References

Kelly, Tim. 2010. Status of Summer Trail Use (2007-09) on Five Paved State Bicycle Trails and Trends Since the 1990s. Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Office of Management and Budget Services.

Marschner, F.J. 1974. *The original vegetation of Minnesota, compiled from U.S. General Land Office Survey notes* [map, scale 1:500,000]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station, St. Paul. (redraft of the 1930 original).

Minnesota Department of Administration, State Demographic Center. 2007. Annual estimates of city and township population, households and persons per household, 2000 to 2009 (dataset).

2007. Annual estimates of county population, households and persons per household, 2000 to 2009 (dataset).

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. 2011. Parks and Trails Legacy Plan, Parks and Trails of State and Regional Significance, A 25-year long-range plan for Minnesota.

. 2007. Trail Planning, Design and Development Guidelines.

_____.2006. Tomorrow's Habitat for the Wild and Rare: An Action Plan for Minnesota Wildlife.

APPENDIX A: Rare Species and Communities of Concern

The following list of species is drawn from the database of the Natural Heritage Information System of the DNR, Division of Ecological and Water Resources, within or near (within one mile) of the proposed trail search corridor. Species are classified as follows:

- SPC Special Concern
- THR Threatened
- END Endangered
- NON A species with no legal status, but about which the Division of Ecological and Water Resources is gathering data for possible future listing

Terrestrial Communities are listed because they represent high-quality habitats, but have no legal status.

	0.1	
Common Name	Scientific Name	MN Status
Animals (Vertebrate)		
American Bittern	Botaurus lentiginosus	NON
Bald Eagle	Haliaeetus leucocephalus	SPC
Blanding's Turtle	Emydoidea blandingii	THR
Cerulean Warbler	Setophaga cerulea	SPC
Common Snapping Turtle	Chelydra serpentine	SPC
Eastern Hognose Snake	Heterodon platirhinos	NON
Hooded Warbler	Setophaga citrina	SPC
Least Darter	Etheostoma microperca	SPC
Loggerhead Shrike	Lanius ludovicianus	THR
Northern Goshawk	Accipiter gentilis	NON
Plains Hog-nosed Snake	Heterodon nasicus	SPC
Prairie Vole	Microtus ochrogaster	SPC
Pugnose Shiner	Notropis anogenus	SPC
Red-shouldered Hawk	Buteo lineatus	SPC
Sandhill Crane	Grus canadensis	NON
Upland Sandpiper	Bartramia longicauda	NON
Wilson's Phalarope	Phalaropus tricolor	THR
Yellow Rail	Coturnicops noveboracensis	SPC

Animals (Invertebrate)

A Caddisfly	Agapetus tomus	SPC
Black Sandshell	Ligumia recta	SPC

Creek Heelsplitter	Lasmigona compressa	SPC
Leonard's Skipper	Hesperia leonardus Ieonardus	SPC
Little White Tiger Beetle	Cicindela lepida	THR
Mucket	Actinonaias ligamentina	THR
Northern Barrens Tiger Beetle	Cicindela patruela patruela	SPC
Two-spotted Skipper	Euphyes bimacula	NON

Animal Assemblage

Colonial Waterbird Nesting Site

Freshwater Mussel Concentration Area

Plants

Blunt Sedge	Carex obtusata	SPC
Bog Bluegrass	Poa paludigena	THR
Butternut	Juglans cinerea	SPC
Drummond's Campion	Silene drummondii	SPC
Hill's Thistle	Cirsium hillii	SPC
Humped Bladderwort	Utricularia gibba	NON
Kitten-tails	Besseya bullii	THR
Tubercled Rein-orchid	Platanthera flava var. herbiola	END
Virginia Water Horehound	Lycopus virginicus	NON

Terrestrial Communities

Black Ash - (Red Maple) Seepage Swamp

Central Mesic Hardwood Forest (Eastern)

Clay/Mud Shore (Inland Lake)

Dry Sand - Gravel Oak Savanna (Southern)

Graminoid Poor Fen (Basin)

Low Shrub Poor Fen

Native Plant Community, Undetermined Class

Northern Poor Fen

Northern Rich Tamarack Swamp (Western Basin)

Oak - Aspen - Red Maple Forest

Red Oak - Sugar Maple - Basswood - (Large-Flowered Trillium) Forest

Sand Beach (Inland Lake)

Silver Maple - (Sensitive Fern) Floodplain Forest

Tamarack Swamp (Southern)

Willow - Dogwood Shrub Swamp

Other Ecological Feature

Esker (Quaternary)



APPENDIX B: Summary of Meeting Results and Public Comments

Three open house meetings were held as part of the trail planning process. The first meeting was held in November 2011 in Little Falls. Large maps depicting the trail search corridor and natural resources information were displayed. DNR staff, consultants, and the trail committee were available to answer questions. Meeting attendants were given the opportunity to fill out a questionnaire about how they envision the Camp Ripley/Veterans State Trail, desired trail uses, and key trail connections. Nearly 70 people attended the meeting.

A second meeting was held in Baxter on March 22, 2012. Maps depicting potential trail alignment and cultural and natural resources information were on display. A short presentation outlined trail benefits, the planning process, and proposed trail alignments. Over 70 people attended the meeting and gave comments on the potential trail alignments.

A draft of the master plan was released for public review in June 2012. An open house was held on June 7, 2012 in Little Falls to review the draft plan. A short presentation outlined the major differences between the corridor study and the master plan, and discussed the implementation process. Approximately 35 people attended the meeting.

In addition, a letter was sent in July 2012 to all townships located within the trail study corridor to inform them about the plan and solicit township board feedback. A response was received from Sylvan Township (see below).

As the summaries below indicate, the proposed trail has attracted both support and opposition.

Summary of November 2011 questionnaire comments:

Changes or additions to vision statement:

- Include cultural resources
- Address both motorized and non-motorized
- Use more realistic language

What do you think will be unique about this trail? Why would people come to ride this trail?

- Scenery Mississippi, Crow Wing Rivers, wildlife
- Connects to many other trails

Do you have any issues or concerns with the proposed uses for this trail?

- Potential issues with ATVs on the same trail as non-motorized uses
- Multiple uses are not always compatible (ATVs with bikes or horses)

How do you plan to use the trail?

Bicycling

- Walking
- ATVs
- Skiing
- Snowmobiling
- Horseback riding

Do you have any ideas for other connections to this trail?

- Soo Line Trail
- Lindbergh State Park
- Belle Prairie Regional Park
- Existing Grant-in-Aid trails (ATV and snowmobile)

What are the significant points of interest that should be connected and why?

- Soo Line & Paul Bunyan Trails connect most of MN by trail
- Crow Wing and Lindbergh State Parks
- Connect to towns and communities

Do you have any recommendations for location of the trail alignment?

- Along Old 371
- Great River Road in Morrison County
- Follow rivers as closely as possible
- Hwy 210

Do you have any additional comments or questions to assist the study committee?

- Rest areas that include amenities restrooms, water and shelter
- How will the potential incompatibility of uses be addressed?

Summary of March 2012 comments on potential alignments:

Segment 1A

- Likes:
 - Trail option between Hwy 210 and railroad tracks if on south side of tracks, provide full privacy fence along private properties
 - Perimeter along #1
 - o Go through southern Baxter
 - South side of 210
 - o Allow snowmobile use on paved trail portions like on Paul Bunyan trail
 - Keep motorized trail users out of ditches; allow them to ride on same surface as bicycles
- Dislikes:
 - o Any connection via 18 to East Gull Lake
 - o Not another bridge over Mississippi R. Use current Hwy 371 bridge.
- Changes:
 - Multi-use trails create huge corridors and cut through landscapes
 - When this is connected to Paul Bunyan State Trail does PBT become motorized? Do not want PBT to be motorized.

Segment 1B

- Likes:
 - Perimeter along #1.
 - o Find bike option closer to Crow Wing R.
 - Use south side of river on Camp Ripley property or between Hwy 210 and railroad.
- Dislikes:
 - South side of railroad sensitive land and unwilling landowners
- Changes:
 - o Why not include Sylvan Township?

Segment 2A

- Likes:
 - Like perimeter along #1
 - o ATVs can use Hwy 1 corridor
- Dislikes:
 - Land is too steep for community biking
 - No connection to Pillsbury SF for horse riding
- Changes:
 - Top of Rossing Hill for a wayside rest/scenic overlook

Segment 2B

- Likes:
 - o ATVs can use Hwy 1 corridor
 - o Fairgrounds in Pillager as a possible trailhead for horse riders.
- Dislikes:
 - o Land is too steep for community biking

Segment 2C

- Likes:
 - Go into downtown/main street of Randall
 - Look for community friendly bike lanes in town and 2 miles out
 - Work with City of Randall to find options in city
 - Use Camp Ripley land as much as possible
- Dislikes:
 - o Don't go north of Randall
- Changes:
 - o ATVs should have route into Randall
 - Go into downtown Randall

Segment 3A

- Likes:
 - South of CR 115 for bikes out of Randall to Green Prairie Lake
 - o Through town
 - o Trail below Green Prairie Lake
- Dislikes:
 - o CR 115 has narrow corridor and is too busy

Segment 3B

- Likes:
 - Bike route along west side of Hwy 371 or further west
- Changes:
 - ATVs have the best access on east side of Hwy 371

Segment 4A

- Likes:
 - From Fort Ripley to Camp Ripley use rural roads closer to Mississippi R.
- Dislikes:
 - Too much ditch riding for snowmobiles and ATVs is boring and dangerous
- Changes:
 - ATVs have the best access on east side of Hwy 371

Segment 4B

- Likes:
 - Bike route west of 371 or closer to Miss. R.
 - Snowmobilers don't want to ride road ditches. Allow use on paved trail as on Paul Bunyan
- Changes:
 - ATVs have the best access on the east side of Hwy 371

Segment 5

- Likes:
 - Little Falls has a good start on family friendly biking and promoting along Miss River
- Dislikes:
 - Little Falls needs better access to the east airport road overpass is the best access for bikes

Segment 6

- Likes:
 - Good biking options exist now with wide shoulders on CR 258 or 52
 Great River Rd.
 - Stay on east side of river into Little Falls
- Dislikes:
 - o Snowmobile and ATV trails need to be in scenic woods
- Changes:
 - ATVs follow 371 east but have use of trail parking lot overpass as connector

Other Comments:

 This trail system is attempting to do too much - it threatens to cut huge swaths in places - usage between ATVs & bicycles is not going to always work. Adding more bituminous surface doesn't seem environmentally sound. Specific to us as landowners is trail coming along livestock & fences

- Bridge access is important for ATV users to get to west. In constricted areas, I
 feel ATVs can combine on the same trails as hikers & bikers, horses, etc.
 Maybe pave these sections. Impose speed limits. Please do not restrict access
 because the the outlaws will only be on these areas.
- It is extremely important to have access to the west side of the river at Blanchard Dam or Camp Ripley for ATV.
- It is extremely important to allow access for ATVs to cross river to get to west side. Blanchard Dam bridge would be ideal or Camp Ripley would be OK. There are currently no ATV trails on west side anywhere and this is the only opportunity to develop trails in that area. Bicyclers do not bring enough revenue to area and motorized recreation can help this. We are respectful riders and we want to help the local economy
- ATV on the west side of river is useless if they cannot cross the river south of Little Falls. Side by side trails don't work. It would be better to pave the whole thing.
- We need the ATV trail to cross the Blanchard Dam so the people from the west side of Morrison County get on the Soo Line trail east.
- Cass Co Draft Utilize northern most route first utilize Great River Energy, Co. 36 route second.
- Let's continue to talk with Camp Ripley re a route on the south side of Crow Wing River. I really like the Pillsbury Forest route!

Summary of June 2012 comments: Verbal comments were generally supportive. Many attendees also inquired about the timeline for development, which is still undetermined. A few written comments were received, both in support and in opposition to the trail.

- I oppose the trail. We have excellent roads with wide paved shoulders for bikers to enjoy.
- The momentum is building on this trail and it's exciting to see. Other trail systems across the country have proven the economic impact a long trail system can have on distressed rural areas. The Hatfield-McCoy Trails in W. Virginia is 500 miles across 5 counties. In its first 5 years, small businesses in the area had sales growth of 25%. Payroll in the area increased 9.5% or \$104 million. While primarily motorized, it is open to non-motorized recreation as well. I am a region 3 director with ATVAM and totally support this multi-use trail.

Sylvan Township comment:

 The Sylvan Town Board of Supervisors recommend that the location of the Camp Ripley Veterans State Trail be located in the road right-of-way of State Highway 210 between the highway and the railroad through Sylvan Township.

Response to Comments

As the above comments indicate, there are many options for implementation of the CRVST plan, and many varying opinions regarding these options. Most comments focused on specific trail alignments and the uses that might be appropriate for each

alignment. As discussed in Section 7, Implementation, additional feasibility studies will be needed to assess not only the most feasible alignments but also the potential for each trail use (motorized and non-motorized) within each segment. Therefore, all trail alignment options will be studied in greater detail before land acquisition or development can occur.

