they need careful consideration in planning for the future.

This map is based on six features:
- Natural Area Size (contiguous areas of forest, brushland, grassland, & wetland),
- Core Forest,
- Land Cover Coincidence (potential coincidence between pre-settlement vegetation and current land cover),
- Sites of Significant Biological Diversity identified by the MNDNR,
- Shoreland Protection Zones and Buffer Areas around water bodies
- Human Disturbance (degree of disturbance from human land use).

**Natural Resource Quality Ranking**

- Lower Relative Quality
- Moderate
- Higher Relative Quality

**Isanti County**

- County Parks, WMA, U of M
- Roads and Streets
- Input from Workshop 1
- Areas of Interest

**Figure C5. Significant Natural Areas Map, CRD, 2007.**
Rural Character
Isanti County, MN

The Rural Character map identifies areas that have significant scenic value related to the natural areas and farming practices that fundamentally define the rural landscape.

While the perception of rural character can vary between individuals, in general, it is defined as the presence of both natural features and agriculture blended in a complex and interesting visual pattern.

Rural character can be assessed as a combination of two broad factors:
- Landform Complexity – represented by the shape of the land in the form of hills, valleys, knolls, and gullies.
- Landcover Complexity – represented in the form and character of the things that sit on the land such as woodlots, pastures, wetlands, and farmsteads.

Analysis was performed at a scale of 40 acre (approximate) units.

Figure C6. Significant Rural Character Areas Map, CRD, 2007.
River corridor facilities are third at 8 votes. Canoeing and skiing ranked at approximately 5 votes.

The most proposed corridor facility are bike trails with 23 votes. Walking trails ranks second at 11 votes. General trail and paved road shoulders for biking ranked third at 7 votes.

The picnic areas are the most used existing site-specific facility are the at 19 votes. All season lake access ranked second as a existing site-specific facility.

The most proposed site-specific facilities are public swimming beach (13 votes), picnic area (12 votes), fishing piers (7 votes), public access on fishing lakes (6 votes) and frisbee golf (5 votes).
Public Workshop 1: Exercise Four Results
Existing Corridor Facilities

Public Workshop 1: Exercise Four Results
Proposed Corridor Facilities

Figure C8. Public Workshop One - Exercise 4, Existing Corridor Facilities, CRD, 2007.

Figure C9. Public Workshop One - Exercise 4, Proposed Corridor Facilities, CRD, 2007.
Public Workshop 1: Exercise Four Results
Existing Site Facilities

Figure C10. Public Workshop One - Exercise 4, Existing Sites, CRD, 2007.

Public Workshop 1: Exercise Four Results
Proposed Site Facilities

Figure C11. Public Workshop One - Exercise 4, Proposed Sites, CRD, 2007.
Public Workshop 2

Public Workshop 2 of the Parks Plan is the second of two public workshops. Both workshops were integral to the planning process and as such had separate exercises and results. The intent of Public Workshop 2 was to report on the results of Workshop 1, the public engagement results of the on-going Isanti County Comprehensive Plan (as shown in figure C12a) process and to prioritize the thrust of Parks Plan. Public Workshop 2 featured four continuums that focused on funding priorities. Community members first formed groups and then reviewed and responded to the continuums separately. The groups then compared their results and came to consensus.

The following are the descriptions of the results of four continuums and one dot-macrac exercise at the Public Workshop. The pie charts in figures C12-C15 represents the results from the group consensus (top chart) and the accumulated individual results (bottom chart).

Continuum 1. New Land Acquisitions and Development of Existing Facilities Continuum

There are many ways to allocate the limited funds for the Parks Plan. Community members were asked if they would like to see funds allocated for new land acquisitions, development of existing facilities or both?

Results between the group and the individual results were very similar. New land acquisition ranked 60% in comparison to developing existing facilities at 40%.

Figure C12. Public Workshop Two - Continuum 1 - Team and Individual Results, CRD, 2007.
The second question focused on rural / agricultural and urban / suburban assets and issues. Of the rural and agricultural assets preservation of land, open space and the preservation of agricultural land ranked in the top three. Development of agricultural fields ranked first among the issues of rural / agriculture. Of the urban and suburban assets parks and lakes, trails open space and hometown atmosphere ranked in the top three. Of the urban and suburban issues unplanned growth ranked in the top three.

The fourth question ranked recreation and tourism assets. Of the top ten potentials a variety of non-motorized trail systems ranked first for each District. Parks Plan additions ranked second. Preservation of natural resources, swimming and lake/river recreation are ranked within the top ten.

The fifth question ranked potential comprehensive plan topics. Of the top six ranked topics, environmental protection, preservation and maintenance of natural resources and trails ranked highly.
Continuum 2. Parks and Development of Connecting Trails Continuum

If funds are allocated for new land acquisition for the Parks Plan would community members like to see funds allocated for new parks, connecting trails or both?

The results from Continuum 2 had very similar findings for both the parks and the development of connecting trails. Parks ranked 60% in comparison to 40% for the development of connecting trails.

Continuum 3. New Parcels and Existing Park Land Expansion

If funds are allocated for new park land acquisition for the Parks Plan would community members like to see funds allocated for new parcels, existing park land expansion or both?

The results from Continuum 3 had very similar findings for both the parks and the development of connecting trails. Expanding existing park land ranked at 60% in comparison to 40% for creating new parks.
Continuum 4. Passive Parks and Active Parks

If funds are allocated for new facility development for the Parks Plan would community members like to see funds allocated for passive parks (picnic shelters), active parks (ball and soccer fields) or both?

The results from Continuum 4 had wide ranging findings for passive and active parks. Passive parks ranked 80% in comparison to 20% for active parks.

Figure C15. Public Workshop Two -Continuum 4 - Team and Individual Results, CRD, 2007.

Figure C16. Image of Public Workshop Two Participants, Tracey Sokolski, 2007.
**Dot-macracy Exercise**: In addition to the 4 continuum exercises community members used a dot-macracy exercise to vote on potential facilities that the Parks Plan should invest in. This exercise consisted of one sheet with forty facility options and the participants having three dots for voting. A swimming beach ranked the highest with 13 votes. Protected wildlife areas ranked second at 12 votes. Walking and hiking trails ranked third at 9 votes. Connective trails for non-motorized biking / hiking ranked fourth with eight votes.

**Public Workshop 2: Dot-macracy Exercise**

Potential Facilities

---

Figure C17. Public Workshop Two - Potential Facilities Dot-macracy - Team and Individual Results, CRD, 2007.

Figure C18. Image of Public Workshop Two Participants, Tracey Sokolski, 2007.
Public engagement for the Parks Plan included a steering committee, two public workshops and three administrative questionnaires. The administrative questionnaires were presented to the County Commissioners, Park and Recreation Commission and Township Boards to gain insight into the interest and financing of the Parks Plan.

**The County Commissioner Questionnaire**
The County Commissioner questionnaire included questions about the principles, mission, facilities and finance of the Parks Plan. The following tables show each question and the results.

The results of question one state that special-use facilities such as swimming area, picnic and playgrounds ranked highest at an average of 5.0 out of 5.0 points as the purpose of the Parks Plan. Protecting the scenic resources ranked second at 4.33 points. Preserving and protecting historic and cultural resources ranked third at 4.0 points. Preserving and protecting environmental resources and providing recreation resources opportunities ranked fourth at 3.67 points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Commissioners Questionnaire: Question One</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principles &amp; Mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Isanti County’s recreation/open space system plan can serve many purposes and provide varied services based on the values of the citizens.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What should the <strong>purpose and mission</strong> of the Isanti County Park System be? Please rate the importance of that purpose on a scale of 1-5 (1=lowest, 5=highest).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preserving and Protecting Environmental Resources</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.67</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preserving and Protecting Historic and Cultural Resources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the Scenic Resources</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Recreation Resource Opportunities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Swimming Area, Picnic and Playground</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C19. County Commissioners Questionnaire - Question One, CRD, 2007.
Question two focused on finding insights into facilities and services that the Parks Plan should support. The question and results are shown below. Of the eleven choices for facilities and services, picnic facilities and hiking trails ranked highest at 4.0 out of 5.0 points on average. Bathroom and swimming facilities ranked second at 3.67 points on average. Bike trails connecting between parks and/or communities ranked third at 3.33 points on average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Facilities</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom Facilities</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Facilities</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Piers / Docks</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Trails Within Parks</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Trails Connecting Between Parks and/or Communities</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking Trails</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Trails</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature / Interpretive Programs (self-guided?)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Learning Areas</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C20. County Commissioners Questionnaire - Question Two, CRD, 2007.
Question three of the County Commissioners questionnaire sought insight into the financing of the Parks Plan. Out of all of the County’s responsibilities the park funding ranked 2.83 out of 5.0 points. Funding for the park system would be more available if matching funds from federal and state sources are identified and available (4.33 out of 5.0 points). Development of existing (undeveloped) parkland ranked highest (4.0 out of 5.0 points) of services that would require funding support from the County’s budget. Acquisition of new land as reserves for the future ranked second at 3.67 on average out of 5.0 points. Maintenance of current facilities ranked third at 3.00 points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Commissioners Questionnaire: Question Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3:</strong> Isanti County has a wide range of services it provides to its residents all of which require funding support from the County’s budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County responsibilities, how much of a priority is funding the park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would funding for the park system be more available if matching funds from federal and state sources are identified and available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Acquisition of new land as reserves for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· New facilities on existing park land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Maintenance of current facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Development of Existing (undeveloped) Parkland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Linking Parks by a Trail System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Other?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the most appropriate mechanisms for funding the Isanti County Park System?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C21. County Commissioners Questionnaire - Question Three, CRD, 2007.
**Isanti County Parks and Recreation Commission**

The Isanti County Parks and Recreation Commission was asked to fill out a short questionnaire in relation to the Parks Plan. The questionnaire covered issues about the principles, mission, appropriate County provided facilities and the finance of the Parks Plan. The following are the results of the questionnaire.

The principles and mission of the Parks Plan provides insight into the Parks and Recreation Commission’s values and advised direction. Out of the fifteen sub-topics, recreation opportunities for daily activity in close proximity to home and travel ranked highest with 4.40 out of 5.0 points. Preserving open space and water-based recreation ranked 4.2 out of 5.0 points. Providing recreational opportunities for group gatherings ranked 4.0 out of 5.0 points. And protecting water quality, enhancing the apparent quality of life and attracting tourism, new residents and economic development ranked 3.80 out of 5.0 points.

---

### Park Board Questionnaire Results: Question One

#### Principles & Mission

1. Isanti County’s recreation/open space system plan can serve many purposes and provide varied services based on the values of the citizens.

What should the purpose and mission of the Isanti County Park System be? Please rate the importance of that purpose on a scale of 1-5 (1=lowest, 5=highest).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preserving and Protecting Environmental Resources, for example:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* protecting water quality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* providing wildlife habitat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* preserving open space</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preserving and Protecting Historic and Cultural Resources for example:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* protecting historic farmsteads and other cultural sites</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* protecting historic rural schools and other structures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* providing historic and cultural interpretation/education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protecting the Scenic Resources, for example:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* preserving Isanti County’s rural character</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* protecting land values</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* enhancing apparent quality of life</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* attracting tourism, new residents, and economic development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Providing Recreation Resource Opportunities for example:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* for daily activity and exercise close to home</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* to participate in sports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* to travel from one place to another (e.g. bike trails)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* for group gatherings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* for water-based recreation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure C22. Parks and Recreation Commission Questionnaire - Question One, CRD, 2007.
The second question, shown in figure C23, was based on County supported facilities. Out of the 12 choices (including the “other” category) bike trails within parks ranked highest with 4.4 out of 5.0 points. Connective bike trails and hiking trails ranked second with 4.2 out of 5.0 points. Swimming and bathroom facilities ranked third with 3.8 out of 5.0 points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Facilities</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom Facilities</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Facilities</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Piers / Docks</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Trails Within Parks (Mountain Bike Trails?)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Trails Connecting Between Parks and/or Communities</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking Trails</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Trails</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature / Interpretive Programs (self-guided?)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Learning Areas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C23. Park Commission Questionnaire - Question Two, CRD, 2007.
The third question of the questionnaire focused on the priority and finance of the Parks Plan. Out of all of the County’s responsibility the Parks and Recreation Commission ranked the Parks Plan at 3.6 out of 5.0 points. If the Parks Plan received matching funding the Parks and Recreation Commission ranked County funding for the Parks Plan at 4.0 out of 5.0 points. Out of four ways to allocate funds, development of existing (undeveloped) parkland ranked highest at 4.5 out of 5.0 points. New facilities on existing parkland ranked third and maintenance of current facilities ranked fourth. Bike trails and linking parks by trails were suggestions for other ways funding should be allocated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Board Questionnaire Results: Question Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3:</strong> Isanti County has a wide range of services it provides to its residents all of which require funding support from the County’s budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In comparison to other County responsibilities, how much of a priority is funding the park system?</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would funding for the park system be more available if matching funds from federal and state sources are identified and available?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How should available funding be allocated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Acquisition of new land as reserves for the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· New facilities on existing park land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Maintenance of current facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Development of Existing (undeveloped) Parkland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking Parks by Trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remediation fund will exist for about two more years. State cigarette tax previously a largely dedicated to parks, now is primarily in general fund.

Figure C24. Park Commission Questionnaire - Question Three, CRD, 2007.
Township Boards

The Isanti County Township Boards were asked to fill out a short questionnaire in relation to the Parks Plan. The questionnaire covered issues about the principles, mission, appropriate County provided facilities, finance of the Parks Plan and Township Parks. The following are the results of the questionnaire:

The principles and mission of the Parks Plan provides insight into the Township Boards’ values and advised direction. Of the four categories, preserving and protecting environmental resources ranked highest at 5.0 out of 5.0 points. Protecting scenic resources ranked second with 4.4 out of 5.0 points. Preserving and protecting historic and cultural resources ranked third with 3.8 out of 5.0 points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township Questionnaire Results: Question One</th>
<th>Township Individual</th>
<th>Township Individual</th>
<th>Township Individual</th>
<th>Township Individual</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Isanti County’s recreation/open space system plan can serve many purposes and provide varied services</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What should the purpose and mission of the Isanti County Park System be? Please rate the importance of that purpose on a scale of 1-5 (1=lowest, 5=highest).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving and Protecting Environmental Resources, for example: protecting water quality, providing wildlife habitat and preserving open space.</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving and Protecting Historic and Cultural Resources, for example: protecting historic farmsteads and other cultural sites, protecting historic rural schools and other structures and providing historic and cultural interpretation/education.</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the Scenic Resources, for example: preserving Isanti County’s rural character, protecting land values, enhancing apparent quality of life and attracting tourism, new residents, and economic development.</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Recreation Resource Opportunities, for example: for daily activity and exercise close to home, to participate in sports, to travel from one place to another (e.g. bike trails), for group gatherings and for water-based recreation.</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Township Individual</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C25. Township Board’s Questionnaire - Question One, CRD, 2007.
The second question, shown in figure C26, was based on County supported facilities. Out of the twelve options (plus the “other” category) hiking trails ranked highest at 4.0 out of 5.0 points. Picnic, bathroom and swimming facilities ranked second with 3.6 out of 5.0 points. Bike trails within parks ranked third with 3.4 out of 5.0 points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Township Individual</th>
<th>Township Individual</th>
<th>Township Individual</th>
<th>Township Individual</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Piers / Docks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Trails Within Parks, (Mountain Bike Trails?)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Trails Connecting Between Parks and/or Communities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking Trails</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Trails</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature / Interpretive Programs (self-guided?)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Learning Areas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C26. Township Board’s Questionnaire - Question Two, CRD, 2007.
The third question of the questionnaire focused on the priority and finance of the Parks Plan. Out of the responsibilities that the County has the Township Boards ranked the Parks Plan as 3.2 out of 5.0 points of priority. Forming a Township / County partnership to fund the parks within respective jurisdictions ranked 1.75 out of 5.0 points. If the Parks Plan received matching funding the Township Boards ranked reciprocal County funding for the Parks Plan at 2.75 out of 5.0 points. Out of five ways to allocate funds acquisition of new land as reserves for the future ranked highest at 4.0 out of 5.0 points. New facilities on existing parkland ranked second at 3.6 out of 5.0 points. Maintenance of facilities and development of existing parkland ranked third at 3.2 out of 5.0 points.

The fourth question focused on the values and perceptions of the township parks. Out of the board members who responded from Springvale, Dalbo and Oxford Townships only Springvale has a park that is owned by the County. Out of the responding Townships only Springvale is planning on expanding it’s park system. The Township parks have differing roles as compared to the County’s Parks Plan. All of the responding townships were interested in a collaborative relationship with the County in regards to the Parks Plan.
Financial

**Question 3:** Isanti County has a wide range of services it provides to its residents all of which require funding support from the County’s budget. Please rate the following on a scale of 1-5 (1=lowest, 5=highest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financing the Park System</th>
<th>Township Individual</th>
<th>Township Individual</th>
<th>Township Individual</th>
<th>Township Individual</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In comparison to other County responsibilities, how much of a priority is funding the park system?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should townships form partnerships with Isanti County to fund parks within the township’s jurisdiction?</td>
<td>1 Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would funding for the park system be more available if matching funds from federal and state sources are identified and available?</td>
<td>2 Not Sure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of new land as reserves for the future</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New facilities on existing park land</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of current facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Existing (undeveloped) Parkland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking Parks by a Trail System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other?</td>
<td>Bond Referendum</td>
<td>How many Parks do we need?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C 27. Township Board’s Questionnaire - Question Three, CRD, 2007.
**Question 4:** The some of the Townships within Isanti County own and operate parks within their jurisdiction. These parks offer a wide range of services to the residents of the township. To gain an understanding of the best relationship between County facilities and Township facilities please answer the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township Park System</th>
<th>Township Individual</th>
<th>Township Individual</th>
<th>Township Individual</th>
<th>Township Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Township</td>
<td>Springvale</td>
<td>Springvale</td>
<td>Springvale</td>
<td>Dalbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your township own and/or operate any parks within its jurisdiction?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Township gives money to Springvale County Park</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Township does not but the County does.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your township plan to create a park system or expand the existing system?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The County is expanding the park system.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Currently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the purpose and role of township parks the same as that of county parks?</td>
<td>Township doesn’t have a park.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would a collaborative approach to providing recreation opportunities best meet the needs of county and township residents?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The County should do Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the contact information for the person best suited to provide information to inventory your township’s parks and recreational facilities?</td>
<td>Steve Nelson</td>
<td>No Township Parks in Springvale</td>
<td>Kathleen Benson, Clerk 763-689-4964</td>
<td>We have nothing to inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td>The park A Walgo is very seldom used - a waste of tax monies. Kids use it as a gathering place to drink and make deals. Parks are not the answer.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good luck with the future of planning of Isanti County’s Park- they need some guidance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION

The Isanti County Parks and Bike Path Master Plan was sponsored by Isanti County Active Living (ICAL) and funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. ICAL is a local organization that is part of Active Living by Design (ALbD), a national program of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. ICAL and ALbD strives to promote the increase and enhancement of physical activity choices within peoples’ daily lives. ALbD recommends the following 5 strategies for comprehensive promotion of active living:

1. Preparation – fostering partnerships throughout the region.
2. Promotion – communicating the message of active living.
3. Programs – creating programs that heighten demand for physical activity in the community.
4. Policy Influence – influence decisions that impact policies and programs that support active living.
5. Physical projects – develop parks, trails, bikeways and sidewalks to promote physical activity.

The project approach, time line, public engagement and Steering Committee was combined with the 2007 Isanti County Parks and Recreation Plan (Parks Plan) update effort because of the similar nature and potential synergy between the two plans. The Master Plan is an extension of a larger ICAL project to facilitate active living for the citizens of Isanti County. Isanti County (along with the Cities of Isanti, Cambridge and Braham) through the broader ICAL project, have identified the following goals for integrating physical activity into daily life:

1. Develop and maintain an effective partnership to promote physical activity.
2. Increase community awareness of the health and other benefits of active living.
3. Increase access to and availability of diverse opportunities for physical activity.
4. Enhance policy and organizational supports for physical activity.
5. Improve built and natural environments to support active living.
**Active Living by Design (ALbD) Principles**

Active living is a way of life that integrates physical activity into daily routines. The goal is to accumulate at least 30 minutes of activity each day. Individuals may achieve this by walking or bicycling for transportation, exercise or pleasure; playing in the park; working in the yard; taking the stairs; and using recreation facilities.

In committing to promoting and increasing physical activity, these principles will guide future interdisciplinary collaboration in the active living movement.

1. Physical activity is a behavior that can favorably improve health and quality of life.

2. Everyone, regardless of age, gender, language, ethnicity, economic status or ability, should have safe, convenient and affordable choices for physical activity.

3. Places should be designed to provide a variety of opportunities for physical activity and should accommodate a wide range of individual preferences and abilities.

4. Development patterns should encourage mixed uses, compact design, and a variety of transportation choices.

5. Buildings should be designed and oriented to promote opportunities for active living, especially active transportation.

6. Transportation systems, including transit, should provide safe, convenient and affordable access to housing, work sites, schools and community services.

7. Parks and green space, including trails, should be safe, accessible and part of a transportation network that connects destinations of interest, such as housing, work sites, schools, community services and other places with high population density.

8. Municipalities and other governing bodies should plan for ongoing interdisciplinary collaboration, promotion of facilities, behavioral supports, policies that institutionalize the vision of active living, and routine maintenance that ensures continued safety, quality and attractiveness of the physical infrastructure.

9. Community governing and planning processes should address the multiple impacts of the built environment and transportation choices on residents’ ability to be physically active.

*Active Living Essentials, Active Living by Design, online reference, September, 2007.*
Strategies and Goals

This Master Plan is part of a broader project of the ICAL. The broader project maintained five organizing strategies. The charge of the Master Plan is to explore and expand on the following two of the five strategies:

- Increase access to and availability of diverse opportunities for physical activity.
- Improve built and natural environments to support active living.

The goal of the Master Plan is to illustrate opportunities for active living in Isanti County. Much of the focus of the Parks Plan is on the inventory and prioritization between acquisition and development of park holdings within the County. The majority of the park holdings in the County and the Cities have numerous high quality facilities and trails that provide opportunities for a range of activity engagement choices. Isanti County citizens have limited choices to move between parks, schools, communities and places of work in the areas external to the park holdings and cities. As such, the Master Plan focuses on the suitability for bicycling in the County and the potential bike routes between the County’s park holdings.

Figure D1. Paved Shoulder on a Street in Isanti County, Joe Crocker, 2007.
PROCESS

The project process (shown in figure D2 below) began with the creation of the Steering Committee and included three major phases: a research phase, a documentation phase and an analysis phase. The Steering Committee was comprised of community members from the Isanti County Parks and Recreation Commission, County Commissioners, Township Boards, local organizational representatives and citizens at large. Efforts were made to have a diverse Steering Committee to provide needed insight into multiple perspectives and opinions from people in the County.

The research phase included four Steering Committee meetings, inventory of the natural and rural character resources and Public Workshop 1. The Steering Committee discussed the mission of the Parks Plan, significant and potential locations for expansion, likes and dislikes of the Parks Plan, financing, interjurisdictional collaboration and much more. Natural and rural character resource maps were used for inventory and analysis in both the Steering Committee meetings and in Public Workshop 1. The Natural Areas Map shows areas within the County that have environmental integrity. The Rural Character Map shows areas within the County that are visually pleasing. Public Workshop 1 focused on identifying broad community values on natural resources and rural character, the Park Plan’s purpose,

1. Environmental integrity reflects a state of the environment wherein air, water, and biologic systems function adequately to be self-sustaining. In this state the environment can also provide services that sustain human health and well-being (Steve Roos, Center for Rural Design, 2007).

![Figure D2. Master Plan Approach and Time Line, Center for Rural Design, 2006.](image-url)
within the County that are visually pleasing. Public Workshop 1 focused on identifying broad community values on natural resources and rural character, the Park Plan’s purpose, services, and areas of significance.

The documentation phase included: data from Public Workshop 1 and the Comprehensive Planning process, a Steering Committee meeting, administrative questionnaires and Public Workshop 2. Public Workshop 1 and the Comprehensive Plan community input results provided insight into the importance and thrust of the Parks Plan in Isanti County. The Steering Committee Meeting reviewed the results and helped to shape the format and activities for the second Public Workshop. Public Workshop 2 used the results of the previous Workshop to provide a platform from which new questions were developed. This workshop focused on the prioritization of the community values and asked the community members to come to consensus about numerous issues. Similar to Public Workshop 1, a series of administrative questionnaires were presented to the County Commissioners, the Park Board and the Township Board. These questionnaires asked willing participants questions about the mission, jurisdictional interest and finance of the Park Plan.

The analysis phase included Public Workshop 2 documentation, two Steering Committee meetings, development of the Parks Plan and presentation of the Parks Plan to the Parks and Recreation Commissioners and the County Commissioners. The Steering Committee reviewed the results from Public Workshop 2. The Public Workshop results, administrative questionnaires and Steering Committee feedback were then combined, analyzed and interpreted in the creation of the Parks Plan. The Steering Committee worked hand in hand with the Center for Rural Design and reviewed each section of the report.
Biking Suitability in Isanti County

The Biking Suitability in Isanti County Map, as shown in figure D3, highlights the range of biking opportunities on the existing roads of Isanti County and connections to regional amenities. This map was developed by Mr. Joe Crocker, Steering Committee Co-Chair and Mrs. Jean Crocker and illustrated by the Center for Rural Design.

Continuous bike travel and regional connectiveness, bike connections between towns and linkages between the Isanti County Park holdings are of significance when analyzing biking suitability.

Continuous bike travel and regional connectiveness provide serious and weekend bikers safe options when choosing to navigate for a variety of purposes. According to the map and highlighted in blue, red and green there are a significant amount of suitable biking roads in the County. Interstate 47 in the west of the County allows moderately suitable and continuous biking from the north to the south. County Road 5 in the southern part of the County provide moderately suitable to suitable continuous biking from east west. County Road 28 connects with County Road 5 and offers a highly suitable connection to Sherburne County and the town of Zimmerman. County Road 3 and 13 in the northern part of the County offer suitable to highly suitable continuous biking from east to west.

Bike connections between towns provide more navigation choices for the Isanti County Community. The three cities in Isanti County, Braham, Cambridge and Isanti are linked by State Highway 65. State Highway 65 and 95 are minimally suitable according to the Biking Suitability Map. An alternative to biking illegally on a highway is to take lower traffic roads or a segregated bike path. Isanti County is currently working on connecting Isanti and Cambridge by a paved bike path that runs parallel to the railroad. A connection between Cambridge and Braham is suggested to be established also. County Road 34 and 36 and State Highway 13 connects Cambridge with Braham.

The north-south connection is not direct but offers a opportunity to travel by bike between these two towns. Another options for connecting Cambridge and Braham is a segregated path parallel to Interstate 65.

Linkages between the Isanti County Park holdings provide opportunities for increased use of the parks. The Biking Suitability Map shows the park holdings and suggests that there potentially could be connections between them. The Bike and County Park Road Connections Map utilizes the suitability continuum and recommends bike route linkages between parks.
**Active Living**

**Isanti County Parks and Bike Path Master Plan**

The Isanti County Parks and Bike Path Master Plan (Master Plan), as shown in figure D4, presents recommended routes that are best suited to connect the Isanti County Parks and Recreation Plan. Of priority to the development of the Master Plan is:

1. Suitability of the existing roads to support safe biking.
2. Connection to the county parks
3. Connection to the cities of Isanti, Cambridge and Braham
4. Avoidance of State Highway 95 and 65.

The suitability of the existing roads to support safe biking was developed by Mr. Joe Crocker, Steering Committee Co-Chair and Mrs. Jean Crocker, both of whom are avid bikers in Isanti County. The suitability of the roads were based on the amount of daily traffic, the average speed of traffic, shoulder width and materiality and the level of safety perceived when biking on the roads.

Isanti County has 9 parks and is located with the vicinity of significant regional resources. The Master Plan provides a variety of bike path loops that may appeal to a diversity of bike riders.

Two railroad trails are proposed in the Master Plan; a segregated bike path that connects the town of Isanti to Cambridge and a segregated bike path that connects Cambridge to Braham. This city to city connection is important to the ALbD principles because the path would provide a more physically active choice of mode of travel between the cities for daily transportation and destination trips than vehicular modes. The bike path connecting the cities of Isanti and Cambridge is nearly ready for construction. The bike path connecting Cambridge and Braham is being planned. The Master Plan strongly encourages the establishment of segregated continuous bike travel because it is safer and more appealing to potential users.

The intent of the Master Plan is to provide safe continuous bike travel however, crossing and traveling on the State Highways 95 and 65 is unavoidable. The Master Plan strongly encourages designated bike lanes parallel to these roads, pedestrian crosswalks and traffic calming techniques. Bike lanes can be situated next to or integrated parallel to the road. Pedestrian crosswalks should be considered for the intersections where the bike path is proposed to cross the State Highways. Stop lights may be the most appropriate and safest technique for the secure passage of bikes and pedestrian across a highway. Other circumstances may call for a pedestrian bridge for safe passage of pedestrians and bikers. If the traffic speed is manageable a pedestrian crosswalk with flashing lights may be the most applicable. Traffic calming techniques are spatial barriers than discourage and intend to reduce traffic speeds. Plantings, medians, speed bumps, road bump outs and context sensitive fences are some examples of traffic calming techniques.

Master Plan 2008
Figure D3. Biking Suitability in Isanti County, Mr. and Mrs. Joe Crocker and the Center for Rural Design, 2007.
Isanti County Parks
and Bike Path
Master Plan

Isanti County Parks and Bike Path

- Highly Suitable - No Shoulder and Minimal Traffic
- Moderately Suitable - Wide Paved Shoulder
- Suitable - No Shoulder, Moderate Traffic
- Minimally Suitable - Wide Shoulder and High, Fast Traffic
- Not Suitable - No Shoulder and High Traffic
- County Parks
- Municipalities
- County Parks
- Planned Railroad Trail
- Potential Railroad Trail

Figure D4. Isanti County Parks and Bike Path Master Plan, Center for Rural Design, 2007.
CONNECTING BIKE ROUTES WITH CITIZEN LANDSCAPE PREFERENCES

As discussed previously as a component of the project process involved engaging with the citizens of Isanti County to clarify their environmental and aesthetic preferences throughout the county. These preferences identify their experiential and emotional connections to the landscape of the county as a whole and to places of special interest within the county. Identifying suitable biking opportunities that provide access to these special places enhances the goals of ALBD and the Isanti County Park Plan in a reciprocal fashion - bicycling opportunities encourage an active living lifestyle while, at the same time, they connect people with the landscape and places in the county they enjoy the most, strengthening their appreciation for preserving the rural character of Isanti County.

The Biking Suitability classifications identified on the map in Figure D3 were overlaid on a map of the county’s Natural Environment and Habitat Resources (Figure D5) and a map of the county’s Intrinsic Scenic Value (Figure D6). Both of these maps were used in the public participation process as the basis for identifying citizen values related to the landscape of the county.

The Natural Environment and Habitat Resources map encompasses all of the Isanti County Parks and MN DNR Wildlife Management Areas as well as other areas of significant environmental value. As illustrated in Figure D5, almost all of the identified significant environmental resources in the county can be accessed on at least one side by roads rated as suitable to highly suitable for bicycling.

The map of Intrinsic Scenic Value (Figure D6) combines the scenic value of both the natural areas of the county and the cultural landscape - farms, farmsteads, small communities - into what is broadly defined as ‘rural character’. While the natural areas in the county can provide enjoyable destinations for bicycle trips, the scenic value of the overall ‘rural character’ of Isanti County makes the trip to and from destinations a pleasurable experience. As illustrated in Figure D6, many of the roads rated as highly suitable for bicycling travel through some of the most scenic areas of the county.
Active Living

Connecting Bike Routes with the Isanti County Transportation Plan

This section will explore the relationships between a county-wide bicycle trail system and the Isanti County Transportation Plan.

Principles and Goals

Active Living by Design lists a set of guiding principles as presented earlier in this report. Several of these principles coincide with goals outlined in the Isanti County Transportation Plan.

For example, Goal 4 of the Isanti County Transportation Plan (2006-2030) identifies the need to support a multimodal transportation system that provides opportunities for choice in transit choices. This goal compliments ALbD Principle 4 that, in part, calls for encouraging the availability of transportation choices. Similarly, Goal 1 of the Transportation Plan calls for the continued creation and maintenance of safe and efficient transportation infrastructure that meets current and future needs while ALbD principles 7 and 8 address issues of design and maintenance that ensure safety, quality and attractiveness of the physical infrastructure.

Section 2.7.2 of the Transportation Plan identifies the role trails can and do play as a viable component of the transportation network that serves all forms of non-motorized transportation. In addition, it recognizes that some of this need can be integrated into the existing network partially alleviating the need for an entire and completely separate system of trails.

In Section 4.5 the Transportation Plan identifies several suggested future dedicated trails that could provide internal connections between the communities of Braham, Cambridge, and Isanti as well as connections to regional facilities outside of the county. Currently, work is under way to secure rights to an alignment for a dedicate trail between the cities of Cambridge and Isanti. Dedicated trail corridors offer several advantages, in particular, to recreational users. However, acquiring rights-of-way and building dedicated trails is an expensive and long-term process that will not be able to meet needs in the short-term or provide flexible and widely dispersed opportunities in the long-term. Providing these opportunities will require integrating bicycle transportation into overall roadway network. Section 4.5 recognizes this possibility but points out that the county does not presently have any policies with regard to building or designing trails on or adjacent to county roadways. Isanti County Active Living, in collaboration with other non-profits and citizen groups, should work with the county to outline a set of policies to guide the accommodation of bicycle traffic on the county’s roadway system.
Natural Environment and Habitat Resources
Isanti County, MN

The Habitat Resource model depicts areas that have significant potential to support rare or specialist species that require habitats of specific types, sizes and/or isolation from anthropogenic disturbance types. For purposes of this assessment, 'habitat' is defined as a surrogate for potential biological diversity which, in turn, represents the potential for a high level of environmental function. This assessment is based on five subcomponent models:
- Habitat Size (contiguous areas of forest, brushland, grassland, & wetland),
- Core Forest,
- Land Cover Coincidence (potential coincidence between pre-settlement vegetation and current land cover),
- Disturbance Regime (degree of disturbance from human land use),
- Sites of Significant Biological Diversity identified by the MNDNR.

Natural Resource Quality Ranking
- Lower Relative Quality
- Moderate
- Higher Relative Quality

Figure D5. Isanti County Parks and Bike Path Master Plan and Natural Environmental Analysis Map, Center for Rural Design, 2007.
Intrinsic Scenic Value
Isanti County, MN

Intrinsic scenic value is derived from physical elements in the landscape, both natural and cultural, and the way they interact to create visually pleasing experiences. Scenic value can be assessed as a combination of two factors:
- Landscape Complexity defined as complexity in the shape of the surface of the land,
- Landcover Complexity defined as complexity in the form and character of the things that sit on the land.

**Intrinsic Scenic Value Rating**

- Lower Scenic Value
- Moderate Scenic Value
- Higher Scenic Value

Analysis was performed at a scale of 40 acre (approximate) units.

Figure D6. Isanti County Parks and Bike Path Master Plan and Intrinsic Scenic Analysis Map, Center for Rural Design, 2007.
Figure D7. Future Traffic Volumes, Isanti County Transportation Plan, SRF, 2007.
Accommodating Bicycle Traffic Within the Isanti County Transportation Plan

Integrating bicycle transportation into an existing roadway system requires an understanding of two primary aspects of the roadway system:

- the current and expected traffic volume on components of the roadway system,
- appropriate design parameters to integrate bicycle traffic with motor vehicle traffic.

This document can not incorporate an exhaustive analysis of the relationship between bicycle traffic and motor vehicle traffic on the full extent of roadway types within Isanti County. Nor can it provide a complete set of design guidelines to integrate bicycles into the county’s system. There are many resources available that delve into these issues in depth, in particular, MN/DOT Bicycle Facility Design Manual (2007), along with several guides from the US Department of Transportation, AASHTO, ITE, and others. A list of available resources will follow at the end of this section.

This document can, however, provide a preliminary examination of the possible fit between bicycling and the projected future traffic volumes on county roads as well as an overview of key design issues.

Traffic Volumes

Bicycling on high speed, high traffic roads raise both perceived and real concerns for cyclist safety. Experienced cyclists understand the risks associated with high speed traffic, have developed skills and confidence in negotiating these roadways in a manner that mitigates most of the risk, and often appreciate the expediency of travel on well maintained and direct routes. On the other hand, less experienced cyclists will often find these roadways intimidating - a process that can turn perceived safety risks into real ones. However, the principle factor in this perceived concern is traffic volume rather than traffic speed alone. Relatively lightly travelled roads can provide comfortable routes for bicycle transportation.

In a predominantly rural area such as Isanti County, the roadway system will have a significant number of roads with a functional class rating of minor collector or above and even most of the local roads will be designed for relatively high speed. As such, accommodating bicycle traffic only on low speed roadways is not feasible. Therefore, an appropriate system of bicycle routes that utilize existing roadways will assess suitability based on traffic volumes.

In the process of creating a new transportation plan the consultants working with Isanti County, SRF Consulting Group, Inc., developed projections for future traffic volumes (Figure D7). It is anticipated that within the life of the transportation plan there will be only two
Major roadways that will have ADT counts above 10,000:

- Mn 65 travelling north/south through the county connecting the communities of Braham, Cambridge, and Isanti,
- MN 95 travelling east/west through the county connecting Cambridge to Interstate 35 in the east and Princeton in the west.

While these routes offer immediate connectivity and good facility, the Biking Suitability map (Figure D7) ranks these routes as minimally suitable due to their high traffic volume. In addition, a short portion of County 5 passing through the City of Isanti and the western portion of County 8 connecting to Zimmerman are rated as possibly reaching an ADT exceeding 10,000. These roads are currently ranked as moderately suitable for bicycling due to wide paved shoulders. These stretches may need to be ranked differently in the future if the projected traffic volumes are reached.

There are several stretches of roadway, principally in the southern half of the county and associated with the communities of Cambridge and Isanti, that could have ADT counts between 5,000 and 10,000. These roadways are currently ranked as moderately suitable for bicycling due, again, to wide paved shoulders.

The remaining roadways in the county are expected to remain below an ADT count of 5,000 in the future, with most remaining below 2,000 and many in the northern half of the county staying below 500. All of these roadways are ranked as suitable or highly suitable for bicycling, principally due to low traffic volumes. Many of these roadways do not incorporate paved shoulders but their low traffic volumes allow bicyclists to use the traffic lane most of the time. These roads could be significantly enhanced for bicycling with the addition of paved shoulders as maintenance or opportunity allows.

The bicycle routes indicated in Figure D4 that connect the communities of Braham, Cambridge, and Isanti with each other and the county park system have been selected primarily to provide a more enjoyable bicycling experience through the rural landscape of the county by avoiding major highways. The majority of this system is on roadways expected to remain under 2,000 ADT. The primary exception is the unavoidable designation of a segment of MN 95 from County 45 in Cambridge to County 57 approximately 6 miles west. This segment is necessary to connect Cambridge with Springvale and Dalbo county parks. This segment of roadway does incorporate wide paved shoulders and can accommodate bicycle traffic. It is recommended that other necessary upgrades be added to this segment, including striping and signage to add to bicyclist safety. These and other design guidelines are covered in detail in reference manuals and handbooks listed at the end of the next section.
Overview of Design Guidelines

As mentioned, this document will not attempt to present bicycle transportation design guidelines in depth. Many very thorough discussions of this topic are available, some of which are listed at the end of this section. This section will be limited to an overview of issues related to accommodating bicycles on rural cross section roadways.

Of particular interest to planning the bicycle network is Chapter 2, Section 6 ‘Bicycle Network Planning’ in Mn/Dot Bicycle Facility Design Manual (pp. 40-51). This section outlines the design process including the factors that determine the existing bicycling conditions along a proposed route that offer opportunity or create barriers. This information aids in the selection of possible corridors, as those outlined in the previous section. The need to work strategically with other agencies and departments is also identified.

The following strategies are critical in implementing a bicycle network plan:

- Prioritize capital improvements. Identify those projects that are easily implemented or those projects that address a critical need such as a high crash location.
- Identify potential funding sources, timelines, and maximum and minimum qualifying project amounts.
- Communicate progress with transportation partners to help implement plan including county, city, business owners, schools, universities, colleges, and residents.

In the next section, the manual points to another significant component of the planning process - bicyclist and motorist education. Many of the primary safety concerns with bicycles and motor vehicles sharing the same roadway are related to recognizing the presence of each other and understanding the operational parameters of each mode of transportation. These concerns are best addressed through an education process that is both formal, e.g., bicycle safety training through the school system and private organizations, and informal, e.g., appropriate signage that clearly identifies the potential presence of bicyclists to motorists. Minnesota’s Share the Road bicycle safety education program (www.sharettheroadmn.org) offers more detailed information and educational materials.

Chapter 4 of the Mn/Dot manual deals extensively with on-road bikeway design including issues specific to rural systems. The chapter examines bikeway types with a section focused on paved shoulders and shared lanes, both of which are common approaches to accommodating bicyclists on rural roadways. The table below (Figure D8), extracted from the manual, details the relationship of ADT to motor vehicle speed in determining appropriate design parameters for paved shoulders and shared lanes, as well as shared-use paths and wide outside lanes. Similar information is provided in Figures D9 & D10, facing page, prepared by the Federal Highway administration. These tables relate design parameters
to an additional issue - that of cyclist skill level. The information on the following page is extracted from the report, ‘Guidelines for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities in Texas’ by the Texas Transportation Institute addresses the same design issues of suitable size related to speed and volume.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motor Vehicle ADT (2 Lane)</th>
<th>&lt;500</th>
<th>501-1,000</th>
<th>1,001-2,000</th>
<th>2,001-6,000</th>
<th>6,001-10,000</th>
<th>&gt;10,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle ADT (4 Lane)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,001-4,000</td>
<td>4,001-10,000</td>
<td>10,001-20,000</td>
<td>&gt;20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motor Vehicle Speed</th>
<th>25 mph</th>
<th>31.75 mph</th>
<th>35 to 40 mph</th>
<th>45 mph and greater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS = 4”  or SL</td>
<td>PS = 4” or WOL</td>
<td>PS = 4” or WOL</td>
<td>PS = 4” or WOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS = 4”  or SL</td>
<td>PS = 4” or WOL</td>
<td>PS = 4” or WOL</td>
<td>PS = 4” or WOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS = 4”  or SL</td>
<td>PS = 4” or WOL</td>
<td>PS = 4” or WOL</td>
<td>PS = 4” or WOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS = 4”  or SL</td>
<td>PS = 4” or WOL</td>
<td>PS = 4” or WOL</td>
<td>PS = 4” or WOL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See discussion in Section 4-3.1 regarding rumble strips on 4-foot shoulders.

PS = Paved Shoulder, SL = Shared Lane, SUP = Shared-Use Path, WOL = Wide Outside Lane

Figure D8. Table 4-2: Bikeway Design Selection for Rural Cross Section, ‘Guidelines for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities in Texas.’

Recommended Roadway Design Treatments and Widths for Accommodating Bicyclists

Group A Bicyclists (Highly Skilled Adults) on Rural Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Motor Vehicle Operating Speed</th>
<th>Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>less than 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adequate sight distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 mph</td>
<td>12’ (SL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 40 mph</td>
<td>14’ (WC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50 mph</td>
<td>4’ (SH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50 mph</td>
<td>4’ (SH)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES

WC numbers represent “usable width” of outer lanes measured from the lane stripes to the edge of the gutter pan. If no gutter pan is provided, add 1 ft (0.3 m) minimum for skid distance from face of curb.

BL numbers indicate minimum width from curb face. The bicycle lane stripes should be at least 4’ (1.2 m) from the edge of the gutter pan or drainage area.

WC and SL numbers represent “usable widths” of outer lanes, measured from the lane stripes to the edge of the pavement if a smooth, firm, level shoulder is adjacent. If rough or dropped pavement edges or a soft shoulder exists, add 1 ft (0.3 m) minimum for skid distance from the edge of the pavement.

KEY

SL = Shared Lane
WC = Wide Curb Lane
SH = Shoulder
BL = Bicycle Lane
n/a = not applicable
1 mph = 1.61 km/h

Figure D9. Recommended Roadway Design Treatments and Widths for Accommodating Bicyclists, ‘Guidelines for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities in Texas.’
### Roadway Design Treatments and Widths for Accommodating Bicyclists

**Group B/C Bicyclists (Average Skill Adults/Children) on Rural Roads**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Motor Vehicle Speed</th>
<th>Average Annual Traffic (AADT) Volume</th>
<th>Adequate Sight Distance</th>
<th>Inadequate Sight Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>less than 2,000</td>
<td>4' (SH)</td>
<td>4' (SH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,000 - 10,000</td>
<td>4' (SH)</td>
<td>4' (SH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>over 10,000</td>
<td>4' (SH)</td>
<td>4' (SH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 m/h</td>
<td></td>
<td>4' (SH)</td>
<td>4' (SH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 40 m/h</td>
<td></td>
<td>4' (SH)</td>
<td>4' (SH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50 m/h</td>
<td></td>
<td>6' (SH)</td>
<td>6' (SH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50 m/h</td>
<td></td>
<td>6' (SH)</td>
<td>8' (SH)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NOTES

- PC numbers represent "usable width" of outer lanes measured from the lane stripe to the edge of the gutter pan. If no gutter pan is provided, add 1 ft (0.3 m) minimum for sight distance from face of curb.
- BL numbers indicate minimum width from curb face. The bicycle lane stripe should be at least 4' (1.2 m) from the edge of the gutter pan or drainage area.
- PC and SL numbers represent "usable width" of outer lanes, measured from the lane stripe to the edge of the pavement. If smooth, firm, level shoulder is adjacent, if rough or dropped pavement edges or a soft shoulder exists, add 1 ft (0.3 m) minimum for sight distance from edge of the pavement.

#### KEY

- SL = Shared Lane
- WC = Wide Curb Lane
- SH = Shoulder
- BL = Bicycle Lane
- n/a = not applicable
- 1 m/h = 1.81 km/h

---

Figure D10. Roadway Design Treatments and Widths for Accommodating Bicyclists, *Guidelines for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities in Texas.*
Shoulders

Shoulders may also be used in some areas for bicycles. In general, this approach is most appropriate for consideration in rural areas or on low-volume roadways. A shoulder width of at least 1.2 m (4 feet) should be considered if bicycle use is anticipated. Additional width is desirable, especially if motor vehicle speeds are above 60 km/h (35 mph) on the roadway; if there are high volumes of trucks and buses, or if other unique conditions exist. Figure 13 provides an example of a cross section with the shoulders designed for use by bicycles. As illustrated in Figure 13, special consideration should also be given to the clearance from the pavement edge to the plane of the foreslope of a ditch, guardrail, or roadside sign. Considerations should also be given to ensuring that the shoulder pavement quality is good.

- Guidelines for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities in Texas, Texas Transportation Institute

Figure 10. Examples of Bike Lanes on Rural Roadway

Figure D11. Examples of Bike Lanes on Rural Roadway, ‘Guidelines for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities in Texas.’

Figure 13. Example of Bike Use of Shoulders

Figure D12. Example of Bike Use of Shoulders, ‘Guidelines for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities in Texas.’
As part of the continued efforts to support broad opportunities for healthy lifestyles for residents of the county, Isanti County Active Living should actively pursue partnerships with the both the private and public sectors. These partnerships can not only provide the vehicle for advancing the planning and implementation of the physical system of designated bike-ways and dedicated trails but also provide the foundation for a bicycle training and education program that will foster the use of the facilities with the residents of Isanti County.

Isanti County Active Living can continue existing programs and initiate new program that accomplish the following goals:

- Continue support for the land acquisition and construction of the dedicated Cambridge /Isanti bicycle trail.
- Assist in seeking opportunities to begin planning and acquisition of a similar corridor between Cambridge and Braham.
- Actively encourage Isanti County to create a bicycle friendly infrastructure program as part of its highway and road upgrade plans, in particular, where those facilities provide connection between communities and key recreational opportunities within the County as well as in neighboring counties.
- Continue work with communities in the County to also improve bicycle infrastructure where it provides connection to key features within the community such as schools, shopping districts, and parks.
- Work with schools and private sector groups to initiate or expand bicycle education programs that inform the public of the health and environmental benefits of non-motorized transportation as well as encourage the safe use of bicycles through rider training programs.
Reference Guides

Following is a list of useful references topically organized and with website addresses, where possible, for easy access. While certainly not all inclusive, this list provides a broad base of information to facilitate bicycle system planning and design as well as recommendations on public engagement in the process and bicycle safety education.

Planning Guides:


http://www.cyclecraft.co.uk/digest/cfi_jaf.pdf

Making Cycling Irresistible: Lessons from the Netherlands, Denmark, and Germany. John Pucher and Ralph Buehler, Rutgers University, November 2007.
http://policy.rutgers.edu/faculty/pucher/Irresistible.pdf

http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bikeped/design.htm

http://www.bicyclinginfo.org/rd/planning.cfm#data

Minnesota Bicycle Transportation Planning and Design Guidelines. Minnesota Department of Transportation, June 1996.
http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/docs/mnbikeguide.pdf

http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/projects/bike.htm
The Economic Impact of Bicycling in Wisconsin. Bicycle Federation of Wisconsin and Wisconsin Dept. of Transportation.
http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/projects/bike.htm

Design Guides:


http://www.dot.state.ny.us/cmb/consult/hdmfiles/hdm.html

http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/PED_BIKE/bike/bsol_plan.htm

http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/PED_BIKE/bike/bsol_plan.htm

http://www.bike.cornell.edu/pdfs/localbike.pdf

http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/BIKEPED/planproc.shtml

http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/projects/bike.htm


Many other technical, planning, and design guides are available on the U.S. Dept. of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration website at:
http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/PED_BIKE/bike/bike_sol.htm