

APPENDICES

VOLUME 2

Appendix A	List of Preparers
Appendix B	List of Recipients
Appendix B1	List of Recipients of FEIS
Appendix B2	List of Recipients of Notice of Availability
Appendix C	List of Acronyms
Appendix D	List of References
Appendix E	Agency Correspondence
Appendix E1	Notices of Intent and Availability
Appendix E2	Comments on the Scope of the SDEIS
Appendix E3	Agency Letters
Appendix E4	Section 106 Documentation
Appendix F.....	Public Outreach
Appendix F1.....	Local Agreements
Appendix F2.....	List of Meetings
Appendix G	Programmatic Agreement
Appendix H	Financial Analysis
Appendix I.....	Central Corridor Title VI Review

VOLUME 3

Appendix J	Technical Information and Studies
Appendix J1	Air Quality
Appendix J2	Electromagnetic Fields and Interference
Appendix J3.....	Noise
Appendix J4.....	Vibration
Appendix J5.....	Evaluation of Western, Victoria, and Hamline Station Options
Appendix J6.....	Metro Transit Safety Department Hazards Analysis

VOLUME 4

Appendix KComments and Responses on the DEIS and SDEIS

Appendix K1 Comments and Responses on the DEIS

VOLUME 5

Appendix KComments and Responses on the DEIS and SDEIS

Appendix K2 Comments and Responses on the SDEIS

VOLUME 6

Appendix L.....Engineering Plan Sets

APPENDIX K
COMMENTS AND RESPONSES ON THE DEIS AND SDEIS
PART 1: DEIS

Guide to Appendix K

Appendix K is divided into two sections: 1) It contains the verbatim comments received on the AA/DEIS during the 45-day comment period following publication of the NOA in the Federal Register on April 21, 2006, and 2) it contains the comments received on the SDEIS during the 45-day comment period following publication of the NOI in the Federal Register on July 11, 2008.

A particular comment and the corresponding response can be found by using the Commenter Index or the Issue Area at the beginning of each section (DEIS or SDEIS). All comments received on the AA/DEIS and the SDEIS have been documented and responded to in the FEIS.

Agency comment letters with full text are included in Appendix E. The documents in appendix K are in the following order:

AA/DEIS

- K1 - AA/DEIS Table of Contents by Issue Area
- K2 - AA/DEIS Commenter Index
- K3 - AA/DEIS Comment Code Index
- K4 - AA/DEIS Comments-Response Report

SDEIS

- K5 - SDEIS Table of Contents by Issue Area
- K6 - SDEIS Commenter Index
- K7 - SDEIS Comment Code Index
- K8 - SDEIS Comments-Response Report

Comment Database and Process

A comment database was established to track all agency, tribal, and public comments received on the AA/DEIS and on the SDEIS. Public testimony was recorded at the public hearings and oral comment was recorded at the public open house meetings. Comments were also submitted by the public, organizations, and governmental agencies by letter, on comment sheets, and by e-mail. All comments received or postmarked by the end of the comment period are included in this appendix.

Analysis Process

The process and methodology used to track and code comments received during the public review period was a multistage process that included assigning each comment a tracking number, identifying substantive comments, grouping comments into categories, and responding to each substantive comment.

Most of the testimony and written submittals contained multiple comments. These comments were identified and, where possible, grouped into categories (e.g., purpose and need, land use, cost). Some comments did not readily fall into a specific category. These comments were placed into a “miscellaneous” comment category. Many comments in each category raised similar concerns; therefore, it was possible to group and sort issues together for a single response.

Comment Tracking

Each comment (e-mail, comment form, letter, transcribed oral comment, or public hearing testimony) was assigned a unique identifying number in the general order received and was entered into a database along with the name of the commenter, the date received, and contact information. In addition, each commenter was assigned an identifying number (e.g. CCLRP0779).

Comment Coding

After being assigned a number, each comment document was reviewed to identify the individual comments within. Each individual comment was then assigned a unique numerical code (e.g., SocEJ-1, EcoEE-2, PlaTP3), which was added to the document number. This ensured that each comment had a unique descriptor that could be readily referenced to the originator. For example: (CCLRP0760) EngTI-42.

Issue Categories

Next, each coded comment was studied to identify the “issue” it presented or the “why” of the comment: e.g., costs are too high, traffic will be improved, impacts are too great, the community will be adversely affected. Thus, all similar comments coded with similar issues could be sorted and grouped together for a response. For example the “issue” In Favor of Project, which was coded as PlaTP-129 had a total of 196 comments. In the Table of Comments by Issue, it is listed as: In Favor of Project (PlaTP-129) (196).

Central Corridor LRT AA/DEIS Public Comments Index
Sorted by Commenter Name
5/6/2009

Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Comment Code	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
Abbey	David	CCLRP0072	PlaTP-139		6.2	EngRW-004	Congestion
Abbey	David	CCLRP0072	ProALT-583		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Abbey	David	CCLRP0072	ProPURP-248		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Abbey	David	CCLRP0072	ProPURP-251		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779	EngCI-18	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779	PlaTE-128	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779	ProALT-190	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779	ProALT-472	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779	ProPURP-170	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779	PubPI-038	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	3.2	PubPI-019	Community Involvement
Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779	SocEJ-079	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779	SocEJ-080	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779	SocNC-147	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779	SocNC-232	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Adams	Tottiana	CCLRP0059	SocNC-036		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation

Agrimson	Gerry	CCLRP0225	NR-44	Minnesota Life Insurance Company, A Securian Financial Group Affiliate	2.3	NR-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Agrimson	Gerry	CCLRP0225	PlaTP-149	Minnesota Life Insurance Company, A Securian Financial Group Affiliate	2.3	PlaTP-119	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Agrimson	Gerry	CCLRP0225	ProALT-633	Minnesota Life Insurance Company, A Securian Financial Group Affiliate	2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Agrimson	Gerry	CCLRP0225	ProPM-150	Minnesota Life Insurance Company, A Securian Financial Group Affiliate	1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Agrimson	Gerry	CCLRP0225	ProProjBdj-025	Minnesota Life Insurance Company, A Securian Financial Group Affiliate	10.1	ProProjBdj-006	Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
Aguilar-Downing	Thomas	CCLRP0638	ProPM-266	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Aguilar-Downing	Thomas	CCLRP0638	ProPURP-222	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Akre	John	CCLRP0652	EngBP-24	Minneapolis Television Network	6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Akre	John	CCLRP0652	NR-9	Minneapolis Television Network	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Akre	John	CCLRP0652	PlaTF-4	Minneapolis Television Network	1	PlaTF-003	In Favor of Project
Akre	John	CCLRP0652	PlaTP-067	Minneapolis Television Network	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
Akre	John	CCLRP0652	ProALT-005	Minneapolis Television Network	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Akre	John	CCLRP0652	ProPM-136	Minneapolis Television Network	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Akre	John	CCLRP0652	SocEU-11	Minneapolis Television Network	4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
Akre	John	CCLRP0652	SocSS-003	Minneapolis Television Network	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086	EcoEE-143		5.1	EcoEE-018	Economic Conditions
Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086	EngPG-30		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086	EngRW-31		6.2	EngRW-011	Congestion
Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086	PlaTP-128		2.3	PlaTP-111	Stations
Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086	ProHLP-037		1	ProHLP-019	Who Will Benefit?
Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086	ProHLP-117		1	ProPURP-002	Who Will Benefit?
Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086	ProPURP-250		6.2	ProPURP-004	Congestion
Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086	PubPI-019		11	PubPI-012	Information Availability
Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086	PubPI-049		3.2	PubPI-026	Community Involvement
Alger	Stuart	CCLRP0923	SocEJ-077		3.8	ProHLP-030	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Ali	Abia	CCLRP0765	ProALT-235		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Ali	Abia	CCLRP0765	ProPM-047		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0484	EngRW-13		6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion
Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0484	NatVA-32		3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0484	PlaTP-100		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0484	PlaTP-245		6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0783	ProALT-011		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0484	ProALT-175		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0783	ProALT-525		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0484	ProPM-090		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0484	SocSS-042		3.7	SocSS-002	Safety and Security
Alto	Beth	CCLRP0238	PlaTP-075	Securian Financial Group	2.3	PlaTP-085	University of Minnesota
Alto	Beth	CCLRP0238	ProPM-220	Securian Financial Group	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Alva	Shilpa	CCLRP0645	ProPM-291		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Alva	Shilpa	CCLRP0645	ProPURP-191		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Amon	Dennis	CCLRP0671	ProPM-241	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Amon	Dennis	CCLRP0671	ProPURP-230	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Anastasia	Tony	CCLRP0861	EngPG-72		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Anastasia	Tony	CCLRP0861	PlaTP-123		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Anastasia	Tony	CCLRP0861	ProALT-155		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Anastasia	Tony	CCLRP0861	ProPURP-048		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Anderson	Amy	CCLRP0340	NatVA-9		3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Anderson	Amy	CCLRP0340	ProPM-067		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Anderson	Amy	CCLRP0340	SocNC-032		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Anderson	Ashley	CCLRP0646	ProPM-238		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Anderson	Ashley	CCLRP0646	ProPURP-225		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Anderson	Janet	CCLRP0067	EngRW-2		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
Anderson	Janet	CCLRP0067	NatNV-22		4.7	NatNV-005	Noise
Anderson	Janet	CCLRP0067	PlaTP-026		2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
Anderson	Janet	CCLRP0067	PlaTP-144		2.3	PlaTP-117	Alignment
Anderson	Janet	CCLRP0067	SocSS-53		6.2	EngRW-014	Congestion

Anderson	Keith	CCLRP0898	PlaTP-259		6.1	PlaTF-008	Travel Time
Anderson	Keith	CCLRP0898	ProALT-159		2.3	EngTI-023	Grade Separation
Anderson	Keith	CCLRP0898	ProHLP-086		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
Anderson	Kristyn	CCLRP0099	ProALT-183		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Anderson	Kristyn	CCLRP0099	ProHLP-104		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Anderson	Kristyn	CCLRP0099	SocNC-115		3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics
Anderson	Marilyn	CCLRP0113	NR-15		6.1	NR-021	Bus System Impact
Anderson	Marilyn	CCLRP0113	SocSS-007		3.7	SocSS-002	Safety and Security
Anderson	Peter	CCLRP0849	EcoEE-114		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Anderson	Peter	CCLRP0849	EngRW-23		6.2	EngRW-012	Effects on Roadways
Anderson	Peter	CCLRP0849	PlaTE-124		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Anderson	Peter	CCLRP0849	ProHLP-061		2.3	ProALT-025	Stations
Anderson	Peter	CCLRP0849	ProPM-127		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Anderson	Peter	CCLRP0849	SocSS-5		6.2	EngRW-003	Effects on Roadways
Anderson	Steve	CCLRP0347	EcoEE-89		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Anderson	Steve	CCLRP0347	PlaTF-12		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Anderson	Steve	CCLRP0347	ProALT-566		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Anderson	Steve	CCLRP0347	ProPURP-038		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Anderson	Warren	CCLRP0746	ProALT-188		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous
Anderson	Warren	CCLRP0917	ProALT-288		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous
Anderson	Warren	CCLRP0746	ProALT-584		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous
Anderson	Warren	CCLRP0746	ProProjBdj-009		10.1	ProProjBdj-006	Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
Anderson-Howze	Rossie	CCLRP0882	SocEJ-043	Pilgrim Baptist Church	3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
Anderson-Howze	Rossie	CCLRP0882	SocNC-084	Pilgrim Baptist Church	11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
Anonymous	X	CCLRP0488	EngPG-26		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Anonymous	X	CCLRP0488	NatNV-8		4.7	NatNV-005	Noise
Anonymous	X	CCLRP0488	PlaTP-099		3.7	PlaTP-096	Safety and Security
Anonymous	X	CCLRP0924	ProALT-225		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Anonymous	X	CCLRP0488	ProPM-275		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Anonymous	X	CCLRP0489	SocEJ-084		3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
Anonymous	X	CCLRP0489	SocNC-002		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Anonymous	X	CCLRP0489	SocNC-029		3.2	SocNC-012	Neighborhood Preservation
Anonymous		CCLRP0933	ProHLP-094		6.3	PlaTF-006	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Distance/Paths to Stations
Arend	Chris	CCLRP0689	ProPM-187	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Arend	Chris	CCLRP0689	ProPURP-097	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Arnold	Scott	CCLRP0650	EcoEE-105		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Arnold	Scott	CCLRP0650	NatAQ-28		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
Arnold	Scott	CCLRP0650	PlaTP-194		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Arnold	Scott	CCLRP0650	ProPM-262		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Arrell	James & Nancy	CCLRP0091	ProALT-446		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Arth	David	CCLRP0800	ProFSt-001		8.1	ProFSt-001	Capital Funding Strategy
Arth	David	CCLRP0800	ProProjBdj-006		10.1	ProProjBdj-006	Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
Arth	David	CCLRP0800	ProProjBdj-015		10.1	ProProjBdj-006	Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
Au	Alan	CCLRP0380	ProPM-283	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Au	Alan	CCLRP0380	ProPURP-179	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Auron	Matt	CCLRP0773	EcoEE-45		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Auron	Matt	CCLRP0773	EngTI-36		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Auron	Matt	CCLRP0773	NatAQ-22		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
Auron	Matt	CCLRP0773	ProALT-082		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Auron	Matt	CCLRP0773	ProPURP-227		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Avidor	Ken	CCLRP0653	ProALT-323		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Axelson	Nina	CCLRP0786	EngBP-31	St. Anthony Park Community Council	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Axelson	Nina	CCLRP0786	EngPG-83	Community Council St. Anthony Park	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Axelson	Nina	CCLRP0786	NR-10	Community Council St. Anthony Park	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Axelson	Nina	CCLRP0786	ProALT-267	Community Council St. Anthony Park	11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
Axelson	Nina	CCLRP0786	SocLU-011	Community Council	3.1	SocLU-001	Land Use and Socio-Economics
Babcock	Stephen	CCLRP0256	PlaTP-163		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Bachmann	Sigrid	CCLRP0081	EcoEE-100		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Bachmann	Sigrid	CCLRP0081	EngCI-4		6.3	EngCI-002	Parking
Bachmann	Sigrid	CCLRP0081	PlaTP-255		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Bachmann	Sigrid	CCLRP0081	ProALT-338		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Bacigalupo	Roxanne	CCLRP0810	ProPM-105		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Bailey	Kevin L.	CCLRP0324	PlaTE-26		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Bailey	Kevin L.	CCLRP0324	ProALT-408		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Bailey	Kevin L.	CCLRP0324	ProPURP-007		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Baker	Bob	CCLRP0822	ProALT-205		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Baker	Bob	CCLRP0822	ProHLP-093		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
Baker	Kay	CCLRP0881	PlaTP-027		2.3	PlaTP-024	Stations
Baker	Kay	CCLRP0881	ProALT-024		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
Baker	Kay	CCLRP0881	ProALT-634		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	EngPG-82	Merriam Park Community Council	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	NR-34	Merriam Park Community Council	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact

Banas	Scott	CCLRP0787	PlaTF-9	Merriam Park Community Council	1	PlaTF-003	In Favor of Project
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	PlaTP-031	Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0787	PlaTP-034	Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	PlaTP-188	Merriam Park Community Council	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0787	PlaTP-227	Merriam Park Community Council	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0787	ProALT-002	Merriam Park Community Council	6.1	PlaTP-046	Transit Effects
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0787	ProALT-099	Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	ProALT-623	Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	ProHLP-031	Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	ProHLP-074	Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	ProHLP-089	Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	ProHLP-003	Stations
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0787	ProPURP-141	Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	PubPI-014	Merriam Park Community Council	3.8	PubPI-007	Inclusive Community Involvement
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0787	PubPI-051	Merriam Park Community Council	3.2	PubPI-028	Community Involvement
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	SocSS-037	Merriam Park Community Council	6.2	SocSS-006	Effects on Roadways Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	SocSS-11	Merriam Park Community Council	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	SocSS-2	Community Council	6.3	EngBP-001	Information Availability
Banks	Roger	CCLRP0801	PubPI-045		11	PubPI-023	Information Availability
Banks	Roger	CCLRP0801	PubPI-075		11	PubPI-041	Information Availability
Barnett	Bill	CCLRP0560	ProALT-559		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Barnett	Bill	CCLRP0560	SocNC-227		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Barraclough	Scott	CCLRP0617	ProALT-177		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Barraclough	Scott	CCLRP0617	SocNC-078		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Barta	Rob	CCLRP0188	EngRW-16		6.2	EngRW-010	Effects on Roadways
Barta	Rob	CCLRP0188	PlaTP-167		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation

Batulis	Scott	CCLRP0865	PlaTP-025	St. Joseph's Hospital	2.3	ProALT-010	Stations
Bauman	Gregory	CCLRP0255	ProALT-337		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Bauman	Gregory	CCLRP0255	SocNC-068		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Becher	Jessica	CCLRP0702	ProPM-194	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Becher	Jessica	CCLRP0702	ProPURP-157	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Beck	Paula	CCLRP0506	ProALT-392		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Beck	Paula	CCLRP0506	SocNC-170		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Beckstrom	John	CCLRP0600	ProALT-316		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Beckstrom	John	CCLRP0600	SocNC-144		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Beegle	Margaret	CCLRP0209	ProALT-487		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous
Beeson	Rick	CCLRP0886	EcoEE-53	Central Corridor Partnership	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Beeson	Rick	CCLRP0886	ProPURP-080	Central Corridor Partnership	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Beeson	Rick	CCLRP0886	SocNC-215	Central Corridor Partnership	1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Behnke	Brad	CCLRP0349	EcoEE-88		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Behnke	Brad	CCLRP0349	PlaTE-174		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Behnke	Brad	CCLRP0349	ProALT-232		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Behnke	Brad	CCLRP0349	ProPURP-064		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Belmonte	Joseph	CCLRP0558	ProALT-121		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Belmonte	Joseph	CCLRP0558	SocNC-158		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Benson	Marie	CCLRP0473	EcoEE-7		5.1	EcoEE-002	Economic Conditions
Benson	Marie	CCLRP0473	EngRW-14		6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion
Benson	Marie	CCLRP0473	PlaTE-173		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Benson	Marie	CCLRP0473	PlaTP-021		2.3	PlaTP-019	Stations
Benson	Marie	CCLRP0473	ProALT-266		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Benson	Marie	CCLRP0473	ProHLP-050		1	ProPURP-002	Who Will Benefit?
Benson	Marie	CCLRP0473	ProPM-065		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Benson	Marie	CCLRP0473	SocSC-3		9	SocSC-001	Secondary and Cumulative Impacts
Beran	Matt	CCLRP0432	ProHLP-121		2.3	ProHLP-015	Miscellaneous
Berg	Bara	CCLRP0941	EngPG-80		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Berg	Bara	CCLRP0941	PlaTP-039		2.3	PlaTP-032	Stops
Berg	Bara	CCLRP0941	ProPM-037		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Berger	Robert D	CCLRP0230	EcoEE-128		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
Berger	Robert D	CCLRP0230	PlaTP-249		6.1	PlaTP-134	Transit Effects
Berger	Robert D	CCLRP0230	ProPM-022		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Bergeson	Brooke	CCLRP0399	ProPM-186		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Bergeson	Brooke	CCLRP0399	ProPURP-148		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Berget	Ann	CCLRP0688	ProPM-039	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project

Berget	Ann	CCLRP0688	ProPURP-094	Ecolab Inc., Peterson, Fram & Bergman	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Bergman	Glenn A.	CCLRP0424	ProALT-073	Peterson, Fram & Bergman	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Bergman	Glenn A.	CCLRP0424	ProPM-074	Peterson, Fram & Bergman	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Bergman	Glenn A.	CCLRP0424	ProPURP-051	Bergman, Fram & Peterson, Fram & Bergman	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Bergman Bernick	Glenn A. Herbert	CCLRP0424 CCLRP0021	ProPURP-238 EngPG-22	Bergman	1 6.3	PlaTP-129 EngPG-001	In Favor of Project Parking Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Bernick	Herbert	CCLRP0021	ProALT-455		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Bernick	Herbert	CCLRP0021	ProALT-504		2.3	ProALT-006	Buses)
Bernick	Herbert	CCLRP0021	ProHLP-071		1	ProPURP-002	Who Will Benefit?
Bernick	Herbert	CCLRP0021	ProPM-012		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Berthiaume	Michele	CCLRP0417	ProPM-078		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Berthiaume	Michele	CCLRP0417	ProPURP-194		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Bessette	Andy	CCLRP0551	EngCI-10	St. Paul Travelers	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Bessette	Andy	CCLRP0551	EngCI-11	St. Paul Travelers	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Bessette	Andy	CCLRP0551	EngCI-38	St. Paul Travelers	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Bessette	Andy	CCLRP0551	ProALT-560	St. Paul Travelers	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Bessette	Andy	CCLRP0551	ProHLP-006	St. Paul Travelers	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Betlej	Joseph	CCLRP0239	ProALT-280	Advantus Capital Management	6.1	ProALT-019	
Bexell	Luther	CCLRP0798	PlaTP-013		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Bexell	Luther	CCLRP0798	SocEJ-092		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
Bexell	Luther	CCLRP0798	SocNC-031		3.2	SocNC-006	Neighborhood Preservation
Bexell	Luther	CCLRP0798	SocNC-146		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
Beyer	Chelsea	CCLRP0724	ProPM-131	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Beyer	Chelsea	CCLRP0724	ProPURP-241	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Bieganek	Justin	CCLRP0305	EcoEE-109		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Bieganek	Justin	CCLRP0305	PlaTE-182		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Bieganek	Justin	CCLRP0305	ProALT-594		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Bieganek	Justin	CCLRP0305	ProPURP-043		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Binger	Craig	CCLRP0855	EcoEE-72	Amherst Wilder Foundation	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Binger	Craig	CCLRP0855	NatAQ-6	Amherst Wilder Foundation	4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality

Binger	Craig	CCLRP0855	PlaTE-22	Amherst Wilder Foundation	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Binger	Craig	CCLRP0855	ProALT-305	Amherst Wilder Foundation	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Binger	Craig	CCLRP0855	ProPURP-125	Amherst Wilder Foundation	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Binger	Craig	CCLRP0855	SocNC-194	Amherst Wilder Foundation	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Bjornstad	Stacy	CCLRP0205	PlaTE-165		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Bjornstad	Stacy	CCLRP0205	PlaTE-181		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Bjornstad	Stacy	CCLRP0205	ProALT-424		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Bjornstad	Stacy	CCLRP0205	ProALT-457		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Blecha	Jennifer	CCLRP0634	ProALT-007		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Blecha	Jennifer	CCLRP0634	ProALT-609		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Blecha	Jennifer	CCLRP0634	ProPM-268		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Blissenbach	Paul	CCLRP0194	EcoEE-131		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Blissenbach	Paul	CCLRP0194	PlaTE-130		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Blissenbach	Paul	CCLRP0194	ProALT-008		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Blissenbach	Paul	CCLRP0194	ProPM-014		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Blustein	Maureen	CCLRP0297	ProALT-386		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Blustein	Maureen	CCLRP0297	SocNC-091		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Bock	Terry	CCLRP0740	PlaTP-198	University of MN Health Center	1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
Bock	Terry	CCLRP0740	ProALT-124	University of MN Health Center	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Bolar	Barb	CCLRP0797	EngPG-32		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Bolar	Barb	CCLRP0797	EngPG-33		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Bolar	Barb	CCLRP0797	EngPG-44		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Bolar	Barb	CCLRP0889	EngPG-53		6.3	EngPG-002	Parking
Bolar	Barb	CCLRP0797	SocSS-032		3.7	SocSS-004	Safety and Security
Bolar	Barb	CCLRP0797	SocSS-59		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Bollman	Alex	CCLRP0300	EcoEE-21		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Bollman	Alex	CCLRP0300	ProALT-329		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Bollman	Alex	CCLRP0300	ProPM-223		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Bolson	Kent	CCLRP0199	PlaTP-187		2.3	PlaTP-035	Grade Separation
Bolson	Kent	CCLRP0199	ProALT-209		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Bolson	Kent	CCLRP0199	ProHLP-065		3.2	ProHLP-012	U of M
Booker-Butler	Glenice	CCLRP0922	ProHLP-017		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Booker-Butler	Glenice	CCLRP0922	SocEJ-026		3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
Booker-Butler	Glenice	CCLRP0922	SocLU-019		3.1	SocLU-012	Impact
Bowron	Alice	CCLRP0095	SocEJ-086		3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
Boyle	Marge	CCLRP0132	EngCI-25		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses

Boyle	Marge	CCLRP0132	EngRW-5		6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion
Boyle	Marge	CCLRP0132	EngTI-32		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
Boyle	Marge	CCLRP0132	PlaTP-044		2.3	PlaTP-034	Stations
Boyle	Marge	CCLRP0132	PlaTP-122		6.1	PlaTP-108	Bus System Impact
							Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact
Boyle	Marge	CCLRP0132	SocSS-50		6.3	EngBP-001	and Mitigation
Bradley	Tareasa	CCLRP0389	ProPM-254		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Bradley	Tareasa	CCLRP0389	ProPURP-109		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Bradway	Brian	CCLRP0371	ProPM-231		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Bradway	Brian	CCLRP0371	ProPURP-040		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Brainerd	Mary	CCLRP0546	ProALT-249	HealthPartners	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Bramlett	Derald	CCLRP0607	ProALT-501		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Bramlett	Derald	CCLRP0607	SocNC-125		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Brand	Gary	CCLRP0282	ProALT-492		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous
Brandt	Jared	CCLRP0632	ProPM-102		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Brandt	Jared	CCLRP0632	ProPURP-249		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
							Impact and Mitigation for
Brauer	George Ulrich	CCLRP0796	EcoEE-120		3.2	EngCI-003	Community Businesses
Brauer	George Ulrich	CCLRP0035	PlaTP-062		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Brauer	George Ulrich	CCLRP0035	PlaTP-214		6.1	PlaTF-010	Bus System Impact
Brauer	George Ulrich	CCLRP0035	ProALT-114		2.3	ProALT-004	Alternatives Analysis
							Alternatives Analysis (LRT &
Brauer	George Ulrich	CCLRP0035	ProPURP-037		2.3	ProALT-029	Buses)
Braun	Lois	CCLRP0074	ProHLP-099		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
Braun	Lois	CCLRP0074	ProPM-151		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
							Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact
Braun	Lois	CCLRP0074	SocSS-31		6.3	EngBP-018	and Mitigation
Breining	Dennis	CCLRP0322	ProALT-330		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Breining	Dennis	CCLRP0322	SocNC-126		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Brezina	Nancy	CCLRP0679	ProPM-052	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Brezina	Nancy	CCLRP0679	ProPURP-119	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				MN Jewish Theatre			
Brooks	Barbara	CCLRP0483	NatVA-22	Company	3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Bruin	Marilyn	CCLRP0134	SocEJ-072		3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
Bruin	Marilyn	CCLRP0134	SocNC-024		3.2	SocNC-006	Neighborhood Preservation
Bruin	Marilyn	CCLRP0134	SocNC-027		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation
Bryski	Joseph	CCLRP0603	ProALT-071		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Bryski	Joseph	CCLRP0603	SocNC-177		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Buchanan	Nick	CCLRP0360	ProPM-263		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Buchanan	Nick	CCLRP0360	ProPURP-153		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Buchen	Daniel	CCLRP0583	ProALT-153		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Buchen	Daniel	CCLRP0583	SocNC-047		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Buggy	Jon	CCLRP0750	ProALT-368	Ellerbe Becket	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project

Buggy	Jon	CCLRP0750	ProALT-637	Ellerbe Becket	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Buggy	Jon	CCLRP0750	ProPURP-042	Ellerbe Becket	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Buggy	Jon	CCLRP0750	ProPURP-108	Ellerbe Becket	1	ProPURP-012	In Favor of Project
Buggy	Jon	CCLRP0750	SocEE-24	Ellerbe Becket	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
Buggy	Jon	CCLRP0750	SocNC-075	Ellerbe Becket	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Buggy	Jon	CCLRP0750	SocNC-201	Ellerbe Becket	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Burd	David	CCLRP0454	PlaTP-257		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Burd	David	CCLRP0454	ProALT-364		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Burt	Jeffrey	CCLRP0637	ProPM-017	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Burt	Jeffrey	CCLRP0637	ProPURP-220	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				Central Corridor			
Burt	Veronica	CCLRP0902	EcoEE-60	Equity Coalition	5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
				Central Corridor			
Burt	Veronica	CCLRP0902	SocEJ-003	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-001	Businesses
				Central Corridor			
Burt	Veronica	CCLRP0468	SocEJ-052	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-012	Inclusive Community Involvement
				Central Corridor			
Burt	Veronica	CCLRP0902	SocEJ-062	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
Busch	Jeff	CCLRP0692	ProPM-165	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Busch	Jeff	CCLRP0692	ProPURP-137	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Bush	Gale	CCLRP0601	ProALT-294		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Bush	Gale	CCLRP0601	SocNC-086		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Bushard	Barbara	CCLRP0211	ProALT-154		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Bushard	Barbara	CCLRP0211	SocNC-155		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Bushnell	William	CCLRP0093	ProALT-302		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				BOMA (Building			
				Owners & Managers			
				Association)			
Buth	William	CCLRP0540	EngCI-13		4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
				BOMA (Building			
				Owners & Managers			
				Association)			
Buth	William	CCLRP0540	EngCI-57		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
				BOMA (Building			
				Owners & Managers			
				Association)			
Buth	William	CCLRP0811	ProALT-376		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				BOMA (Building			
				Owners & Managers			
				Association)			
Buth	William	CCLRP0540	ProFSt-002		4.1	ProHLP-016	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems

Commenter Name	Response ID	Project ID	Topic	Page	Response ID	Response Description
Buth	William	CCLRP0540	ProHLP-003	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Campbell	Keith	CCLRP0206	PlaTE-172	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Campbell	Keith	CCLRP0206	ProPM-296	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Carlquist	Matthew	CCLRP0444	ProALT-111	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Carlquist	Matthew	CCLRP0444	ProPM-282	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Carlson	Dave	CCLRP0838	ProALT-274	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Carlson	Sharon	CCLRP0329	ProALT-112	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Carlson	Sharon	CCLRP0329	ProPURP-073	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231	EcoEE-73	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231	NatAQ-23	4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231	NatAQ-25	4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231	PlaTE-175	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231	PlaTE-197	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231	ProALT-412	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231	ProPM-293	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231	ProPURP-009	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231	ProPURP-010	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231	ProPURP-204	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231	SocNC-033	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231	SocNC-162	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Carson	Marcia	CCLRP0518	ProALT-522	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Carson	Marcia	CCLRP0518	SocNC-108	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Casey	Sheryl	CCLRP0677	ProALT-345	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Casey	Sheryl	CCLRP0677	ProPURP-065	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Casey	Sheryl	CCLRP0677	ProPURP-184	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Casey	Sheryl	CCLRP0677	ProPURP-202	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Caso	Patience	CCLRP0829	PlaTP-252	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
Caso	Patience	CCLRP0829	ProALT-430	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Caso	Patience	CCLRP0829	ProHLP-060	2.3	ProHLP-006	Stops
Caso	Patience	CCLRP0829	ProPOL-1	3.2	EngCI-003	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Caso	Patience	CCLRP0829	PubPI-081	3.2	PubPI-011	Community Involvement
Caso	Patience	CCLRP0829	SocCR-007	3.8	SocEJ-005	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Caso	Patience	CCLRP0829	SocSS-4	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation

Casto	Jane	CCLRP0667	PlaTE-157	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Casto	Jane	CCLRP0667	PlaTE-40	Ecolab Inc.,	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Casto	Jane	CCLRP0667	ProPM-253	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Casto	Jane	CCLRP0667	ProPM-297	Ecolab Inc.,	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Casto	Jane	CCLRP0667	ProPURP-002	Ecolab Inc.,	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Celeste	Celeste	CCLRP0121	PlaTP-175		6.3	PlaTP-125	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station Design
Celt	Adam	CCLRP0338	EcoEE-110		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Celt	Adam	CCLRP0338	EngEng-6		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Celt	Adam	CCLRP0338	PlaTE-158		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Celt	Adam	CCLRP0338	ProPM-160		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Chapeau	Julie	CCLRP0229	ProALT-176		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Chapeau	Julie	CCLRP0229	SocNC-149		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Chouinard	Joe	CCLRP0474	EngBP-13		6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Chouinard	Joe	CCLRP0474	EngBP-8		6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Chouinard	Joe	CCLRP0474	NR-38		6.1	NR-018	Bus System Impact
Christopherson	Philip	CCLRP0496	ProALT-127		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Christopherson	Philip	CCLRP0496	SocNC-145		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Cisdrich	Carol	CCLRP0119	ProPM-273		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Clark	Eric	CCLRP0143	ProALT-569		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Clark	Eric	CCLRP0143	SocSS-39		6.2	EngRW-011	Congestion
Clarkin	Daniel	CCLRP0928	ProALT-120		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Clinefelter	Megan	CCLRP0098	ProPM-083		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Clinefelter	Megan	CCLRP0098	ProPM-156		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Close	Bob	CCLRP0260	PlaTE-88		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Close	Bob	CCLRP0260	ProALT-379		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Close	Bob	CCLRP0260	ProPM-175		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Close	Bob	CCLRP0260	SocNC-007		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Cobb	Martha	CCLRP0910	PlaTP-256		2.3	PlaTP-070	University of Minnesota
Cobb	Martha	CCLRP0910	ProHLP-045		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
Cobb	Martha	CCLRP0910	PubPI-010		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
Cobb	Martha	CCLRP0910	SocNC-174		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	EcoEE-103	City of St. Paul	5.1	EcoEE-015	Economic Conditions
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	EcoEE-108	City of St. Paul	5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	EcoEE-156	City of St. Paul	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	EcoEE-3	City of St. Paul	5.1	EcoEE-003	Economic Conditions
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	EcoEE-70	City of St. Paul	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	EcoEE-77	City of St. Paul	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	EngBP-10	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngBP-010	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation

Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	EngBP-9	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	EngCI-1	City of St. Paul	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	EngCI-20	City of St. Paul	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	EngCI-41	City of St. Paul	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	EngCI-45	City of St. Paul	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	EngEng-9	City of St. Paul	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	EngPG-27	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	EngPG-3	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	EngPG-39	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	EngPG-42	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	EngPG-45	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	EngPG-48	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-002	Parking
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	EngPG-60	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	EngPG-74	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	EngPG-75	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	EngTI-27	City of St. Paul	6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	EngTI-8	City of St. Paul	2.3	EngTI-007	Stations
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	EngUT-24	City of St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	NatAQ-26	City of St. Paul	4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	NatNV-3	City of St. Paul	4.7	NatNV-002	Noise
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	NatNV-7	City of St. Paul	4.7	NatNV-001	Noise
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	NatVA-28	City of St. Paul	3.6	NatVA-005	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	NatVA-3	City of St. Paul	3.4	NatVA-003	Cultural Resources
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	NatVA-8	City of St. Paul	3.6	NatVA-002	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	NR-14	City of St. Paul	11	NR-009	Public Involvement
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	NR-23	City of St. Paul	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	NR-3	City of St. Paul	6.3	NR-001	Parking
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	PlaPla-1	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaPla-001	Transit Effects
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaPla-2	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaPla-002	LRT System Design
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	PlaTF-14	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTF-012	Transit Effects
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	PlaTP-001	City of St. Paul	6.3	PlaTP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	PlaTP-003	City of St. Paul	6.2	PlaTP-003	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	PlaTP-006	City of St. Paul	3.1	PlaTP-006	Land Use
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-030	City of St. Paul	2.3	PlaTP-026	Stations

Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-032	City of St. Paul	2.3	EngTI-007	Stations
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-036	City of St. Paul	2.3	PlaTP-029	Stations
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-040	City of St. Paul	3.1	PlaTP-006	Land Use
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-043	City of St. Paul	2.3	PlaTP-029	Stations
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-050	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-074	LRT System Design
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	PlaTP-055	City of St. Paul	2.3	PlaTP-077	Alignment
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-056	City of St. Paul	3.6	PlaTP-078	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	PlaTP-064	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-080	LRT System Design
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-081	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-089	Transit Effects
							Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station
							Design
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	PlaTP-106	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngBP-005	
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	PlaTP-110	City of St. Paul	6.2	PlaTP-102	Effects on Roadways
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-125	City of St. Paul	2.3	PlaTP-093	Stations
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-126	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-110	LRT System Design
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-137	City of St. Paul	6.3	PlaTP-005	Parking
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-166	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-080	LRT System Design
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-177	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-126	LRT System Design
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-180	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-134	Transit Effects
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-191	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-212	City of St. Paul	3.1	PlaTP-048	Stations
							Report Clarifications Updates and
							Corrections
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	PlaTP-228	City of St. Paul	6.2	PlaTP-008	
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-230	City of St. Paul	3.7	PlaTP-059	Safety and Security
							Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact
							and Mitigation
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-242	City of St. Paul	6.3	PlaTP-063	
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	PlaTP-243	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PlaTP-258	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-083	Transit Effects
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	ProALT-206	City of St. Paul	11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	ProALT-290	City of St. Paul	11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	ProALT-301	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	ProALT-367	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	ProALT-466	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	ProALT-506	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
							Alternatives Analysis (LRT &
							Buses)
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	ProALT-554	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-029	
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	ProALT-570	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	ProALT-639	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	ProHLP-019	City of St. Paul	2.3	PlaTP-031	Alignment
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	ProHLP-054	City of St. Paul	3.1	ProHLP-014	Stations
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	ProHLP-095	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProHLP-020	Stations
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	ProHLP-101	City of St. Paul	3.1	ProHLP-014	Stations
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	ProHLP-122	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProHLP-003	Stations
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	ProHLP-124	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment

Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	ProPM-004	City of St. Paul	8.1	ProPM-015	Capital Funding Strategy
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	ProPM-026	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	ProPM-108	City of St. Paul	4	ProPM-019	Report Corrections Needed
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	ProPM-119	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProPM-001	Alternatives Analysis
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	ProPOL-35	City of St. Paul	11	PlaTP-131	Public Comment Process
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PubPI-002	City of St. Paul	3.2	PubPI-002	Neighborhood Preservation
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	PubPI-020	City of St. Paul	3.2	PubPI-011	Community Involvement
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PubPI-053	City of St. Paul	11	PubPI-027	Public Involvement
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	PubPI-054	City of St. Paul	3.2	PubPI-029	Community Involvement
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	PubPI-087	City of St. Paul	11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	SocEJ-097	City of St. Paul	3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	SocHI-3	City of St. Paul	3.4	SocHI-001	Cultural Resources
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	SocHI-5	City of St. Paul	3.4	SocHI-004	Cultural Resources
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	SocHM-2	City of St. Paul	4.2	SocHM-002	Water Resources
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	SocHM-6	City of St. Paul	4.9	SocHM-003	Hazardous or Regulated Materials
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	SocLU-005	City of St. Paul	3.1	SocLU-003	Land Use
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	SocLU-009	City of St. Paul	3.1	SocLU-007	Land Use
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	SocLU-020	City of St. Paul	3.2	SocLU-013	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	SocLU-031	City of St. Paul	3.1	SocLU-015	Land Use and Socio-Economics
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	SocLU-26	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	SocNC-017	City of St. Paul	3.2	SocNC-002	Community Cohesion
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	SocNC-049	City of St. Paul	3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	SocNC-139	City of St. Paul	3.2	NR-024	Community Involvement
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	SocP4-3	City of St. Paul	3.5	SocP4-003	Parklands and Recreation Areas
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	SocP4-6	City of St. Paul	3.5	SocP4-005	Parklands and Recreation Areas
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	SocSoc-002	City of St. Paul	3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	SocSS-009	City of St. Paul	3.7	SocSS-003	Safety and Security
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	SocSS-030	City of St. Paul	3.7	SocSS-005	Safety and Security
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	SocSS-12	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	SocSS-19	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	SocSS-23	City of St. Paul	6.2	EngRW-003	Effects on Roadways
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	SocSS-48	City of St. Paul	6.2	EngRW-015	Effects on Roadways
Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	SocSS-8	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Coleman	Kenerica	CCLRP0153	NR-8		6.1	NR-021	Bus System Impact
Coleman	Kenerica	CCLRP0153	PlaTP-109		2.3	PlaTP-093	Stations
Coleman	William	CCLRP0144	ProPM-097		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Collins	Ben	CCLRP0647	ProPM-183	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Collins	Ben	CCLRP0647	ProPURP-085	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project

Collins	Tom	CCLRP0856	EcoEE-141	St. Paul Port Authority	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Collins	Tom	CCLRP0856	PlaTP-189	St. Paul Port Authority	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Collins	Tom	CCLRP0856	ProALT-474	St. Paul Port Authority	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Collins	Tom	CCLRP0856	ProPURP-118	St. Paul Port Authority	3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics
Collins	Tom	CCLRP0856	SocEE-15	St. Paul Port Authority	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
Collins	Tom	CCLRP0856	SocNC-191	St. Paul Port Authority	3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact
Colvin	Gloria	CCLRP0129	SocEJ-034		6.3	EngBP-001	and Mitigation
Condon	Susan	CCLRP0695	PlaTE-96	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Condon	Susan	CCLRP0695	ProPM-209	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Conrad	Will	CCLRP0024	NatNV-1		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
Conrad	Will	CCLRP0024	PlaTE-189		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Conrad	Will	CCLRP0024	ProALT-239		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Cooper	Jeanne	CCLRP0874	ProHLP-105		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Cooper	Jeanne	CCLRP0874	PubPI-004		11	PubPI-004	Public Involvement
Cooper	Jeanne	CCLRP0874	SocEJ-046		3.8	SocEJ-024	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Cornelius	Kristen	CCLRP0107	PlaTE-171		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Cornelius	Kristen	CCLRP0107	PlaTP-156		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Cornelius	Kristen	CCLRP0107	ProALT-521		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Cowles	Jay	CCLRP0756	NR-60		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Cowles	Jay	CCLRP0756	PlaTF-8		1	PlaTF-003	In Favor of Project
Cowles	Jay	CCLRP0756	PlaTP-083		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Cowles	Jay	CCLRP0756	ProALT-542		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Cowles	Jay	CCLRP0756	SocLU-002		3.1	SocLU-003	Land Use
Cowles	Page Knudsen	CCLRP0006	NatVA-17		3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Cowles	Page Knudsen	CCLRP0006	PlaTE-36		2.3	PlaTE-019	Grade Separation
Cowles	Page Knudsen	CCLRP0006	ProALT-588		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Cowles	Page Knudsen	CCLRP0006	SocEU-7		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
Cowles	Page Knudsen	CCLRP0006	SocNC-066		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Cox	Emily	CCLRP0738	PlaTP-205		1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
Cox	Emily	CCLRP0738	ProHLP-002		2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota
Cox	Emily	CCLRP0738	ProProjBdj-005		6.1	ProProjBdj-002	LRT System Design
Crain	Zach	CCLRP0877	PlaTE-39		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Crain	Zach	CCLRP0877	ProALT-442		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Crain	Zach	CCLRP0877	PubPI-040		11	PubPI-004	Public Involvement
Crain	Zach	CCLRP0877	SocEU-6		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy

Crain	Zach	CCLRP0877	SocNC-099		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Crockett	Carol	CCLRP0253	ProALT-550		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Crockett	Carol	CCLRP0253	SocNC-206		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Croft	Julie	CCLRP0930	EngPG-58		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Croft	Julie	CCLRP0930	ProHLP-088		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Croft	Julie	CCLRP0930	SocNC-061		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Danielzuk	Steven	CCLRP0226	ProALT-459		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Danielzuk	Steven	CCLRP0226	SocNC-069		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Daugherty	Elizabeth	CCLRP0696	ProPM-086	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Daugherty	Elizabeth	CCLRP0696	ProPURP-107	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Dauner	Scott	CCLRP0649	ProPM-115		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Dauner	Scott	CCLRP0649	ProPURP-151		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Davalos	Janell	CCLRP0676	EngPG-12	Ecolab Inc., Architect Environmental Group Architect Environmental	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Davis	Leslie	CCLRP0761	NatVA-11		3.6	NatVA-005	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Davis	Leslie	CCLRP0761	ProProjBdj-008	Group Architect Environmental	8.1	ProProjBdj-005	Capital Funding Strategy
Davis	Leslie	CCLRP0761	ProProjBdj-011	Group Architect Environmental	8.1	ProProjBdj-005	Capital Funding Strategy
Davis	Leslie	CCLRP0761	ProPURP-045	Group	1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Delaney	Lisa	CCLRP0682	ProPM-075	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Delaney	Lisa	CCLRP0682	ProPURP-196	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Delavega	Bob	CCLRP0780	EcoEE-127		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Delavega	Bob	CCLRP0780	EngCI-29		3.2	EngCI-001	
Delavega	Bob	CCLRP0780	EngTI-28		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
Delavega	Bob	CCLRP0780	ProALT-448		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Delavega	Bob	CCLRP0780	ProPURP-061		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Delegard	Virgil	CCLRP0706	ProPM-284	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Delegard	Virgil	CCLRP0706	ProPURP-053	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Deluca	Tim	CCLRP0842	SocLU-037	Braun Intertec	3.1	SocLU-001	Land Use and Socio-Economics
Dennie	Janice	CCLRP0578	ProALT-363		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Dennie	Janice	CCLRP0578	SocNC-057		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
D'Entremont	Elise	CCLRP0502	ProALT-282		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
D'Entremont	Elise	CCLRP0502	SocNC-160		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Denys	Jennifer and Carl	CCLRP0252	ProALT-062		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Denys Dewitt	Jennifer and Carl John	CCLRP0252 CCLRP0184	ProHLP-069 EcoEE-122	2.3 5.1	ProHLP-015 EcoEE-008	Miscellaneous Economic Conditions Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Dewitt Dewitt	John John	CCLRP0184 CCLRP0184	EngBP-27 PlaTE-135	6.3 6.1	EngBP-001 PlaTE-010	Transit Effects Selection of Locally Preferred Alternative Alignment Stations
Dewitt Dewitt Dewitt Dewitt Dewitt	John John John John John	CCLRP0184 CCLRP0184 CCLRP0184 CCLRP0184 CCLRP0184	PlaTF-5 PlaTP-015 PlaTP-193 ProALT-399 ProFSt-005	2.3 2.3 2.3 2.3 8.1	PlaTF-013 PlaTP-013 PlaTP-021 ProALT-001 ProFSt-010	Alternatives Analysis Capital Funding Strategy
Dickinson Dickinson	Jim Jim	CCLRP0222 CCLRP0222	ProALT-080 ProPM-218	2.3 1	ProALT-001 ProPURP-009	Alternatives Analysis In Favor of Project
Diffley Diffley	Kathleen Kathleen	CCLRP0214 CCLRP0214	ProALT-198 SocNC-076	2.3 2.3	ProALT-001 ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis Alternatives Analysis Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Dillery Dillery Dillery Dillery Dillery Dillery Dillery Dillery Dillery Dillery Dilling Dilling	John John John John John John John John John John Jane Jane	CCLRP0313 CCLRP0313 CCLRP0313 CCLRP0313 CCLRP0313 CCLRP0313 CCLRP0313 CCLRP0313 CCLRP0313 CCLRP0313 CCLRP0710 CCLRP0710	EngBP-47 EngPG-29 EngPG-52 PlaTP-037 PlaTP-077 PlaTP-145 PlaTP-217 PlaTP-233 PlaTP-239 ProALT-037 ProPM-106 ProPURP-156	6.3 6.3 6.3 2.3 6.1 6.1 2.3 6.1 6.1 2.3 1 1	EngBP-002 EngPG-001 EngPG-001 PlaTP-030 PlaTP-086 PlaTP-061 PlaTP-052 PlaTP-080 ProALT-024 ProALT-008 ProPURP-009 ProPURP-009	Parking Parking Stations LRT System Design Bus System Impact Stations LRT System Design LRT System Design University of Minnesota In Favor of Project In Favor of Project
Dinkel Dinkel Dinkel Dinkel Dixon Dixon Dolphin Dolphin Dolphin Doucette Doucette	Billy Billy Billy Billy Caroline Caroline Elizabeth Elizabeth Elizabeth Kathleen Kathleen	CCLRP0880 CCLRP0880 CCLRP0880 CCLRP0880 CCLRP0590 CCLRP0590 CCLRP0721 CCLRP0721 CCLRP0721 CCLRP0584 CCLRP0584	EcoEE-49 EngTI-3 ProALT-113 ProPURP-104 ProALT-164 SocNC-067 ProPM-082 ProPURP-022 ProPURP-162 ProALT-314 SocNC-184	5.1 1 2.3 2.3 2.3 2.3 1 1 1 2.3 2.3	EcoEE-008 EngTI-003 ProALT-001 ProALT-001 ProALT-001 ProALT-001 ProPURP-009 ProPURP-009 ProPURP-009 ProALT-001 ProALT-001	Economic Conditions In Favor of Project Alternatives Analysis Alternatives Analysis Alternatives Analysis Alternatives Analysis In Favor of Project In Favor of Project In Favor of Project Alternatives Analysis Alternatives Analysis
Dougherty	Bonnie	CCLRP0203	ProALT-489	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Dougherty	Bonnie	CCLRP0203	ProALT-573	Securian Trust Company	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Dougherty	Bonnie	CCLRP0203	ProPURP-001	Securian Trust Company	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Dowell	Larry	CCLRP0892	EngPG-56	St. Paul Chamber of Commerce	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Dowell	Larry	CCLRP0892	ProALT-261	St. Paul Chamber of Commerce	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Dowell	Larry	CCLRP0892	ProProjBdj-030	St. Paul Chamber of Commerce	10.1	ProProjBdj-014	Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
Dowell	Larry	CCLRP0892	ProPURP-120	St. Paul Chamber of Commerce	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Dowell	Larry	CCLRP0892	ProPURP-154	St. Paul Chamber of Commerce	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Dowell	Larry	CCLRP0892	ProPURP-160	St. Paul Chamber of Commerce Minneapolis	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Downey	Keith	CCLRP0749	EcoEE-152	Regional Chamber of Commerce Minneapolis	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Downey	Keith	CCLRP0749	EcoEE-86	Regional Chamber of Commerce Minneapolis	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Downey	Keith	CCLRP0749	ProALT-202	Regional Chamber of Commerce Minneapolis	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Downey	Keith	CCLRP0749	ProALT-441	Regional Chamber of Commerce Minneapolis	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Downey	Keith	CCLRP0749	ProPURP-003	Regional Chamber of Commerce	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Doyle	Brendan	CCLRP0224	ProALT-102		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Doyle	Brendan	CCLRP0224	ProALT-197		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Doyle	Brendan	CCLRP0224	ProALT-524		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Doyle	Brendan	CCLRP0224	ProPM-015		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Doyle	Brendan	CCLRP0224	ProPURP-210		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Drasher	Daniel	CCLRP0414	ProPM-080		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Drasher	Daniel	CCLRP0414	ProPURP-021		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Drew	Alden	CCLRP0835	ProALT-213		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Dubois	Josh	CCLRP0002	EcoEE-153		3.2	EcoEE-020	Neighborhood Preservation
Dubois	Josh	CCLRP0002	ProALT-215		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Dubois	Josh	CCLRP0002	ProALT-409		11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
Dubois	Josh	CCLRP0002	ProHLP-114		2.3	ProHLP-006	Stops

Dubois	Josh	CCLRP0002	ProPURP-213		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Dubois	Josh	CCLRP0002	SocNC-020		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Dubois	Josh	CCLRP0002	SocNC-090		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
Dubois	Josh	CCLRP0002	SocNC-166		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Duckwall	Adam	CCLRP0585	ProALT-057		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Duckwall	Adam	CCLRP0585	SocNC-045		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Dunne	Thomas M.	CCLRP0355	EngTI-4	TKDA	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Dunne	Thomas M.	CCLRP0355	ProPURP-193	TKDA	1	ProHLP-019	Who Will Benefit?
Dutton	Lisa	CCLRP0243	PlaTE-11		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Dutton	Lisa	CCLRP0243	PlaTP-093		6.1	PlaTP-094	Supporting Bus Service
Dutton	Lisa	CCLRP0243	ProPM-024		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Dutton	Lisa	CCLRP0243	ProPM-176		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Dutton	Lisa	CCLRP0243	SocEU-12		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
Dyer	Reese	CCLRP0662	ProPM-069	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Dyer	Reese	CCLRP0662	ProPM-172	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Dyer	Reese	CCLRP0662	ProPURP-093	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Dzwonkowski	Ken	CCLRP0073	EcoEE-115		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Dzwonkowski	Ken	CCLRP0073	ProALT-158		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Dzwonkowski	Ken	CCLRP0073	ProPURP-025		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Dzwonkowski	Ken	CCLRP0073	SocEE-21		4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
Easton	John	CCLRP0519	ProALT-092		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Easton	John	CCLRP0519	SocNC-209		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Eckerly	Eunice	CCLRP0341	PlaTP-042		2.3	PlaTP-020	Stations
Eckerly	Eunice	CCLRP0341	ProPURP-124		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Eckerly	Eunice	CCLRP0341	SocNC-039		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
Eggen	Sonya	CCLRP0412	ProPM-236	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Eggen	Sonya	CCLRP0412	ProPURP-029	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Eggum	Tom	CCLRP0831	ProALT-068		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Ek	Jessica	CCLRP0413	ProPM-248	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Ek	Jessica	CCLRP0413	ProPURP-190	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Ekstrums	Cheryl	CCLRP0925	ProALT-231		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Engen	Bryce	CCLRP0675	NR-13		11	NR-010	Miscellaneous
Engle	Dolores	CCLRP0263	EngPG-38		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Engle	Dolores	CCLRP0263	EngTI-31		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
Engle	Dolores	CCLRP0263	SocSS-40		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Erdman	Art	CCLRP0737	PlaTE-198		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Erdman	Art	CCLRP0737	ProALT-056		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Erdman	Art	CCLRP0737	ProALT-208		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Erkel	James	CCLRP0302	PlaTF-1		6.1	PlaTF-002	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Erkel	James	CCLRP0302	PlaTP-010		6.1	PlaTP-135	Transit Effects

Author	Reviewer	Request ID	Response ID	Request Date	Response Date	Response
Erkel	James	CCLRP0302	ProALT-001	2.3	ProALT-036	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Erkel	James	CCLRP0302	ProALT-081	6.1	ProALT-018	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Everett	Leslie	CCLRP0743	EngRW-25	6.2	EngRW-013	University of Minnesota
Everett	Leslie	CCLRP0743	EngTI-10	6.2	EngRW-013	University of Minnesota
Everett	Leslie	CCLRP0193	PlaTP-011	2.3	PlaTP-009	University of Minnesota
Everett	Leslie	CCLRP0068	PlaTP-116	2.3	PlaTP-009	University of Minnesota
Everett	Leslie	CCLRP0068	PlaTP-238	2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
Everett	Leslie	CCLRP0193	ProALT-339	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Everett	Leslie	CCLRP0193	SocEE-14	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
Everett	Leslie	CCLRP0068	SocSS-1	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Ewing	Dixie	CCLRP0509	ProALT-361	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Ewing	Dixie	CCLRP0509	SocNC-096	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
						St. Paul Area
						Chambe of
						Commerce
Faletti	A,amda	CCLRP0815	ProALT-130	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Fang	Pang	CCLRP0566	ProALT-552	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Fang	Pang	CCLRP0566	SocNC-089	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Farrell	Chris	CCLRP0320	ProALT-006	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Farrell	Chris	CCLRP0320	ProPM-042	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Fedor	Dennis	CCLRP0219	ProALT-348	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Fedor	Dennis	CCLRP0219	SocNC-081	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Feismia	Ann	CCLRP0030	EngTI-15	2.3	EngTI-013	Grade Separation
Feismia	Ann	CCLRP0030	PlaTP-142	2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Feismia	Ann	CCLRP0030	ProHLP-096	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
Feismia	Ann	CCLRP0030	SocNC-204	2.3	SocNC-016	Grade Separation
Felien	Ed	CCLRP0809	ProHLP-067	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Felien	Ed	CCLRP0809	ProHLP-081	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Felien	Ed	CCLRP0809	SocCR-003	3.8	SocEJ-005	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Fellman	Lance	CCLRP0623	ProALT-418	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Fellman	Lance	CCLRP0623	SocNC-127	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Ferguson	Jill	CCLRP0386	ProPM-045	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Ferguson	Jill	CCLRP0386	ProPURP-062	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Fernandez	Adria	CCLRP0164	EcoEE-62	5.1	EcoEE-002	Economic Conditions
Fernandez	Adria	CCLRP0164	EngBP-26	6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Fernandez	Adria	CCLRP0164	ProALT-445	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Fiedler	William	CCLRP0722	ProPM-041	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Fiedler	William	CCLRP0722	ProPURP-192	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Firebaugh	Todd	CCLRP0852	ProALT-210	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Firebaugh	Todd	CCLRP0852	SocNC-073	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation

Fischer	Sharon	CCLRP0748	PlaTE-141	City of Lakes Chamber of Commerce	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Fischer	Sharon	CCLRP0748	PlaTE-81	City of Lakes Chamber of Commerce	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Fischer	Sharon	CCLRP0748	ProALT-069	City of Lakes Chamber of Commerce	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Fischer	Sharon	CCLRP0748	ProALT-170	City of Lakes Chamber of Commerce	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Fischer	Sharon	CCLRP0748	ProALT-558	City of Lakes Chamber of Commerce	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Fischer	Sharon	CCLRP0748	ProPURP-012	City of Lakes Chamber of Commerce	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Fischer	Sharon	CCLRP0748	ProPURP-166	City of Lakes Chamber of Commerce	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Fischer	Sharon	CCLRP0748	SocEU-17	City of Lakes Chamber of Commerce	4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
Fleming	Terri	CCLRP0819	ProALT-271		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Flint	Philice Ann	CCLRP0131	EcoEE-136		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
Flint	Philice Ann	CCLRP0131	NR-48		6.1	NR-007	Transit Effects
Flint	Philice Ann	CCLRP0131	ProPM-154		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Flood	Patrick	CCLRP0521	ProALT-423		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Flood	Patrick	CCLRP0521	SocNC-195		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Flores	Teresa	CCLRP0680	ProPM-242	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Flores	Teresa	CCLRP0680	ProPURP-066	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Foote	Dan	CCLRP0853	EcoEE-79		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Foote	Dan	CCLRP0853	ProALT-070		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Foote	Dan	CCLRP0853	ProPURP-047		1	ProPURP-010	Who Will Benefit?
Foote	Dan	CCLRP0853	ProPURP-232		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Fox	Stephanie	CCLRP0891	PlaTE-104		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Fox	Stephanie	CCLRP0891	PlaTE-144		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Fox	Stephanie	CCLRP0891	ProALT-277		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Fox	Stephanie	CCLRP0891	ProPURP-198		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Frederick	Brian	CCLRP0670	ProPM-280	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Frederick	Brian	CCLRP0670	ProPURP-105	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Frelix	Tanya	CCLRP0145	PlaTP-254		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact

Commenter Name	Response Number	Project ID	Topic	Score	Response ID	Response Description
Frelix	Tanya	CCLRP0145	SocSS-36	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Fremder	George	CCLRP0191	EngUT-2	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Fremder	George	CCLRP0191	ProPM-159	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Fremder	George	CCLRP0191	ProPURP-035	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Frey	Brian	CCLRP0616	ProALT-395	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Frey	Brian	CCLRP0616	SocNC-185	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Fritts	Lori	CCLRP0826	EngCI-35	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Fritts	Lori	CCLRP0859	EngCI-36	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Fritts	Lori	CCLRP0859	NatVA-1	2.3	NatVA-001	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Fritts	Lori	CCLRP0859	PlaTF-3	1	PlaTF-003	In Favor of Project
Fritts	Lori	CCLRP0859	ProALT-357	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Fritts	Lori	CCLRP0826	ProALT-434	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Fritts	Lori	CCLRP0859	ProFSt-004	8.1	ProFSt-004	Capital Funding Strategy
Fritz	Bev	CCLRP0028	ProALT-243	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Fritz	Bev	CCLRP0028	SocEE-17	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
Fritz	Lauri	CCLRP0469	ProALT-086	2.3	ProALT-001	Midway Chamber of Commerce Alternatives Analysis
Fritz	Lauri	CCLRP0469	ProPURP-218	1	PlaTP-129	Midway Chamber of Commerce In Favor of Project
Frost	Libby	CCLRP0734	NR-12	2.3	ProALT-021	Alignment
Fuller	Jacquie	CCLRP0303	NatNV-6	4.7	NatNV-001	Noise
Fuller	Jacquie	CCLRP0303	NatVA-27	3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Fuller	Jacquie	CCLRP0303	ProPM-008	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Fuller	Jeffrey S.	CCLRP0105	PubPI-071	11	PubPI-015	Public Comment Process
Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895	EngBP-32	6.3	EngBP-016	Citizens for Effective Transit Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482	EngTI-1	6.2	EngTI-001	Citizens for Effective Transit Congestion
Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895	EngTI-12	6.2	EngTI-010	Citizens for Effective Transit Congestion
Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895	EngTI-7	6.2	EngTI-010	Citizens for Effective Transit Congestion
Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895	NatAQ-24	4.6	NatAQ-002	Citizens for Effective Transit Air Quality
Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482	NatAQ-8	4.6	NatAQ-002	Citizens for Effective Transit Air Quality
Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482	NatNV-20	4.7	NatNV-004	Citizens for Effective Transit Noise

Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895	PlaTE-162	Citizens for Effective Transit	6.1	PlaTE-013	Bus System Impact
Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895	PlaTF-2	Citizens for Effective Transit	1	PlaTF-011	Not in Favor of Project
Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482	PlaTP-114	Citizens for Effective Transit	6.1	PlaTP-105	LRT Park and Rides
Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482	PlaTP-132	Citizens for Effective Transit	6.1	PlaTF-008	Travel Time
Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895	PlaTP-221	Citizens for Effective Transit	6.3	PlaTP-042	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895	ProALT-410	Citizens for Effective Transit	1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482	ProALT-437	Citizens for Effective Transit	2.3	ProALT-039	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482	ProPM-252	Citizens for Effective Transit	2.3	ProPM-012	Cost Effectiveness
Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482	ProProjBdj-027	Citizens for Effective Transit	10.1	ProProjBdj-006	Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895	ProPURP-171	Citizens for Effective Transit	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482	SocSS-16	Citizens for Effective Transit	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Gale	Chris	CCLRP0213	ProALT-207		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gale	Chris	CCLRP0213	SocNC-243		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Galles	Dan	CCLRP0863	ProALT-432		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Galles	Dan	CCLRP0863	ProHLP-100		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Gallivan	Timothy	CCLRP0597	ProALT-607		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gallivan	Timothy	CCLRP0597	SocNC-212		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Garvey	Dyane	CCLRP0789	PlaTP-169	Building Owners Management Association	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
Garvey	Dyane	CCLRP0789	ProALT-587	Building Owners Management Association	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Garvey	Dyane	CCLRP0789	SocEJ-002	Building Owners Management Association	3.8	SocEJ-001	Businesses
Garvey	Dyane	CCLRP0789	SocEJ-011	Building Owners Management Association	3.8	SocEJ-005	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Garvey	Terry	CCLRP0888	ProALT-561		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gaston	Vince	CCLRP0051	ProPM-072		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Gaston	Vince	CCLRP0051	ProPURP-083		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project

Gaston	Vince	CCLRP0051	SocNC-043		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Gastoni	Vincent	CCLRP0533	ProALT-098	Parsons	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gatto	Pat	CCLRP0514	ProALT-581		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gatto	Pat	CCLRP0514	SocNC-038		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gavanda	Michael	CCLRP0535	ProALT-171	International Union of Painters & Allied Trades	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gavanda	Michael	CCLRP0535	ProPOL-3	International Union of Painters & Allied Trades	11	ProPOL-007	Project Contracting
Gavanda	Michael	CCLRP0535	ProPOL-6	International Union of Painters & Allied Trades	11	ProPOL-007	Project Contracting
Gavanda	Michael	CCLRP0535	ProPOL-9	International Union of Painters & Allied Trades	11	ProPOL-007	Project Contracting
Geiger	Tera	CCLRP0569	ProALT-142		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Geiger	Tera	CCLRP0569	SocNC-138		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gelbach	Deb	CCLRP0890	ProALT-527		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Gelbach	Deb	CCLRP0890	ProPURP-236		6.3	ProPURP-003	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Distance/Paths to Stations
Gerber	Nina	CCLRP0661	ProPM-084	Ecolab Pest Elimination	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Gerber	Nina	CCLRP0661	ProPURP-240	Ecolab Pest Elimination	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
German	Judy	CCLRP0497	ProALT-146		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
German	Judy	CCLRP0497	SocNC-056		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Geurkink	Kerry	CCLRP0244	PlaTE-151		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Geurkink	Kerry	CCLRP0244	PlaTE-97		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Geurkink	Kerry	CCLRP0244	ProALT-375		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Geurkink	Kerry	CCLRP0244	ProPM-288		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Geurkink	Kerry	CCLRP0244	SocSS-029		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gilbert	Doug	CCLRP0208	EngCI-30		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Gilbert	Doug	CCLRP0208	ProALT-549		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gilbert	Doug	CCLRP0208	ProPM-264		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gilbert	Doug	CCLRP0208	SocNC-236		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Gilbertson	Judy	CCLRP0681	ProPM-054	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Gilbertson	Judy	CCLRP0681	ProPURP-216	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Gilbreth	Jason	CCLRP0641	ProPM-112	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Gilbreth	Jason	CCLRP0641	ProPURP-177	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Gilbreth	Stefanie	CCLRP0370	ProPM-170		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Gilbreth	Stefanie	CCLRP0370	ProPURP-180		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project

Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	EcoEE-145		5.1	EcoEE-019	Economic Conditions
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	EngCI-6		6.3	EngCI-004	Parking
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	EngPG-35		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	EngPG-78		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	NatVA-23		3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	NatVA-29		3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0802	NR-26		11	NR-002	Project Contracting
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	NR-58		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	PlaPla-5		6.1	PlaPla-004	Transit Effects
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	PlaTE-147		1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	PlaTE-164		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
							Pedestrians & Bicyclists -
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	PlaTE-63		6.3	PlaTF-006	Distance/Paths to Stations
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	PlaTP-059		11	PlaTP-131	Public Comment Process
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	PlaTP-150		2.3	ProALT-004	Alternatives Analysis
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	PlaTP-244		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	ProALT-009		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	ProALT-047		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0758	ProALT-184		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	ProALT-281		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	ProHLP-014		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	ProHLP-058		1	ProHLP-019	Who Will Benefit?
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	ProHLP-116		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	ProPM-125		6	ProPM-021	Report Corrections Needed
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	ProPM-169		2.3	ProPM-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	ProPM-171		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0758	ProPM-198		2.3	ProPM-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	ProPM-204		5.3	ProPM-002	Development Effects
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	ProPM-271		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	ProPOL-34		11	PlaTP-131	Public Comment Process
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	ProPURP-020		6.2	ProPURP-006	Effects on Roadways
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	PubPI-018		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	SocEE-10		2.3	ProALT-004	Alternatives Analysis
Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271	SocEU-14		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
Goff	Jim	CCLRP0272	PlaTP-226	J.G. Goff and Associates	6.1	PlaTP-057	Bus System Impact
Goff	Jim	CCLRP0272	ProALT-563	J.G. Goff and Associates	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Goff	Jim	CCLRP0272	ProPM-224	J.G. Goff and Associates	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Goff	Phyllis	CCLRP0782	ProALT-134		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Goff	Phyllis	CCLRP0782	ProALT-135		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Goff	Phyllis	CCLRP0782	PubPI-029		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process

Goldman	Rich	CCLRP0651	EngTI-45		2.3	EngTI-023	Grade Separation
Goldman	Rich	CCLRP0651	PlaTP-073		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Goldman	Rich	CCLRP0651	SocNC-161		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation
Goldstein	Janice	CCLRP0043	PubPI-056		3.2	PubPI-030	Community Involvement
Goldstein	Janice	CCLRP0043	PubPI-073		11	PubPI-039	Public Involvement
Goldstein	Janice	CCLRP0043	SocEJ-031		3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
Goldstein	Janice	CCLRP0043	SocNC-114		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Goldstein	Janice	CCLRP0043	SocNC-128		3.8	SocEJ-012	Inclusive Community Involvement
Goldstein	Jules	CCLRP0772	EngTI-19		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
Goldstein	Jules	CCLRP0772	PlaTP-023		2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
Graham	Teresa	CCLRP0500	ProALT-293		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Graham	Teresa	CCLRP0500	SocNC-059		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Grans	Steve	CCLRP0361	PlaTP-250	Minnesota State Fair	6.1	PlaTP-134	Transit Effects
Grant	Sam	CCLRP0177	NR-4		3.2	NR-024	Community Involvement
Grant	Sam	CCLRP0177	ProPURP-091		3.2	ProPURP-005	Community Involvement
Grant	Sam	CCLRP0177	PubPI-044		11	PubPI-022	Public Comment Process
Grant	Sam	CCLRP0177	SocEJ-040		3.8	SocEJ-013	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Grant	Sam	CCLRP0177	SocEJ-045		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
Gravelle	Theresa	CCLRP0408	EcoEE-47	Ecolab, Inc	5.1	EcoEE-010	Economic Conditions
Gravelle	Theresa	CCLRP0408	PlaTP-208	Ecolab, Inc	1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
Gravelle	Theresa	CCLRP0408	ProPM-162	Ecolab, Inc	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Gravelle	Theresa	CCLRP0408	ProPURP-234	Ecolab, Inc	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Greene	David	CCLRP0893	EcoEE-75		5.1	EcoEE-012	Economic Conditions
Greene	David	CCLRP0032	NR-32		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Greene	David	CCLRP0893	PlaTP-104		6.1	PlaTP-098	Supporting Bus Service
Greene	David	CCLRP0893	ProALT-406		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Greene	David	CCLRP0631	ProHLP-098		2.3	ProHLP-010	Stations
Greene	David	CCLRP0032	SocEJ-094		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
Greene	David	CCLRP0893	SocNC-030		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation
Greene	Roger	CCLRP0872	EngPG-70	HealthEast Care System	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Greene	Roger	CCLRP0872	PlaTE-102	HealthEast Care System	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Greene	Roger	CCLRP0872	ProALT-308	HealthEast Care System	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Greene	Roger	CCLRP0872	ProPM-120	HealthEast Care System	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Griffin	Tim	CCLRP0834	ProALT-359	St. Paul Design Center	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Grotheim	Kevin	CCLRP0010	EcoEE-134		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Grotheim	Kevin	CCLRP0010	ProALT-567		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Grotheim	Kevin	CCLRP0010	ProPM-299		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Grover	Tom	CCLRP0659	PlaTE-191	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Grover	Tom	CCLRP0659	ProPM-011	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Grover	Tom	CCLRP0659	ProPURP-132	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Grunwald	Cheryl	CCLRP0358	ProPM-134	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Grunwald	Cheryl	CCLRP0358	ProPURP-017	Ecolab	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Grunwald	Cheryl	CCLRP0358	ProPURP-201	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Grzywinski	Joan	CCLRP0894	PlaTE-24	Central Corridor Partnership	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Grzywinski	Joan	CCLRP0894	ProALT-108	Central Corridor Partnership	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Grzywinski	Joan	CCLRP0465	ProALT-383	Central Corridor Partnership	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Grzywinski	Joan	CCLRP0894	ProALT-471	Central Corridor Partnership	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Grzywinski	Joan	CCLRP0894	ProPM-276	Central Corridor Partnership	2.3	NR-013	Miscellaneous
Grzywinski	Joan	CCLRP0894	PubPI-050	Central Corridor Partnership	11	PubPI-027	Public Involvement
Grzywinski	Joan	CCLRP0894	SocEE-8	Central Corridor Partnership	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
Gude	Mike	CCLRP0183	EcoEE-58		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
Gude	Mike	CCLRP0183	NR-22		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Gude	Mike	CCLRP0183	NR-28		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Gude	Mike	CCLRP0183	PlaTE-137		6.1	PlaTE-011	Bus System Impact
Gude	Mike	CCLRP0183	ProALT-483		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gude	Mike	CCLRP0183	ProALT-622		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gude	Mike	CCLRP0183	ProProjBdj-017		10.1	ProProjBdj-010	Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
Gude	Mike	CCLRP0183	PubPI-024		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
Gujral	Prabhjit	CCLRP0402	ProPM-298		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Gujral	Prabhjit	CCLRP0402	ProPURP-063		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Guldgn	Jeff	CCLRP0052	ProALT-317		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Guldgn	Jeff	CCLRP0052	ProALT-429		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Guldgn	Jeff	CCLRP0052	ProALT-619		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Gundersen	Jane	CCLRP0825	ProALT-336		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Gundersen	Jane	CCLRP0825	ProHLP-068		2.3	PlaTP-013	Alignment
Gute	Mary	CCLRP0450	ProALT-473		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Guzman	Maximo	CCLRP0384	ProPM-203	Ecolab inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Guzman	Maximo	CCLRP0384	ProPURP-139	Ecolab inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Haben	Dave	CCLRP0248	ProHLP-106		2.3	ProHLP-015	Miscellaneous
Hadley	Linda	CCLRP0699	PlaTE-105	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hadley	Linda	CCLRP0699	ProPM-144	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project

Hadley	Linda	CCLRP0699	ProPURP-243	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hadley	Linda	CCLRP0699	SocNC-143	Ecolab Inc.,	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Hagen	David	CCLRP0591	ProALT-564		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hagen	David	CCLRP0591	SocNC-163		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Haigh	Sue	CCLRP0909	EngTI-9	Twin Cities Habitat for Humanity	6.2	EngTI-004	Congestion
Haigh	Sue	CCLRP0909	PlaTE-51	Twin Cities Habitat for Humanity	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Haigh	Sue	CCLRP0909	ProALT-077	Twin Cities Habitat for Humanity	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Haigh	Sue	CCLRP0909	SocEJ-029	Twin Cities Habitat for Humanity	3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
Hale	Carla	CCLRP0245	EcoEE-32	Securian Financial Group	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Hale	Carla	CCLRP0245	PlaTE-150	Securian Financial Group	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Hale	Carla	CCLRP0245	PlaTE-85	Securian Financial Group	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Hale	Carla	CCLRP0245	ProPM-036	Securian Financial Group	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Hames	Dan	CCLRP0495	ProALT-425		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hames	Dan	CCLRP0495	SocNC-175		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hammond	Mary J.	CCLRP0339	EngPG-17		6.3	EngPG-003	Parking
Hammond	Mary J.	CCLRP0339	PlaTE-185		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Hammond	Mary J.	CCLRP0339	ProPM-193		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Handzija	Haris	CCLRP0334	EcoEE-25		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Handzija	Haris	CCLRP0334	PlaTE-43		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Handzija	Haris	CCLRP0334	ProALT-580		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Handzija	Haris	CCLRP0334	ProPURP-235		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hanf	Benjamin	CCLRP0181	ProALT-481		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hanf	Benjamin	CCLRP0181	SocNC-167		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hannu	Donovan	CCLRP0308	ProPM-182		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Hanson	Chad	CCLRP0582	ProALT-236		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hanson	Chad	CCLRP0582	SocSC-002		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	EngUT-11	Metropolitan Council	4.2	EngUT-004	Water Resources
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	EngUT-12	Metropolitan Council	4.2	EngUT-004	Water Resources
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	EngUT-13	Metropolitan Council	4.2	EngUT-004	Water Resources
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	EngUT-14	Metropolitan Council	4.2	EngUT-004	Water Resources

Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	EngUT-21	Metropolitan Council	4.1	EngUT-005	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	NatAQ-30	Metropolitan Council	4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	NatWB-1	Metropolitan Council	4.2	NatWB-001	Water Resources
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	PlaTE-169	Metropolitan Council	3.1	PlaTE-014	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	PlaTP-120	Metropolitan Council	3.2	PlaTP-025	U of M
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	PlaTP-141	Metropolitan Council	3.1	PlaTP-115	Coordinate with Other Community Plans
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	ProHLP-034	Metropolitan Council	3.1	ProHLP-022	Impact
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	ProHLP-035	Metropolitan Council	3.1	SocLU-005	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	ProPM-207	Metropolitan Council	3	ProPM-018	Report Corrections Needed
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	PubPI-063	Metropolitan Council	3.1	PubPI-034	Coordinate with Other Community Plans
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	SocEE-11	Metropolitan Council	4.2	SocEE-006	Water Resources
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	SocEE-13	Metropolitan Council	4.2	SocEE-006	Water Resources
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	SocEE-2	Metropolitan Council	4.2	SocEE-002	Water Resources
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	SocEE-20	Metropolitan Council	4.2	EngUT-004	Water Resources
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	SocLU-013	Metropolitan Council	3.1	SocLU-008	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	SocP4-2	Metropolitan Council	3.5	SocP4-002	Parklands and Recreation Areas
Hanson	Ryan	CCLRP0262	ProALT-101		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hanson	Ryan	CCLRP0262	SocNC-117		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Harder	Terri	CCLRP0599	ProALT-618		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Harder	Terri	CCLRP0599	SocNC-171		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Harens	Thomas	CCLRP0273	EcoEE-129	Inventiong Solutions	1	EcoEE-017	Who Will Benefit?
Harens	Thomas	CCLRP0273	ProALT-095	Inventiong Solutions	2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Harens	Thomas	CCLRP0273	ProALT-219	Inventiong Solutions	2.3	ProALT-045	Alternatives Analysis
Harens	Thomas	CCLRP0273	ProALT-297	Inventiong Solutions	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Harens	Thomas	CCLRP0273	ProPM-244	Inventiong Solutions	2.3	NR-013	Miscellaneous
Harens	Thomas	CCLRP0273	ProPOL-15	Inventiong Solutions	2.3	ProALT-004	Alternatives Analysis

Harens	Thomas	CCLRP0273	PubPI-055	Inventing Solutions	11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
Hargens	Amy	CCLRP0633	EcoEE-65		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Hargens	Amy	CCLRP0633	ProALT-242		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hargens	Amy	CCLRP0633	ProPM-208		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Harriet	Harriet	CCLRP0148	ProALT-531		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Harriet	Harriet	CCLRP0148	PubPI-013		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
Harrigan	Sandy	CCLRP0920	SocNC-035		1	ProHLP-019	Who Will Benefit?
Harris	Ginny	CCLRP0813	NatNV-21		4.7	NatNV-005	Noise
Harris	Ginny	CCLRP0813	PlaTP-165		3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
Harris	Ginny	CCLRP0813	ProALT-356		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hart	Bryan	CCLRP0328	ProALT-628		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hart	Bryan	CCLRP0328	ProFSt-008		8.1	ProFSt-006	Capital Funding Strategy
Hart	Bryan	CCLRP0328	ProPURP-005		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Hart	Sean	CCLRP0204	EcoEE-123		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Hart	Sean	CCLRP0204	NatAQ-11		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
Hart	Sean	CCLRP0204	NatNV-12		4.7	NatNV-001	Noise
Hart	Sean	CCLRP0204	ProALT-312		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hart	Sean	CCLRP0204	ProALT-486		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hart	Sean	CCLRP0204	SocEU-15		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
Hart	Sean	CCLRP0204	SocNC-193		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Hartung	Jill	CCLRP0711	PlaTE-112	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hartung	Jill	CCLRP0711	ProPM-018	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hartung	Jill	CCLRP0711	ProPURP-252	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Harvey	Gary	CCLRP0299	ProALT-237		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Harvey	Gary	CCLRP0299	SocNC-136		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Harvey	Robert	CCLRP0510	ProALT-495		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Harvey	Robert	CCLRP0510	SocNC-203		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hauenstein	Emily	CCLRP0729	ProPM-079	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hauenstein	Emily	CCLRP0729	ProPURP-163	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Haugee	Eric	CCLRP0088	EngBP-49		6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Haugee	Eric	CCLRP0088	EngCI-33		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Haugee	Eric	CCLRP0088	EngPG-24		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Haugee	Eric	CCLRP0088	PlaTE-53		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Haugee	Eric	CCLRP0088	PlaTP-161		6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
Haugee	Eric	CCLRP0088	PlaTP-232		6.1	PlaTP-061	Bus System Impact
Haugee	Eric	CCLRP0088	ProPM-138		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Haugee	Eric	CCLRP0088	ProPM-213		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Haugen	Eunice	CCLRP0332	EcoEE-23		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Haugen	Eunice	CCLRP0332	PlaTE-18		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Haugen	Eunice	CCLRP0332	ProALT-381		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Haugen	Eunice	CCLRP0332	ProPURP-046		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Author	Reviewer	Request ID	Response ID	Organization	Score	Response ID	Response Description
Haugh	Scott	CCLRP0223	ProPM-265	Securian Financial Group	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hauser	Julie	CCLRP0362	ProPM-148	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hauser	Julie	CCLRP0362	ProPURP-018	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hauser	Steven	CCLRP0232	EngBP-11		6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Hauser	Steven	CCLRP0232	EngBP-34		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Hauser	Steven	CCLRP0232	EngCI-23		4.2	EngCI-008	Water Resources
Hauser	Steven	CCLRP0232	EngPG-31		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Hauser	Steven	CCLRP0232	NR-54		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Hauser	Steven	CCLRP0232	PlaTP-088		2.3	ProALT-030	Alternatives Analysis
Hauser	Steven	CCLRP0232	PlaTP-216		6.1	PlaTP-051	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Hauser	Steven	CCLRP0232	ProALT-042		6.1	ProALT-014	LRT System Design
Heelan	Rebecca G	CCLRP0019	ProPM-091		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Heelan	Rebecca G	CCLRP0019	PubPI-022		11	PubPI-004	Public Involvement
Hegdahl	Nancy	CCLRP0720	PlaTE-106	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hegdahl	Nancy	CCLRP0720	ProPM-032	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hegdahl	Nancy	CCLRP0720	ProPURP-149	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hegge	Ellen	CCLRP0717	ProPM-096	Ecolab inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hegge	Ellen	CCLRP0717	ProPURP-076	Ecolab inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hegge	Ellen	CCLRP0717	ProPURP-182	Ecolab inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Heiland	Theresa	CCLRP0462	PlaTP-053	Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
Heiland	Theresa	CCLRP0462	PlaTP-101	Merriam Park Community Council	6.1	PlaTP-061	Bus System Impact
Heiland	Theresa	CCLRP0462	PlaTP-119	Merriam Park Community Council	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
Heiland	Theresa	CCLRP0462	ProALT-055	Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Heiland	Theresa	CCLRP0462	PubPI-047	Merriam Park Community Council	3.2	PubPI-011	Community Involvement
Hein	Brigitte	CCLRP0309	ProALT-165		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hein	Brigitte	CCLRP0309	SocNC-140		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hennen	David	CCLRP0047	EngPG-23		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Hennen	David	CCLRP0047	ProALT-551		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hennen	David	CCLRP0047	ProPOL-29		3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
Hennen	David	CCLRP0133	PubPI-079		11	PubPI-043	Public Comment Process
Hennen	David	CCLRP0047	SocNC-156		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Herbison	Priscilla	CCLRP0096	EcoEE-93		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Herbison	Priscilla	CCLRP0096	PlaTE-109		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Herbison	Priscilla	CCLRP0096	ProPM-009		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project

Herbison	Priscilla	CCLRP0096	ProPURP-221		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Herbison	Priscilla	CCLRP0096	SocNC-052		3.3	SocNC-014	Acquisitions and Displacements/Relocations
Herman	Andrea	CCLRP0921	PlaTE-148		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Herman	Andrea	CCLRP0921	PlaTP-029		2.3	ProALT-010	Stations
Herman	Andrea	CCLRP0044	PlaTP-086		6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
Herman	Andrea	CCLRP0044	ProPM-212		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Herman	Andrea	CCLRP0044	ProPURP-068		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Herman	Randy	CCLRP0254	PlaTE-114		6.3	PlaTE-007	Parking
Herman	Randy	CCLRP0254	ProALT-353		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Herman	Randy	CCLRP0254	SocNC-046		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hermes	James	CCLRP0261	ProALT-185		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hermes	James	CCLRP0261	SocNC-122		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Herr	Ben	CCLRP0529	ProPM-103	DSG (Dakota Supply Group)	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hess	James	CCLRP0697	PlaTE-118	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hess	James	CCLRP0697	PlaTE-37	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hess	James	CCLRP0697	ProPM-066	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hickman	Joan	CCLRP0127	SocSS-044		3.7	SocSS-002	Safety and Security
Hielsberg	Thomas	CCLRP0087	PlaTP-200		2.3	PlaTP-034	Stations
Hielsberg	Thomas	CCLRP0087	ProALT-477		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hietpas	Scott	CCLRP0700	ProPM-111	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hietpas	Scott	CCLRP0700	ProPURP-135	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hill	Brian	CCLRP0294	PlaTE-30		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hill	Brian	CCLRP0294	ProPM-071		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Hilleman	Monte	CCLRP0439	EcoEE-149	St. Paul Port Authority	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Hilleman	Monte	CCLRP0868	EcoEE-81	St. Paul Port Authority	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Hilleman	Monte	CCLRP0868	EngTI-18	St. Paul Port Authority	6.2	EngTI-004	Congestion
Hilleman	Monte	CCLRP0868	PlaTE-187	St. Paul Port Authority	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Hilleman	Monte	CCLRP0868	ProALT-233	St. Paul Port Authority	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Hilleman	Monte	CCLRP0439	ProALT-303	St. Paul Port Authority	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hilleman	Monte	CCLRP0868	ProALT-422	St. Paul Port Authority	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hilleman	Monte	CCLRP0868	SocHM-5	St. Paul Port Authority	4.9	SocHM-005	Hazardous or Regulated Materials
Hokanson	Natalie	CCLRP0274	PlaTE-57		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Hokanson	Natalie	CCLRP0274	ProALT-572		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Hokanson	Natalie	CCLRP0274	ProPURP-006		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Hokanson	Natalie	CCLRP0274	ProPURP-175		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Holbrook	Chris	CCLRP0425	PlaTE-7		6.2	PlaTE-026	Congestion
Holbrook	Chris	CCLRP0425	PlaTP-225		2.3	PlaTP-035	Grade Separation
Holbrook	Chris	CCLRP0425	ProALT-326		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hollander	Judith	CCLRP0326	EcoEE-54		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Hollencamp	Stephen	CCLRP0227	ProALT-378		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hollencamp	Stephen	CCLRP0227	SocNC-102		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Holm	Keith	CCLRP0505	ProALT-252		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Holm	Keith	CCLRP0505	SocNC-097		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Holzman	Lou	CCLRP0387	ProPM-089	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Holzman	Lou	CCLRP0387	ProPURP-081	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Honeywell	Cedar	CCLRP0266	ProALT-547		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Honeywell	Cedar	CCLRP0266	SocNC-072		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Horneck	Ryan	CCLRP0615	ProALT-180		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Horneck	Ryan	CCLRP0615	SocNC-214		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hoven	Ralph Van	CCLRP0376	ProPM-117		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Hoven	Ralph Van	CCLRP0376	ProPURP-140		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Howe	Kirsten	CCLRP0157	PlaTE-20		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Howe	Kirsten	CCLRP0157	PlaTE-49		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Howe	Kirsten	CCLRP0157	ProPM-214		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
							Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station
Hruby	Maryanne	CCLRP0063	EngEng-3		6.3	PlaTE-001	Design
Hruby	Maryanne	CCLRP0063	EngPG-34		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Hruby	Maryanne	CCLRP0063	PlaTE-139		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Hruby	Maryanne	CCLRP0063	PlaTP-007		1	ProHLP-019	Who Will Benefit?
Hruby	Maryanne	CCLRP0063	PubPI-070		2.3	PubPI-018	Alignment
							Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Hruby	Maryanne	CCLRP0063	SocSS-24		6.3	EngBP-013	
				Canadian Pacific			
Huber	John	CCLRP0526	PlaTP-117	Railway	6.1	PlaTP-106	Transit Effects
				Canadian Pacific			
Huber	John	CCLRP0526	PlaTP-248	Railway	6.1	PlaTP-134	Transit Effects
Huebsch	Victoria	CCLRP0579	ProALT-342		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Huebsch	Victoria	CCLRP0579	SocNC-131		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hunter	Coralie	CCLRP0258	EcoEE-50		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Hunter	Coralie	CCLRP0258	NatAQ-3		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
Hunter	Coralie	CCLRP0258	PlaTE-56		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Hunter	Coralie	CCLRP0258	ProPM-092		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hunter	Coralie	CCLRP0258	ProPURP-187		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				Securian Financial			
Huovinen	Suzette	CCLRP0247	EcoEE-26	Group	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions

Huovinen	Suzette	CCLRP0247	PlaTE-70	Securian Financial Group	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Huovinen	Suzette	CCLRP0247	ProALT-123	Securian Financial Group	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hurlbut	Robert	CCLRP0242	ProALT-234		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Hurlbut	Robert	CCLRP0242	SocNC-186		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Huynh	Nghi	CCLRP0793	EcoEE-17		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Huynh	Nghi	CCLRP0793	EngCI-43		3.2	EngCI-001	Community Businesses
Huynh	Nghi	CCLRP0793	EngPG-81		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Huynh	Nghi	CCLRP0793	SocNC-164		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
Iacono	Michael	CCLRP0130	EngRW-17		6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion
Iacono	Michael	CCLRP0130	PlaTP-103		6.1	PlaTP-097	Supporting Bus Service Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Iacono	Michael	CCLRP0130	ProALT-048		2.3	ProALT-037	Buses)
Iacono	Michael	CCLRP0130	ProALT-050		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Iacono	Michael	CCLRP0130	ProALT-478		2.3	ProALT-040	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Iacono	Michael	CCLRP0130	ProALT-627		2.3	ProALT-044	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Indihar	Frank J	CCLRP0537	ProALT-508	HealthEast Care System	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Inman	Karen	CCLRP0004	EngCI-27		3.2	EngCI-001	Community Businesses
Inman	Karen	CCLRP0004	NR-36		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Inman	Karen	CCLRP0004	ProALT-544		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Inman	Karen	CCLRP0004	SocEJ-044		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
Inman	Karen	CCLRP0004	SocEJ-061		3.8	SocEJ-011	Inclusive Community Involvement Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Inman	Karen	CCLRP0004	SocNC-205		3.2	SocNC-010	Community Businesses Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Inman	Karen	CCLRP0004	SocSS-27		6.3	EngBP-001	and Mitigation
Inserra	Andy	CCLRP0270	EcoEE-157		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Inserra	Andy	CCLRP0270	PlaTE-125		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Inserra	Andy	CCLRP0270	PlaTE-192		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Inserra	Andy	CCLRP0270	ProALT-491		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Inserra	Andy	CCLRP0270	ProALT-579		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Inserra	Andy	CCLRP0270	ProPURP-078		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Ireland	Amy	CCLRP0824	ProALT-417		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Ireland	Mark	CCLRP0284	EcoEE-18		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Ireland	Mark	CCLRP0284	EngBP-48		6.3	EngBP-012	and Mitigation
Ireland	Mark	CCLRP0284	ProALT-320		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Ireland	Mark	CCLRP0284	ProALT-574		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Ireland	Mark	CCLRP0284	SocLU-029		3.1	SocLU-001	Land Use and Socio-Economics
Ireland	Mark	CCLRP0284	SocNC-087		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Iverson	Kristi	CCLRP0683	ProPM-116	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Iverson	Kristi	CCLRP0683	ProPURP-223	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Jacobs	Randall	CCLRP0879	PlaTE-178		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Jacobs	Randall	CCLRP0879	PlaTE-195		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Jacobs	Randall	CCLRP0879	ProALT-382		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Jacobs	Randall	CCLRP0879	ProPM-031		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Jaeschke	Carl	CCLRP0678	EcoEE-37	Ecolab Inc.,	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Jaeschke	Carl	CCLRP0678	ProPM-188	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Jaeschke	Carl	CCLRP0678	ProPURP-069	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Jarman	Jim	CCLRP0397	ProPM-109		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Jarman	Jim	CCLRP0397	ProPURP-169		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Jarvenpa	Alan	CCLRP0141	NR-35		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Jarvenpa	Alan	CCLRP0141	PlaTE-012		3.2	SocNC-020	Neighborhood Preservation
Jarvenpa	Alan	CCLRP0141	PlaTP-115		6.1	PlaTP-061	Bus System Impact
Jarvenpa	Alan	CCLRP0141	ProALT-074		11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
Jarvenpa	Alan	CCLRP0141	SocNC-224		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Jaska	Susan	CCLRP0727	ProPM-062	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Jaska	Susan	CCLRP0727	ProPURP-011	Ecolab Inc.,	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Jaska	Susan	CCLRP0727	ProPURP-145	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Jefferson	Carla	CCLRP0491	ProALT-494		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Jefferson	Carla	CCLRP0491	SocNC-112		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				U.S. Department of			
Jensen	Tom	CCLRP0379	EngCI-52	Transportation	6.3	EngCI-009	Miscellaneous
Jessup	Judy	CCLRP0377	ProPM-173	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Jessup	Judy	CCLRP0377	ProPURP-110	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Jindra	Diane	CCLRP0378	ProPM-073	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Jindra	Diane	CCLRP0378	ProPURP-070	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Jiruska	Jennifer	CCLRP0290	ProALT-272		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Jiruska	Jennifer	CCLRP0290	SocNC-231		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Johns	Brian	CCLRP0102	ProALT-388		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Johns	Brian	CCLRP0102	ProPOL-22		1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
Johnson	Carolynn	CCLRP0136	EngCI-51		3.2	ProPOL-004	Community Involvement
Johnson	Carolynn	CCLRP0136	EngPG-50		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Johnson	Carolynn	CCLRP0136	ProPOL-33		3.2	ProPOL-004	Community Involvement
Johnson	Carolynn	CCLRP0136	SocNC-015		3.8	SocEJ-012	Inclusive Community Involvement
Johnson	Carolynn	CCLRP0136	SocNC-085		3.8	SocEJ-012	Inclusive Community Involvement
Johnson	Craig	CCLRP0828	PlaTP-098		6.1	PlaTF-008	Travel Time
Johnson	Craig	CCLRP0828	ProHLP-018		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
Johnson	Craig	CCLRP0828	ProHLP-084		2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota
Johnson	Grant	CCLRP0586	ProALT-540		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Johnson	Grant	CCLRP0586	SocNC-065		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Johnson	Jennifer Johnson	CCLRP0714	EngCI-12	Minnesota Public Radio	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Johnson	Jennifer Johnson	CCLRP0714	EngCI-14	Minnesota Public Radio	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Johnson	Jennifer Johnson	CCLRP0714	EngEng-2	Minnesota Public Radio	3.2	EngCI-010	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Johnson	Jennifer Johnson	CCLRP0714	EngUT-5	Minnesota Public Radio	4.1	EngUT-003	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Johnson	Jennifer Johnson	CCLRP0714	NatNV-16	Minnesota Public Radio	4.8	NatNV-003	Vibration
Johnson	Jennifer Johnson	CCLRP0714	NatNV-19	Minnesota Public Radio	4.7	NatNV-004	Noise
Johnson	Jennifer Johnson	CCLRP0714	ProHLP-053	Minnesota Public Radio	2.3	PlaTP-054	Alignment
Johnson	Jennifer Johnson	CCLRP0714	SocSS-043	Minnesota Public Radio	3.7	SocSS-005	Safety and Security
Johnson	John G.	CCLRP0325	PlaTE-133		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Johnson	John G.	CCLRP0325	ProPM-030		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Johnson	Karen	CCLRP0383	PlaTE-113	Ecolab	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Johnson	Karen	CCLRP0383	ProPM-232	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Johnson	Karen	CCLRP0383	ProPURP-016	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Johnson	Kathleen	CCLRP0503	ProALT-064		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Johnson	Kathleen	CCLRP0503	SocNC-181		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Johnson	Kenneth	CCLRP0440	ProALT-354	St. Paul Port Authority	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Johnson	Lisa	CCLRP0210	ProALT-246		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Johnson	Lisa	CCLRP0210	SocNC-228		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Johnson	Rick	CCLRP0011	PlaTE-129		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Johnson	Rick	CCLRP0011	PlaTE-184		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Johnson	Rick	CCLRP0011	ProALT-078		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Johnson	Tamara	CCLRP0079	ProALT-385		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Johnson	Tamara	CCLRP0079	ProPURP-152		1	ProPURP-010	Who Will Benefit?
Johnson	Thomas	CCLRP0446	ProPM-025		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Jones	Carl	CCLRP0452	PubPI-058		11	PubPI-015	Public Comment Process
Jones	Matt	CCLRP0903	EcoEE-71	St. Paul Trades and Labor 70	5.1	EcoEE-011	Economic Conditions
Jones	Matt	CCLRP0903	ProALT-088	St. Paul Trades and Labor 70	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Jones	Preston	CCLRP0507	ProALT-636		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Jones	Preston	CCLRP0507	SocNC-226		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Jones	Seitu Kenneth	CCLRP0550	NatVA-4		3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Jones	Seitu Kenneth	CCLRP0550	PubPI-005		3.8	PubPI-005	Inclusive Community Involvement

Jones	Seitu Kenneth	CCLRP0550	SocCR-001		3.8	SocEJ-019	Contracting
Jungwirth	David	CCLRP0620	ProALT-090		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Jungwirth	David	CCLRP0620	SocNC-095		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Jurgens	Andrew	CCLRP0268	ProALT-178		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Jurgens	Andrew	CCLRP0268	SocNC-064		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Kalinowski	Mary	CCLRP0716	ProPM-126	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Kalinowski	Mary	CCLRP0716	ProPURP-245	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Kane	Joe	CCLRP0029	ProHLP-118		2.3	ProHLP-028	Other Corridors
Karageorgiou	Elissaios	CCLRP0431	ProALT-117		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Karageorgiou	Elissaios	CCLRP0431	ProALT-203		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
							Impact and Mitigation for
Kasel	Terri	CCLRP0905	EngCI-2		3.2	EngCI-001	Community Businesses
Kasel	Terri	CCLRP0905	EngPG-4		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Kasel	Terri	CCLRP0905	PlaTP-014		2.3	PlaTP-012	Cost Effectiveness
Keena	Judith	CCLRP0342	EcoEE-30		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Keena	Judith	CCLRP0342	PlaTE-143		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Keena	Judith	CCLRP0342	ProALT-493		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Keena	Judith	CCLRP0342	ProPURP-199		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Keljik	Karen	CCLRP0292	ProALT-100		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Keljik	Karen	CCLRP0292	SocNC-176		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Kelliher	Mark	CCLRP0445	EngTI-46		6.2	EngTI-004	Congestion
Kelliher	Mark	CCLRP0445	ProALT-116		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Kelliher	Mark	CCLRP0445	ProHLP-049		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Kennedy	Denis	CCLRP0357	PlaTE-101		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Kennedy	Denis	CCLRP0357	ProALT-191		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Kennedy	Michele	CCLRP0712	PlaTE-121	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Kennedy	Michele	CCLRP0712	ProPM-135	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Kennedy	Michele	CCLRP0712	ProPURP-098	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Keple	Nick	CCLRP0359	ProPM-152		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Keple	Nick	CCLRP0359	ProPURP-239		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Keturakat	Carol	CCLRP0050	EcoEE-139		5.1	EcoEE-012	Economic Conditions
Keturakat	Carol	CCLRP0050	EngRW-15		6.2	EngRW-004	Congestion
Keturakat	Carol	CCLRP0050	NatVA-10		3.6	NatVA-005	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Keturakat	Carol	CCLRP0050	ProFSt-006		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Keturakat	Carol	CCLRP0050	ProPM-301		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Keturakat	Carol	CCLRP0050	SocEE-4		4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
Khaliq	Nathaniel	CCLRP0899	EcoEE-13	NAACP - St. Paul	5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
Khaliq	Nathaniel	CCLRP0899	EngPG-63	NAACP - St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Khaliq	Nathaniel	CCLRP0899	ProProjBdj-007	NAACP - St. Paul	3.1	ProProjBdj-004	Land Use and Socio-Economics
Khaliq	Nathaniel	CCLRP0899	ProPURP-211	NAACP - St. Paul	1	ProPURP-002	Who Will Benefit?
Khaliq	Nathaniel	CCLRP0899	PubPI-033	NAACP - St. Paul	2.3	PubPI-018	Alignment
Khaliq	Nathaniel	CCLRP0899	SocHM-4	NAACP - St. Paul	4.6	SocHM-004	Air Quality

Khaliq	Nathaniel	CCLRP0899	SocSS-46	NAACP - St. Paul	6.2	EngRW-011	Congestion Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Kiihn	Ross G.	CCLRP0330	PlaTE-3		3.2	PlaTE-008	Grade Separation
Kiihn	Ross G.	CCLRP0330	PlaTP-237		2.3	PlaTP-039	Not in Favor of Project
Kiihn	Ross G.	CCLRP0330	ProPM-227		1	PlaTP-130	Other Corridors
Kincaid	Michael	CCLRP0082	NR-5		2.3	NR-022	Miscellaneous
Kincaid	Michael	CCLRP0082	ProHLP-072		2.3	ProHLP-015	Not in Favor of Project
Kincaid	Michael	CCLRP0082	ProPURP-077		1	PlaTP-130	In Favor of Project
Kingston	Tom	CCLRP0771	PlaTE-27	Wilder Foundation	1	PlaTP-129	Alternatives Analysis
Kingston	Tom	CCLRP0771	ProALT-012	Wilder Foundation	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Kingston	Tom	CCLRP0771	ProALT-365	Wilder Foundation	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Kingston	Tom	CCLRP0771	SocEJ-028	Wilder Foundation	3.8	SocEJ-000	Inclusive Community Involvement
Kingston	Tom	CCLRP0771	SocEJ-059	Wilder Foundation	3.8	SocEJ-000	Inclusive Community Involvement
Kinney	Mary C.	CCLRP0246	EcoEE-35	Securian Retirement Services	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Kinney	Mary C.	CCLRP0246	PlaTE-17	Securian Retirement Services	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Kinney	Mary C.	CCLRP0246	ProPM-221	Securian Retirement Services	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Klein	Ellen	CCLRP0401	ProPM-129	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Klein	Ellen	CCLRP0401	ProPURP-072	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Kline-Flores	Vicki	CCLRP0672	ProPM-118	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Kline-Flores	Vicki	CCLRP0672	ProPURP-203	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Klingel	Todd	CCLRP0760	EngTI-42	Minneapolis Regional Chamber of Commerce	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Klingel	Todd	CCLRP0760	PlaTE-127	Minneapolis Regional Chamber of Commerce	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Klingel	Todd	CCLRP0760	ProALT-377	Minneapolis Regional Chamber of Commerce	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Klingel	Todd	CCLRP0760	PubPI-016	Minneapolis Regional Chamber of Commerce	11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
Knutson	Jeff	CCLRP0391	ProPM-179	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Knutson	Jeff	CCLRP0391	ProPURP-036	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Koziol	Dale	CCLRP0392	ProPURP-208	Ecolab	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Kraus	Kim	CCLRP0400	ProPM-019		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Kraus	Kim	CCLRP0400	ProPURP-172		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project

Kriel	Robert	CCLRP0078	EngCI-55		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses Congestion
Kriel	Robert	CCLRP0078	EngRW-33		6.2	EngRW-014	
Kriel	Robert	CCLRP0078	ProALT-586		2.3	ProALT-042	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Kriel	Robert	CCLRP0078	ProHLP-052		2.3	ProHLP-021	
Kriel	Robert	CCLRP0078	ProPM-013		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Kringler	Todd	CCLRP0275	ProALT-464		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Kringler	Todd	CCLRP0275	ProHLP-111		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
				Minnesota Youth Symphonies			
Krueger	Vicki	CCLRP0296	SocNC-217		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Krumm	Kevin	CCLRP0611	ProPM-167		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Krumm	Kevin	CCLRP0611	ProPURP-079		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Kuczaboski	Tony	CCLRP0588	ProALT-172		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Kuczaboski	Tony	CCLRP0588	SocNC-190		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Kue	Saeng	CCLRP0794	PubPI-062		3.8	PubPI-033	Inclusive Community Involvement Businesses
Kue	Saeng	CCLRP0794	SocEJ-005		3.8	SocEJ-001	
Kueppers	Kathy	CCLRP0593	ProALT-591		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Kueppers	Kathy	CCLRP0593	SocNC-107		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				Restoration Professionals Capital City Partnership KPMG			
Labey	Patty	CCLRP0541	ProALT-138		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Labosky	John	CCLRP0530	ProALT-060		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lafrence	Andrew	CCLRP0544	ProALT-362		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lafreniere	Susan	CCLRP0685	ProPM-057		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Lafreniere	Susan	CCLRP0685	ProPURP-168		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Lam	Leisbel	CCLRP0501	ProALT-094		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lam	Leisbel	CCLRP0501	SocNC-050		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lamb	Pat	CCLRP0152	EcoEE-91		5.1	EcoEE-002	Economic Conditions
							Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Distance/Paths to Stations
Lamb	Pat	CCLRP0152	EngBP-25		6.3	EngBP-006	
Lamb	Pat	CCLRP0152	EngPG-61		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Lamb	Pat	CCLRP0152	NR-50		6.1	NR-021	Bus System Impact
Lamb	Pat	CCLRP0152	PlaTP-190		6.1	PlaTP-134	Transit Effects
Lamb	Pat	CCLRP0152	ProPM-051		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
Lamb	Pat	CCLRP0152	SocSS-018		3.7	SocSS-003	Safety and Security
Lambert	Clay	CCLRP0766	EcoEE-106		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
							Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Lambert	Clay	CCLRP0766	EngCI-21		3.2	EngCI-005	
Lambert	Clay	CCLRP0766	ProALT-350		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Lambert	Clay	CCLRP0766	ProProjBdj-020		3.1	ProProjBdj-004	Land Use and Socio-Economics Effects on Roadways
Lambert	Clay	CCLRP0766	SocSS-58		6.2	EngRW-003	

Lamberton	Abigail	CCLRP0039	EcoEE-104		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Lamberton	Abigail	CCLRP0039	PubPI-042		3.2	PubPI-020	Community Involvement
Lamb-Onayega	Angela	CCLRP0150	EngPG-77		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Lamb-Onayega	Angela	CCLRP0150	ProPOL-7		3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
Lamb-Onayega	Angela	CCLRP0150	SocSS-14		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Larson	Cheryl	CCLRP0077	EcoEE-135		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Larson	Cheryl	CCLRP0077	ProHLP-091		2.3	ProHLP-026	Other Corridors
Larson	Cheryl	CCLRP0077	SocEE-12		4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
Larson	Heidi	CCLRP0348	EcoEE-55	Goff & Howard, Inc.	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Larson	Heidi	CCLRP0348	PlaTE-95	Goff & Howard, Inc.	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Larson	Heidi	CCLRP0348	ProPM-229	Goff & Howard, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Larson	Heidi	CCLRP0348	ProPURP-099	Goff & Howard, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Larson	Randy	CCLRP0499	ProALT-212		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Larson	Randy	CCLRP0499	SocNC-244		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Latta	David	CCLRP0548	ProALT-626	US Bank	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Law	Kate	CCLRP0352	EcoEE-31	Gander Mountain	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Law	Kate	CCLRP0352	PlaTE-190	Gander Mountain	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Law	Kate	CCLRP0352	ProPM-184	Gander Mountain	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Law	Kate	CCLRP0352	ProPURP-159	Gander Mountain	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Le	Tyler	CCLRP0025	EngCI-39		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Le	Tyler	CCLRP0025	ProALT-331		2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Leach	Betsy	CCLRP0460	EngPG-46	Hamline Midway Coalition, District 11	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Leach	Betsy	CCLRP0460	NatAQ-17	Hamline Midway Coalition, District 11	4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
Leach	Betsy	CCLRP0460	NatNV-18	Hamline Midway Coalition, District 11	4.7	NatNV-005	Noise
Leach	Betsy	CCLRP0460	PlaTP-097	Hamline Midway Coalition, District 11	6.3	PlaTP-042	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Leach	Betsy	CCLRP0460	PubPI-015	Hamline Midway Coalition, District 11	3.2	PubPI-011	Community Involvement
Leach	Betsy	CCLRP0460	SocEJ-056	Hamline Midway Coalition, District 11	3.8	SocEJ-023	Affordable Housing

Author	Response ID	Project ID	Topic	Page	Response ID	Response Description
Ledin	Steve	CCLRP0883	NR-30	3.2	NR-025	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Ledin	Steve	CCLRP0883	PlaTE-140	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lee	Andrew	CCLRP0759	ProALT-122	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lee	Andrew	CCLRP0759	ProPOL-21	1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
Lee	Annette	CCLRP0543	ProALT-515	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
			Mintahoe, Inc District 7 Planning Council			
Lee	Boa	CCLRP0463	PubPI-083	11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
Lee	Choua	CCLRP0934	EcoEE-147	5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
Lee	Choua	CCLRP0934	PubPI-065	11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
Lee	Choua	CCLRP0934	PubPI-078	3.2	PubPI-020	Community Involvement
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	EcoEE-87	1	EcoEE-013	Who Will Benefit?
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	EngPG-11	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
						Report Clarifications Updates and
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	EngTI-34	6.2	EngTI-018	Corrections
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0839	EngTI-41	6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	EngTI-47	6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
						Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	EngUT-19	4.1	EngUT-001	Distribution Systems
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	NatAQ-14	4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	NatAQ-19	4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	NatAQ-27	4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	NR-27	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	NR-49	6.1	PlaTP-134	Transit Effects
						Report Clarifications Updates and
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	PlaPla-11	6.1	PlaPla-009	Corrections
						Alternatives Analysis (LRT &
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	PlaPla-8	2.3	PlaPla-011	Buses)
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	PlaTE-132	8.1	PlaTE-009	Capital Funding Strategy
						Report Clarifications Updates and
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0776	PlaTE-160	6.1	ProALT-018	Corrections
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	PlaTE-176	6.2	PlaTE-015	Congestion
						Alternatives Analysis (LRT &
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0839	PlaTP-158	2.3	PlaTP-123	Buses)
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0839	PlaTP-211	6.1	PlaTP-047	Bus System Impact
						Report Clarifications Updates and
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	PlaTP-235	6.1	PlaTP-062	Corrections
						Alternatives Analysis (LRT &
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0776	ProALT-140	2.3	ProALT-006	Buses)
						Alternatives Analysis (LRT &
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	ProALT-141	2.3	ProALT-038	Buses)
						Alternatives Analysis (LRT &
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0776	ProALT-143	2.3	ProALT-006	Buses)

Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	ProALT-162	2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	ProALT-295	2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	ProALT-380	6.1	ProALT-018	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	ProALT-460	6.1	ProALT-018	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	ProALT-526	2.3	ProALT-041	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	ProALT-578	2.3	ProALT-028	Miscellaneous
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0776	ProALT-606	2.3	ProALT-043	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	ProPM-016	2.3	ProPM-007	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	SocEE-16	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	SocEU-13	4.11	SocEU-003	Energy
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	SocNC-006	3.2	SocNC-009	Neighborhood Preservation
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	SocNC-182	3.3	SocNC-014	Acquisitions and Displacements/Relocations
Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	SocSS-41	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Lee	Susan	CCLRP0100	ProPM-104	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Lee	Susan	CCLRP0100	SocEU-9	4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
Legi	Rickie	CCLRP0149	ProALT-620	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Legi	Rickie	CCLRP0149	SocSS-21	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Leicht	Lisa	CCLRP0494	ProALT-571	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Leicht	Lisa	CCLRP0494	SocNC-229	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Leighton	Karen	CCLRP0240	EngTI-33	6.2	EngTI-004	Securian Financial Group, Inc. Congestion
Leighton	Karen	CCLRP0240	PlaTE-122	1	EngTI-003	Securian Financial Group, Inc. In Favor of Project
Leighton	Karen	CCLRP0240	ProALT-523	2.3	ProALT-001	Securian Financial Group, Inc. Alternatives Analysis
Leighton	Karen	CCLRP0240	ProPM-028	2.3	ProALT-001	Securian Financial Group, Inc. Alternatives Analysis
Leighton	Karen	CCLRP0240	SocEE-1	4	SocEE-001	Securian Financial Group, Inc. Environmental Effects
Leitte	Lynn	CCLRP0045	NR-11	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Leitte	Lynn	CCLRP0045	NR-21	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Leitte	Lynn	CCLRP0045	NR-29	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Leitte	Lynn	CCLRP0045	PlaTP-095	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service

Leitte	Lynn	CCLRP0045	ProALT-224		6.1	ProALT-034	LRT Park and Rides
Leitte	Lynn	CCLRP0045	ProALT-285		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lemmons	Bruce	CCLRP0020	EngTI-40		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
Lemmons	Bruce	CCLRP0020	PlaTP-231		3.2	PlaTP-060	Community Cohesion
Lemmons	Bruce	CCLRP0020	ProALT-615		2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Lemmons	Bruce	CCLRP0020	ProPM-128		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
Lendway	Lisa	CCLRP0288	EcoEE-140		5.1	EcoEE-002	Economic Conditions
Lendway	Lisa	CCLRP0288	EcoEE-155		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Lendway	Lisa	CCLRP0288	NatVA-6		3.6	NatVA-005	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Lendway	Lisa	CCLRP0288	PlaTE-4		3.2	PlaTE-025	Community Cohesion
Lendway	Lisa	CCLRP0288	PlaTP-012		2.3	PlaTP-010	Grade Separation
Lendway	Lisa	CCLRP0288	PlaTP-016		2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
Lendway	Lisa	CCLRP0288	ProPM-149		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Leonard	Mary	CCLRP0426	EngPG-15	Chocolat Celeste	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Leung	Bibi	CCLRP0707	ProPM-260	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Leung	Bibi	CCLRP0707	ProPURP-055	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Levin	Margaret	CCLRP0816	ProALT-299	Jewish Community Action	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Levin	Margaret	CCLRP0816	SocEJ-054	Jewish Community Action	3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
Levin	Margaret	CCLRP0816	SocEJ-063	Jewish Community Action	3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
Levitt	Mark	CCLRP0293	PlaTE-138	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Levitt	Mark	CCLRP0293	ProPM-222	Ecolab	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lewis	Diana	CCLRP0409	EcoEE-39	Ecolab	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Lewis	Diana	CCLRP0409	PlaTE-45	Ecolab	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Lewis	Diana	CCLRP0409	ProPM-147	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Lickness	Georgia	CCLRP0335	EcoEE-42		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Lickness	Georgia	CCLRP0335	PlaTE-126		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Lickness	Georgia	CCLRP0335	ProPM-228		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lickness	Georgia	CCLRP0335	ProPURP-158		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lincowski	Vi	CCLRP0622	ProALT-454		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lincowski	Vi	CCLRP0622	SocNC-079		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lindh	Ruth	CCLRP0648	PlaTE-199		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Lindh	Ruth	CCLRP0648	ProPM-114		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Lindh	Ruth	CCLRP0648	ProPURP-024		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Lindmen	Karen	CCLRP0932	EcoEE-19	ACORN	5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
Lindmen	Karen	CCLRP0932	PlaPla-6	ACORN	3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
Lindstrom	Jonathan	CCLRP0571	ProALT-612		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lindstrom	Jonathan	CCLRP0571	SocNC-129		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Long	Brett	CCLRP0094	ProPM-206		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Lorence	Rebekah	CCLRP0090	PubPI-028		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process

Commenter Name	Response Name	Project ID	Topic	Agency	Score	Response ID	Response Description
Lorenzen	William	CCLRP0441	NatWB-2	United State Department of Agriculture	4.2	NatWB-001	Water Resources
Losey	Daryl	CCLRP0555	ProALT-496		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Losey	Daryl	CCLRP0555	SocNC-241		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Louder	Lorrie	CCLRP0438	ProALT-053	St. Paul Port Authority	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Louder	Lorrie	CCLRP0438	ProALT-514	St. Paul Port Authority	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lovelace	Earl	CCLRP0034	ProALT-391		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lowder	Lorrie	CCLRP0845	EcoEE-154	St. Paul Port Authority	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Lowder	Lorrie	CCLRP0845	NatAQ-10	St. Paul Port Authority	4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
Lowder	Lorrie	CCLRP0845	ProALT-509	St. Paul Port Authority	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Lowder	Lorrie	CCLRP0845	SocLU-006	St. Paul Port Authority	1	SocLU-004	In Favor of Project
Lowder	Lorrie	CCLRP0845	SocNC-178	St. Paul Port Authority	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Luepker	Ellen	CCLRP0071	ProALT-268	Living Portraits	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Luepker	Ellen	CCLRP0071	SocEE-22	Living Portraits	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
Luhman	John	CCLRP0778	ProPOL-20		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Luhman	John	CCLRP0778	ProPOL-30		11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
Luhman	John	CCLRP0778	ProPURP-008		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Lund	Kristen	CCLRP0108	EcoEE-151		3.2	EcoEE-020	Neighborhood Preservation
Lund	Kristen	CCLRP0108	ProALT-126		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lund	Kristen	CCLRP0108	ProPOL-44		3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
Lund	Kristen	CCLRP0108	SocEJ-041		3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
Lund	Kristen	CCLRP0108	SocLU-017		3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics
Lunde	Jackie & Jeff	CCLRP0343	EngPG-2	Subway	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Lunde	Jackie & Jeff	CCLRP0343	PlaTP-234	Subway	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lunde	Jackie & Jeff	CCLRP0343	ProALT-576	Subway	2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Lunde	Jackie & Jeff	CCLRP0343	ProPM-145	Subway	3.1	SocLU-012	Impact
Luries	Georgia	CCLRP0117	ProALT-635		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lynn	Sheri	CCLRP0103	PlaTE-42		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Lynn	Sheri	CCLRP0103	SocNC-208		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Maccafferty	Siobhan	CCLRP0346	PlaTE-153		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Maccafferty	Siobhan	CCLRP0346	ProPM-035		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Maccafferty	Siobhan	CCLRP0346	ProPM-124		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Maccafferty	Siobhan	CCLRP0346	SocNC-189		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Mack	Andrea L	CCLRP0250	PlaTE-167		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project

Mack	Andrea L	CCLRP0250	PlaTE-76	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Mack	Andrea L	CCLRP0250	ProPM-033	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Madden	Linda	CCLRP0629	ProPM-237	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Madden	Linda	CCLRP0629	ProPURP-115	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
						Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0467	EngEng-10	6.3	EngBP-018	and Mitigation
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	EngPG-62	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	EngRW-26	6.2	EngRW-014	Congestion
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	NatNV-13	4.7	NatNV-002	Noise
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	NR-18	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
						Alternatives Analysis (LRT &
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	NR-25	2.3	NR-008	Buses)
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	PlaPla-4	3.1	PlaPla-003	Zoning
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	PlaTE-21	3.2	NR-024	Community Involvement
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	PlaTP-092	2.3	PlaTP-093	Stations
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	PlaTP-162	2.3	PlaTP-117	Alignment
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	PlaTP-192	2.3	PlaTP-034	Stations
						Selection of Locally Preferred
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	PlaTP-203	2.3	PlaTP-139	Alternative
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0840	PlaTP-241	2.3	PlaTP-052	Stations
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0840	ProALT-196	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0467	ProALT-300	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	ProALT-389	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	ProALT-449	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	ProHLP-013	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0467	ProHLP-112	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	ProPM-133	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	ProProjBdj-010	2.3	ProProjBdj-007	Grade Separation
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	SocEE-6	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	SocLU-004	1	SocLU-002	In Favor of Project
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	SocLU-030	3.1	SocLU-001	Land Use and Socio-Economics
Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154	SocSS-60	3.2	EngRW-016	Community Cohesion
Mallon	Cassandra	CCLRP0665	ProALT-298	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Mallon	Cassandra	CCLRP0665	ProPM-247	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Mallon	Cassandra	CCLRP0665	ProPURP-089	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Malloy	Chris	CCLRP0684	ProPM-023	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Malloy	Chris	CCLRP0684	ProPURP-116	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Malloy	Chris	CCLRP0684	ProPURP-147	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Malone	Raejean	CCLRP0580	ProALT-310	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Malone	Raejean	CCLRP0580	SocNC-100	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
						Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact
Markle	David	CCLRP0472	EngBP-16	6.3	EngBP-001	and Mitigation

Markle	David	CCLRP0752	EngTI-24		6.2	EngTI-004	Congestion
Markle	David	CCLRP0472	PlaPla-7		2.3	PlaPla-006	Cost Effectiveness
Markle	David	CCLRP0752	PlaTP-069		6.1	PlaTF-008	Travel Time
Markle	David	CCLRP0472	PlaTP-078		6.2	PlaTP-087	Congestion
Markle	David	CCLRP0752	PlaTP-091		2.3	PlaTP-020	Stations
Markle	David	CCLRP0472	PlaTP-159		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
Markle	David	CCLRP0472	PlaTP-168		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Markle	David	CCLRP0752	ProALT-223		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
							Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Markle	David	CCLRP0472	ProALT-436		2.3	ProALT-033	
Markle	David	CCLRP0472	ProALT-603		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
Markle	David	CCLRP0752	ProHLP-026		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
Markle	David	CCLRP0472	SocSS-22		6.2	EngRW-003	Effects on Roadways
Marlow	James	CCLRP0369	ProPM-211	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Marlow	James	CCLRP0369	ProPURP-176	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Marshall	Scott	CCLRP0587	ProALT-393		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Marshall	Scott	CCLRP0587	SocNC-221		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Martinson	Jonathan	CCLRP0323	PlaTE-54		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Martinson	Jonathan	CCLRP0323	ProPM-258		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Martinson	Jonathan	CCLRP0323	ProPURP-004		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Massey	Gloria Y	CCLRP0001	EngPG-10		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Massey	Gloria Y	CCLRP0001	EngTI-20		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
Massey	Gloria Y	CCLRP0001	ProALT-307		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Massey	Gloria Y	CCLRP0001	ProPOL-38		3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
Massey	Gloria Y	CCLRP0001	SocEJ-020		3.8	SocEJ-000	Inclusive Community Involvement
							Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Massey	Gloria Y	CCLRP0001	SocSS-28		6.3	EngBP-001	
							Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Mather	Darin	CCLRP0018	EngCI-24		3.2	EngCI-001	
Mather	Darin	CCLRP0018	EngPG-37		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Mather	Darin	CCLRP0018	EngTI-23		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
Mather	Darin	CCLRP0018	NR-52		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Matteson	Paul	CCLRP0850	ProALT-147		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Matteson	Paul	CCLRP0850	SocEJ-083		3.8	SocEJ-008	Affordable Housing
Matteson	Paul	CCLRP0850	SocNC-130		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
				Pilgrim Baptist Church			Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Matthews	Delores	CCLRP0867	EngCI-54		3.2	EngCI-001	
				Pilgrim Baptist Church			Transit Effects
Matthews	Delores	CCLRP0867	PlaTP-131		6.1	PlaTP-112	
				Pilgrim Baptist Church			Stops
Matthews	Delores	CCLRP0867	PlaTP-215		2.3	PlaTP-050	
				Pilgrim Baptist Church			Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Matthews	Delores	CCLRP0867	SocEJ-048		6.3	EngBP-001	

Commenter Name	Respondent Name	Comment ID	Response ID	Organization	Score	Response ID	Response Description
Matthews	Delores	CCLRP0867	SocEJ-051	Pilgrim Baptist Church	3.8	SocEJ-024	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Matthews	Delores	CCLRP0867	SocNC-026	Pilgrim Baptist Church	3.8	SocEJ-001	Businesses
Matthews	Jeffery	CCLRP0573	ProALT-257		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Matthews	Jeffery	CCLRP0573	SocNC-083		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Mattila	Laurie	CCLRP0033	PlaTP-090		6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
Mattila	Laurie	CCLRP0033	PlaTP-213		1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
Mattila	Laurie	CCLRP0033	SocEJ-050		3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
Mattlin	Rev. Margaret	CCLRP0109	EcoEE-130		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
Mattlin	Rev. Margaret	CCLRP0109	EngCI-53		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Mattlin	Rev. Margaret	CCLRP0109	SocEJ-082		3.8	SocEJ-017	Affordable Housing
Mattlin	Rev. Margaret	CCLRP0109	SocLU-001		3.3	ProPOL-001	Acquisitions and Displacements/Relocations
Mattlin	Rev. Margaret	CCLRP0109	SocNC-022		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation
Mattlin	Rev. Margaret	CCLRP0109	SocNC-080		3.2	SocNC-021	Community Involvement
Maus	Lloyd	CCLRP0608	ProPM-278		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Maus	Lloyd	CCLRP0608	SocNC-168		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
May	Charles	CCLRP0234	ProPM-141		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
May	Charles	CCLRP0234	SocNC-116		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Maykoski	Anita	CCLRP0163	EngCI-3		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Maykoski	Anita	CCLRP0163	ProALT-058		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Maykoski	Anita	CCLRP0163	ProALT-360		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Maysack	Deborah	CCLRP0812	ProALT-512	Arthritis Foundation	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Mcbroom	Amy	CCLRP0365	EcoEE-34		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Mcbroom	Amy	CCLRP0365	ProPM-040		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Mcbroom	Amy	CCLRP0365	ProPURP-026		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Mccarty	Jack	CCLRP0625	ProALT-166		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Mccarty	Jack	CCLRP0625	SocNC-135		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Mccauley	Philip	CCLRP0111	ProALT-535		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Mccumber	Julia John	CCLRP0395	EcoEE-22	Ecolab	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Mccumber	Julia John	CCLRP0395	ProPM-201	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Mccumber	Julia John	CCLRP0395	ProPURP-031	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Mcdowell	Rob	CCLRP0279	EcoEE-46		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Mcdowell	Rob	CCLRP0279	PlaTE-161		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Mcdowell	Rob	CCLRP0279	ProPM-059		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Mcdowell	Rob	CCLRP0279	ProPURP-189		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Mcginley	Paul	CCLRP0814	ProALT-289		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Mcginto	Mike	CCLRP0919	ProHLP-044		2.3	ProHLP-015	Miscellaneous

Mcgraw	Martha	CCLRP0135	ProHLP-043		2.3	ProHLP-015	Miscellaneous
Mcgraw	Martha	CCLRP0135	ProPOL-27		3.2	ProPOL-004	Community Involvement
Mcgraw	Martha	CCLRP0135	ProPOL-36		3.3	ProPOL-001	Acquisitions and
Mcgraw	Martha	CCLRP0135	SocP4-5		3.5	SocP4-001	Displacements/Relocations
Mcgraw	Martha	CCLRP0135	SocSS-017		3.7	SocSS-004	Parklands and Recreation Areas
McMahon	David	CCLRP0411	ProALT-421	Ecolab	2.3	ProALT-001	Safety and Security
McMahon	David	CCLRP0411	ProPM-063	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	Alternatives Analysis
McMahon	David	CCLRP0411	ProPURP-127	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				McNally Smith			
McNally	Jack	CCLRP0286	EcoEE-113	College of Music	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
				McNally Smith			
McNally	Jack	CCLRP0286	NatVA-35	College of Music	3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0878	EngEng-7		6.2	EngRW-014	Congestion
McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0466	EngPG-41		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0878	EngTI-11		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
							Alternatives Analysis (LRT &
McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0878	PlaTE-32		2.3	ProALT-029	Buses)
McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0466	PlaTE-48		3.2	PlaTE-022	Community Cohesion
McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0878	PlaTE-60		3.2	PlaTE-025	Community Cohesion
McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0878	PlaTE-61		3.2	PlaTE-024	Community Cohesion
McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0466	PlaTP-063		6.1	PlaTP-079	LRT System Design
McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0878	ProALT-260		6.1	ProALT-047	Supporting Bus Service
McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0878	ProALT-511		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0878	SocHI-1		3.4	SocHI-001	Cultural Resources
Mead	Shannon	CCLRP0233	ProALT-322		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Mead	Shannon	CCLRP0233	SocNC-118		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				St Paul Building and			
				Contraction Trades			
Melander	Harry	CCLRP0832	ProALT-144	Council	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				St Paul Building and			
				Contraction Trades			
Melander	Harry	CCLRP0534	ProPOL-10	Council	11	ProPOL-007	Project Contracting
				St Paul Building and			
				Contraction Trades			
Melander	Harry	CCLRP0832	ProPOL-2	Council	11	ProPOL-007	Project Contracting
				St Paul Building and			
				Contraction Trades			
Melander	Harry	CCLRP0534	ProPOL-26	Council	11	ProPOL-007	Project Contracting
				St Paul Building and			
				Contraction Trades			
Melander	Harry	CCLRP0534	ProPOL-41	Council	11	ProPOL-007	Project Contracting

Commenter Name	Response Number	Requester Name	Requester ID	Requester Address	Requester Phone	Requester Email	Requester Title	Requester Organization	Response ID	Response Description
Melander	Harry	CCLRP0534	ProPOL-8	St Paul Building and Contraction Trades Council	11	ProPOL-007	Project Contracting			
Mensch	Mary	CCLRP0610	ProALT-218		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis			
Mensch	Mary	CCLRP0610	SocNC-199		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis			
Merrill	Michael	CCLRP0311	ProALT-617		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis			
Merrill	Michael	CCLRP0311	SocNC-237		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis			
Meyer	Tara	CCLRP0504	ProALT-444		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis			
Meyer	Tara	CCLRP0504	SocNC-235		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis			
Meyers	Tamar	CCLRP0385	ProPM-272		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project			
Meyers	Tamar	CCLRP0385	ProPURP-071		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project			
Miels	Gayle	CCLRP0137	EngPG-43		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking			
Miels	Gayle	CCLRP0137	NatVA-12		3.6	NatVA-006	Visual Quality and Aesthetics Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses Neighborhood Preservation Impact Affordable Housing Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation			
Miels	Gayle	CCLRP0137	PlaTP-105		3.2	PlaTP-099				
Miels	Gayle	CCLRP0137	ProPM-006		3.2	ProPM-010				
Miels	Gayle	CCLRP0137	ProPOL-28		3.1	ProPOL-005				
Miels	Gayle	CCLRP0137	SocEJ-071		3.8	SocEJ-007				
Miller	Orlyn	CCLRP0848	EngBP-51	University of Minnesota	6.3	EngBP-001				
Miller	Orlyn	CCLRP0848	PlaTP-072	University of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation			
Miller	Orlyn	CCLRP0848	ProALT-332	University of Minnesota	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis			
Miller	Orlyn	CCLRP0848	ProPURP-226	University of Minnesota	11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous			
Minderman	Nicholas	CCLRP0104	EngPG-18		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking			
Minderman	Nicholas	CCLRP0104	EngRW-10		6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion			
Minderman	Nicholas	CCLRP0104	EngTI-38		6.2	EngTI-020	Congestion			
Miner	Deb	CCLRP0449	ProPM-093		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis			
Miser	Kevin	CCLRP0419	ProPM-158		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project			
Miser	Kevin	CCLRP0419	ProPURP-183		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project			
Mishek	Mark	CCLRP0887	PlaTE-47	United Hospital	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project			
Mishek	Mark	CCLRP0887	ProALT-557	United Hospital	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis			
Mishek	Mark	CCLRP0887	ProPURP-111	United Hospital	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project			
Mitchell	Christopher	CCLRP0215	EcoEE-14		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions			
Mitchell	Christopher	CCLRP0215	PlaTP-108		2.3	PlaTP-010	Grade Separation			
Mitchell	Christopher	CCLRP0215	ProALT-313		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis			
Mitchell	Christopher	CCLRP0215	ProPM-217		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis			
Mitchell	Elaine	CCLRP0698	ProPM-085	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project			
Mitchell	Elaine	CCLRP0698	ProPURP-019	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project			
Mockovak	Paul	CCLRP0257	ProALT-490		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis			
Mockovak	Paul	CCLRP0257	SocNC-048		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis			

Moeller	Jim	CCLRP0281	PlaTE-66		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Moeller	Jim	CCLRP0281	ProPM-279		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Moening	Mary Jo	CCLRP0621	ProALT-458		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Moening	Mary Jo	CCLRP0621	SocNC-141		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Mohr	John	CCLRP0841	ProALT-372	Lifetrack Resources	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Mohrbacher	Paul	CCLRP0823	ProALT-456	Downtown District	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Mohrbacher	Paul	CCLRP0823	ProHLP-010	Councils	2.3	ProHLP-010	Stations
Mohrbacher	Paul	CCLRP0823	ProHLP-021	Downtown District	2.3	ProHLP-010	Stations
Mohrbacher	Paul	CCLRP0823	ProHLP-080	Councils	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Moldenhauer	Stanley	CCLRP0269	ProALT-306		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Moldenhauer	Stanley	CCLRP0269	SocNC-040		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180	EngPG-28	Office of the City Council	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180	NR-62	Office of the City Council	6.1	NR-017	Bus System Impact
Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180	PlaTE-108	Office of the City Council	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180	PlaTP-046	Office of the City Council	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180	ProALT-546	Office of the City Council	2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180	ProPOL-14	Office of the City Council	3.2	EngCI-003	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180	ProPOL-23	Office of the City Council	11	ProPOL-002	Miscellaneous
Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180	PubPI-008	Office of the City Council	11	PubPI-004	Public Involvement
Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180	SocSS-55	Office of the City Council	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Montgomery	Vince	CCLRP0847	PlaTE-75		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Montgomery	Vince	CCLRP0847	ProALT-530		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Montgomery	Vince	CCLRP0847	SocEE-3		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Moreau	Nicole	CCLRP0404	ProPM-098	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Moreau	Nicole	CCLRP0404	ProPURP-028	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Morelli	Carla A.	CCLRP0732	ProPM-094	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Morelli	Carla A.	CCLRP0732	ProPURP-096	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0212	EcoEE-10	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions

Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0754	EcoEE-125	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0754	EngCI-22	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	3.2	EngCI-005	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0212	EngCI-40	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0212	PlaTE-8	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0754	PlaTF-11	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	1	PlaTF-003	In Favor of Project
Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0754	ProALT-247	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	2.3	ProALT-021	Alignment
Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0212	ProALT-259	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0754	ProALT-593	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0212	ProPM-192	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0754	ProPURP-173	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	1	ProPURP-010	Who Will Benefit? Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Morris	David	CCLRP0836	EngCI-19		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Morris	David	CCLRP0836	ProFSt-011		8.1	ProFSt-008	Capital Funding Strategy
Morris	David	CCLRP0836	ProPOL-5		3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
Morrison	Eric	CCLRP0394	ProPM-177		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Morrison	Eric	CCLRP0394	ProPURP-039		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Morrison	Eric	CCLRP0394	SocEU-4		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
Mortice	Atom	CCLRP0405	ProPM-235	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Mortice	Atom	CCLRP0405	ProPURP-155	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Moua	Josie	CCLRP0321	ProALT-556		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Moua	Josie	CCLRP0321	SocNC-060		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Mule	Daniel	CCLRP0595	ProALT-461		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Mule	Daniel	CCLRP0595	SocNC-148		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Mulkern	Rik	CCLRP0448	PlaTP-045		2.3	PlaTP-010	Grade Separation
Mulkern	Rik	CCLRP0448	PlaTP-220		2.3	ProALT-030	Alternatives Analysis
Mulkern	Rik	CCLRP0561	ProALT-497		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous
Mullenbach	Carolyn	CCLRP0691	ProPM-270	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Mullenbach	Carolyn	CCLRP0691	ProPURP-057	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Murlowski	Mariss	CCLRP0175	ProALT-597		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Murlowski	Mariss	CCLRP0175	SocNC-222		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Murphy	Gary L.	CCLRP0307	EcoEE-44	Graphic Exhibits, Inc.	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Murphy	Gary L.	CCLRP0307	PlaTE-28	Graphic Exhibits, Inc.	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Murphy	Gary L.	CCLRP0307	ProPM-225	Graphic Exhibits, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Murphy	Gary L.	CCLRP0307	ProPURP-219	Graphic Exhibits, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Murphy	Shaun	CCLRP0666	EngBP-36		6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Murphy	Shaun	CCLRP0666	NatAQ-7		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
Murphy	Shaun	CCLRP0666	ProALT-401		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Murphy	Shaun	CCLRP0666	ProALT-470		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Murray	Jerold	CCLRP0687	ProPM-243	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Murray	Jerold	CCLRP0687	ProPURP-206	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Murray	Joe	CCLRP0200	ProPURP-215	Counselor Realty Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Murray	Joe	CCLRP0200	SocNC-230	Counselor Realty Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Muschler	Eric	CCLRP0042	EcoEE-121		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Muschler	Eric	CCLRP0042	EcoEE-61		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
Muschler	Eric	CCLRP0042	PlaTE-183		3.1	PlaTE-016	Land Use
Muschler	Eric	CCLRP0042	ProPOL-12		3.1	SocLU-003	Land Use
Myer	Dorothy Jean	CCLRP0936	ProPM-055		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Nakajima	Dianne	CCLRP0031	NatNV-23		4.7	NatNV-005	Noise
Nakajima	Dianne	CCLRP0031	PlaTE-19		6.1	PlaTE-029	Transit Effects
Nakajima	Dianne	CCLRP0031	ProALT-156		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Nakajima	Dianne	CCLRP0031	ProPM-029		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Nakajima	Dianne	CCLRP0031	PubPI-036		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
Nardini	Tom	CCLRP0639	EcoEE-41	Nardini Fire Equipment Company, Inc.	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Nardini	Tom	CCLRP0639	PlaTE-110	Nardini Fire Equipment Company, Inc.	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project

Nardini	Tom	CCLRP0639	ProPM-274	Nardini Fire Equipment Company, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Nardini	Tom	CCLRP0639	ProPURP-130	Nardini Fire Equipment Company, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Naumann	Joshua	CCLRP0368	ProPM-261	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Naumann	Joshua	CCLRP0368	ProPURP-207	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Nedich	Biljana	CCLRP0563	ProALT-632		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Nedich	Biljana	CCLRP0563	SocNC-196		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Neimeyer	Charles	CCLRP0559	ProALT-276		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Neimeyer	Charles	CCLRP0559	SocNC-042		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Neimeyer	Jane	CCLRP0291	ProALT-157		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Neimeyer	Jane	CCLRP0291	SocNC-098		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Nelson	Helen	CCLRP0604	ProALT-451		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Nelson	Helen	CCLRP0604	SocNC-034		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Nelson	Julie	CCLRP0709	ProPM-163		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Nelson	Julie	CCLRP0709	ProPURP-112		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact							
Nelson	Paul	CCLRP0857	EngBP-15		6.3	EngBP-001	and Mitigation
Nelson	Paul	CCLRP0857	PlaTE-86		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Nelson	Paul	CCLRP0857	ProALT-110		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Nelson	Paul	CCLRP0857	ProPM-267		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
Nelson	Paul	CCLRP0857	SocEU-5		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
Nelson	Ross	CCLRP0427	EcoEE-51		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Nelson	Ross	CCLRP0427	PlaTE-156		6.1	PlaTE-013	Bus System Impact
Nelson	Ross	CCLRP0427	ProPM-161		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Neo	Susan	CCLRP0723	ProPM-166	PRC Consulting	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Neo	Susan	CCLRP0723	ProPURP-188	PRC Consulting	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Nestegard	Susan	CCLRP0382	ProPM-153		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Nestegard	Susan	CCLRP0382	ProPURP-134		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Newcomb	Curtis	CCLRP0295	ProALT-528		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Newcomb	Curtis	CCLRP0295	SocNC-180		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Nierowicz	Jeanne	CCLRP0403	ProPM-132		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Nierowicz	Jeanne	CCLRP0403	ProPURP-060		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
National Geodetic Survey							
Nigoff	Mindy	CCLRP0442	EngEng-11	National Geodetic Survey	3.1	EngEng-001	Land Use and Socio-Economics
National Geodetic Survey							
Nigoff	Mindy	CCLRP0442	SocHI-6	National Geodetic Survey	3.4	SocHI-001	Cultural Resources
Nordby	Samuel	CCLRP0708	ProPM-021	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Nordby	Samuel	CCLRP0708	ProPURP-165	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Nordenstrom	Dorothy	CCLRP0592	ProALT-435		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Nordenstrom	Dorothy	CCLRP0592	SocNC-210		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Nye	Janet	CCLRP0911	NR-47		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Nye	Janet	CCLRP0911	ProALT-054		2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Nye	Janet	CCLRP0911	ProALT-193		2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Nye	Janet	CCLRP0911	ProALT-334		2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Oberg	Eric	CCLRP0515	ProALT-182		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Oberg	Eric	CCLRP0515	SocNC-133		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
O'Brien	Kathleen	CCLRP0437	NatVA-31	University of Minnesota	3.6	NatVA-009	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
O'Brien	Kathleen	CCLRP0744	PlaTF-6	University of Minnesota	6.1	PlaTF-005	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
O'Brien	Kathleen	CCLRP0744	PlaTP-151	University of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
O'Brien	Kathleen	CCLRP0437	PlaTP-223	University of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-056	University of Minnesota
O'Brien	Kathleen	CCLRP0744	ProALT-292	University of Minnesota	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
O'Brien	Kathleen	CCLRP0437	ProALT-539	University of Minnesota	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
O'Brien	Kathleen	CCLRP0744	ProPURP-178	University of Minnesota	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
O'Brien	Kathleen	CCLRP0744	ProPURP-229	University of Minnesota	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
O'Brien	Keri	CCLRP0249	PlaTE-111		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
O'Brien	Keri	CCLRP0249	ProPM-070		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
O'Connell	Thomas	CCLRP0719	ProALT-595	Ecolab Inc.,	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
O'Connell	Thomas	CCLRP0719	ProPM-044	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
O'Connell	Thomas	CCLRP0719	ProPURP-113	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Odonell	Larry	CCLRP0128	ProALT-275		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
O'Hara	Laura	CCLRP0602	ProALT-598		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
O'Hara	Laura	CCLRP0602	SocNC-106		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Olsen	Terry	CCLRP0367	ProALT-273	TKDA	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Olsen	Terry	CCLRP0745	ProALT-369		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Olsen	Terry	CCLRP0745	ProALT-613		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Olson	Larry	CCLRP0833	ProALT-131	Metro Plains Development UEL (University Enterprise Laboratories, Inc)	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Olson	Randall	CCLRP0553	ProALT-533		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Orantes	Rob	CCLRP0657	ProPM-286	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Orantes	Rob	CCLRP0657	ProPURP-197	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project

Osborne	Shawne	CCLRP0289	EcoEE-117	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Osborne	Shawne	CCLRP0289	ProPM-056	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Ovenshire	RuthAnne	CCLRP0937	PlaTP-065	6.3	PlaTF-006	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Distance/Paths to Stations
Ovenshire	RuthAnne	CCLRP0937	ProALT-148	3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
Overbye	John	CCLRP0196	ProALT-520	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Overbye	John	CCLRP0196	ProALT-605	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Overbye	John	CCLRP0196	SocNC-110	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Owens	Gerry	CCLRP0142	PubPI-048	3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
Owens	Gerry	CCLRP0142	SocEJ-073	3.8	SocEJ-000	Inclusive Community Involvement
						Minnesota Department of Transportation
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	EcoEE-95	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
						Minnesota Department of Transportation
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	EngBP-1	6.3	EngBP-003	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station Design
						Minnesota Department of Transportation
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	EngBP-18	6.3	EngBP-004	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
						Minnesota Department of Transportation
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	EngBP-2	6.3	EngBP-004	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
						Minnesota Department of Transportation
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	EngBP-28	6.3	EngBP-003	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station Design
						Minnesota Department of Transportation
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	EngBP-3	6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
						Minnesota Department of Transportation
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	EngBP-30	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
						Minnesota Department of Transportation
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	EngBP-35	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
						Minnesota Department of Transportation
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	EngBP-44	6.3	EngBP-008	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
						Minnesota Department of Transportation
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	EngBP-5	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
						Minnesota Department of Transportation
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	EngRW-8	11	EngRW-007	Agency Coordination

Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	EngTI-14	Minnesota Department of Transportation Minnesota	6.2	EngTI-012	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	EngTI-25	Department of Transportation Minnesota	6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	NatAQ-13	Department of Transportation Minnesota	4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	PlaTE-29	Department of Transportation Minnesota	2.3	PlaTE-018	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	PlaTP-008	Department of Transportation Minnesota	6.2	PlaTP-008	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	PlaTP-009	Department of Transportation Minnesota	6.2	PlaTP-008	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	PlaTP-068	Department of Transportation Minnesota	6.2	EngRW-017	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	PlaTP-096	Department of Transportation Minnesota	6	ProPM-021	Report Corrections Needed
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	PlaTP-107	Department of Transportation Minnesota	6.2	PlaTP-101	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	PlaTP-111	Department of Transportation Minnesota	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	PlaTP-113	Department of Transportation Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-104	Grade Separation
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	PlaTP-135	Department of Transportation Minnesota	6.2	PlaTP-008	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	PlaTP-157	Department of Transportation Minnesota	6.2	PlaTP-008	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	PlaTP-176	Department of Transportation	6.2	EngRW-017	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections

Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	PlaTP-260	Minnesota Department of Transportation Minnesota	6.2	PlaTP-072	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	ProFSt-003	Minnesota Department of Transportation Minnesota	8.1	ProFSt-003	Capital Funding Strategy
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	ProPM-140	Minnesota Department of Transportation Minnesota	2.3	ProPM-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	ProPM-190	Minnesota Department of Transportation Minnesota	5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	ProPOL-24	Minnesota Department of Transportation Minnesota	11	PlaTP-131	Public Comment Process
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	SocEJ-016	Minnesota Department of Transportation Minnesota	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	SocEJ-076	Minnesota Department of Transportation Minnesota	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	SocSS-51	Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Pahs	Matthew	CCLRP0048	EcoEE-138		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Pahs	Matthew	CCLRP0048	PlaTP-219		2.3	PlaTP-054	Alignment
Pahs	Matthew	CCLRP0048	ProALT-032		2.3	ProALT-010	Stations
Pahs	Matthew	CCLRP0048	ProALT-404		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pahs	Matthew	CCLRP0048	ProALT-475		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Park	Rand	CCLRP0654	EcoEE-11		5.1	EcoEE-007	Economic Conditions
Park	Rand	CCLRP0654	ProPM-239		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Park	Rand	CCLRP0654	ProPM-240		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pasiuk	Dave	CCLRP0897	ProALT-096		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pasiuk	Dave	CCLRP0897	PubPI-037		3.2	PubPI-011	Community Involvement
Pasiuk	Joan	CCLRP0901	ProALT-398		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Pasiuk	Joan	CCLRP0901	ProPM-050		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Pasiuk	Joan	CCLRP0901	ProPM-146		3.8	ProPM-014	Miscellaneous
Pasiuk	Joan	CCLRP0901	ProPOL-13		3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
Pasiuk	Joan	CCLRP0901	ProPOL-31		3.2	ProPOL-004	Community Involvement
Pasiuk	Joel	CCLRP0415	EcoEE-146		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Pasiuk	Joel	CCLRP0415	ProPM-010		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Pasiuk	Joel	CCLRP0415	ProPM-088		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Pasiuk	Joel	CCLRP0415	ProPURP-059		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project

Patrikus	Helen	CCLRP0333	EngBP-40		6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Patterson	Oralee	CCLRP0866	ProHLP-120	Pilgrim Baptist Church	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Patterson	Oralee	CCLRP0866	SocEJ-069	Pilgrim Baptist Church	3.8	SocEJ-027	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Paul	Roxanne	CCLRP0112	NR-46		6.1	NR-021	Bus System Impact
Pauling	Steve	CCLRP0190	EngPG-47		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Pauling	Steve	CCLRP0190	NR-16		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Pauling	Steve	CCLRP0190	ProPM-216		2.3	ProPM-001	Alternatives Analysis
Paulson	Al	CCLRP0228	PlaTE-123		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Paulson	Al	CCLRP0228	ProPM-219		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Paulson	Al	CCLRP0228	PubPI-076		3.2	PubPI-042	Community Involvement
Payne	Ancil	CCLRP0906	NR-20		6.1	NR-012	Transit Effects
Payne	Ancil	CCLRP0906	NR-31		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Payne	Ancil	CCLRP0906	ProALT-179		2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Payne	Ancil	CCLRP0906	ProProjBdj-022		10.1	ProProjBdj-006	Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
Pearl	Shirley White	CCLRP0283	SocNC-016		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation
Pedersen	Millisa	CCLRP0520	ProALT-163		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pedersen	Millisa	CCLRP0520	SocNC-120		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pena	Luis Brown	CCLRP0350	EcoEE-40		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Pena	Luis Brown	CCLRP0350	PlaTE-23		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Pena	Luis Brown	CCLRP0350	ProALT-469		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pena	Luis Brown	CCLRP0350	ProPURP-212		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pendelton	Adrian	CCLRP0189	EcoEE-57		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
Pendelton	Adrian	CCLRP0189	ProPM-038		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Pendelton	Adrian	CCLRP0189	SocSS-034		3.7	SocSS-002	Safety and Security
Peng	Lesley	CCLRP0040	EngPG-68		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Peng	Lesley	CCLRP0040	PlaTP-080		6.3	PlaTP-088	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station Design
Peng	Lesley	CCLRP0040	PlaTP-094		2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
Peng	Lesley	CCLRP0040	ProProjBdj-028		6.1	ProProjBdj-013	Transit Effects
Peng	Lesley	CCLRP0040	SocNC-021		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Pennington	Joan	CCLRP0795	ProALT-051		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pennington	Joan	CCLRP0795	ProPM-210		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Perez	Chris	CCLRP0017	NatNV-14		4.7	NatNV-001	Noise
Perez	Chris	CCLRP0017	ProALT-187		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Perez	Chris	CCLRP0017	ProALT-503		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Perez	Chris	CCLRP0017	ProPM-137		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project

Peterson	Alan	CCLRP0423	EcoEE-148	The Realty Matrix, Inc.	5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
Peterson	Alan	CCLRP0423	ProPM-099	The Realty Matrix, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Peterson	Alan	CCLRP0423	ProPM-174	The Realty Matrix, Inc.	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Peterson	Alan	CCLRP0423	SocEE-18	The Realty Matrix, Inc.	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
Peterson	Alan	CCLRP0423	SocNC-154	The Realty Matrix, Inc.	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167	EcoEE-102		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167	EcoEE-112		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167	EcoEE-118		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167	EcoEE-132		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167	EcoEE-84		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167	EcoEE-90		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167	ProALT-016		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167	ProALT-278		2.3	ProALT-021	Alignment
Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167	ProALT-291		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167	ProALT-346		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167	ProALT-390		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0054	ProALT-625		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0054	ProPM-087		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167	ProPM-255		3.1	ProPM-009	Impact
Peterson	David F.	CCLRP0876	PlaTE-98	Parsons	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Peterson	David F.	CCLRP0876	ProALT-347	Parsons	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Peterson	David F.	CCLRP0552	ProALT-516	Parsons	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Peterson	Hgeoffrey	CCLRP0487	ProPM-064		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Peterson	Jeff	CCLRP0860	PlaTE-79	Ecolab	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Peterson	Jeff	CCLRP0860	ProALT-018	Ecolab	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Peterson	Jeff	CCLRP0860	ProALT-105	Ecolab	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Peterson	Steve	CCLRP0156	EcoEE-133		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Peterson	Steve	CCLRP0156	PlaTE-177		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Peterson	Steve	CCLRP0156	PlaTP-061		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Peterson	Steve	CCLRP0156	ProALT-479		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Peterson	Steve	CCLRP0156	ProPM-269		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Peterson	Steve	CCLRP0156	ProPURP-100		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	EngCI-28	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	EngEng-4	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	6.2	EngTI-024	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections

Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	EngTI-21	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	6.2	EngTI-015	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	NatVA-20	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.6	NatVA-006	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	NatVA-30	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.6	NatVA-006	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	NR-57	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	11	NR-011	Report Corrections
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	PlaTF-7	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	6.1	PlaTF-004	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	PlaTP-022	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2.3	PlaTP-020	Stations
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	PlaTP-035	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.2	PlaTP-025	U of M
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	PlaTP-047	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2.3	PlaTP-030	Stations
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	PlaTP-170	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2.3	PlaTP-056	University of Minnesota
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	ProALT-318	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	ProALT-415	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	ProALT-585	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2.3	ProALT-005	Alternatives Analysis
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	ProHLP-048	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	ProHLP-064	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2.3	ProHLP-025	Other Corridors

Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	ProHLP-097	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.6	ProHLP-027	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	ProHLP-102	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	ProPM-049	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	1	ProPM-016	Report Corrections Needed
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	ProPM-053	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	1	ProPM-016	Report Corrections Needed
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	ProPM-095	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2	ProPM-017	Report Corrections Needed
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	ProPM-199	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3	ProPM-018	Report Corrections Needed
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	ProPM-246	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2	ProPM-017	Report Corrections Needed
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	ProPM-259	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	4	ProPM-019	Report Corrections Needed
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	ProPM-292	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2	ProPM-017	Report Corrections Needed
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	ProPM-302	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2	ProPM-017	Report Corrections Needed
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	ProPOL-40	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	11	PubPI-003	Public Comment Process
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	SocCR-2	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.4	SocCR-001	Cultural Resources
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	SocCR-5	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.4	SocCR-001	Cultural Resources
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	SocEU-10	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	4.11	SocEU-001	Energy

Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	SocHI-2	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.4	SocHI-002	Cultural Resources
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	SocLU-007	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.1	SocLU-005	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	SocLU-018	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	SocLU-023	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.1	SocLU-014	Land Use
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	SocLU-024	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.1	SocLU-005	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	SocLU-025	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.1	SocLU-008	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Pham	Thu	CCLRP0562	ProALT-253		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pham	Thu	CCLRP0562	SocNC-245		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pieper	Catherine	CCLRP0660	ProPM-290	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Pieper	Catherine	CCLRP0660	ProPURP-209	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Pierce	Alexandra	CCLRP0356	EngBP-39		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Pierce	Alexandra	CCLRP0356	NatAQ-12		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
Pierce	Alexandra	CCLRP0356	PlaTE-89		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pierce	Alexandra	CCLRP0356	ProPM-157		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pierce	Alexandra	CCLRP0356	SocNC-093		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
Pinney	Gregory	CCLRP0741	EngRW-19		6.2	EngRW-011	Congestion
Pinney	Gregory	CCLRP0741	PlaTP-178		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
Pinney	Gregory	CCLRP0741	ProHLP-012		6.1	PlaTF-008	Travel Time
Pinney	Gregory	CCLRP0741	ProProjBdj-013		10.1	ProProjBdj-008	Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
Pinney	Gregory	CCLRP0741	SocNC-082		2.3	SocNC-015	Grade Separation
Piotrowski	Jane	CCLRP0327	PlaTE-134		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Piotrowski	Jane	CCLRP0327	PlaTP-079		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Piotrowski	Jane	CCLRP0327	ProPM-226		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Piper	Cameron	CCLRP0201	ProALT-296		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Piper	Cameron	CCLRP0201	SocNC-151		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Piram	Robert	CCLRP0375	EngUT-15	Capitol Region Watershed District	4.2	EngUT-004	Water Resources
Pitera	Gino	CCLRP0277	EcoEE-33		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Pitera	Gino	CCLRP0277	ProPM-046		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project

Pitzel	Eva	CCLRP0628	ProPM-295		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Plackett	Marvin	CCLRP0926	ProALT-400	Episcopal Homes	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Plakut	Marvin	CCLRP0827	ProALT-513	Episcopal Homes	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Platte	Georgia	CCLRP0316	ProALT-084		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Platte	Georgia	CCLRP0316	SocNC-242		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				Morre, Costello &			
Plunkett	J. Patrick	CCLRP0538	ProALT-340	Hart, PLLP	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pokorny	Emmett	CCLRP0669	ProPM-277	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Pokorny	Emmett	CCLRP0669	ProPURP-122	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Pollak	Melisa	CCLRP0337	PlaTE-25		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Pollak	Melisa	CCLRP0337	ProALT-014		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pollak	Melisa	CCLRP0337	ProPM-164		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Poole	Jim	CCLRP0481	PlaTP-076		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
Poole	Jim	CCLRP0481	ProPM-058		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Poole	Jim	CCLRP0481	SocEJ-009		3.8	SocEJ-001	Businesses
Popplewell	Frank	CCLRP0605	ProALT-500		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Popplewell	Frank	CCLRP0605	SocNC-088		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Porter	Matt	CCLRP0703	ProPM-257	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Porter	Matt	CCLRP0703	ProPURP-084	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Pratt	Richard	CCLRP0612	ProALT-518		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Pratt	Richard	CCLRP0612	SocNC-041		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Presley	Dennis	CCLRP0884	PubPI-006		3.8	PubPI-006	Inclusive Community Involvement
Presley	Dennis	CCLRP0884	SocEJ-030		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
							Report Clarifications Updates and
Presley	Dennis	CCLRP0884	SocEJ-037		3.8	SocEJ-013	Corrections
Presley	Dennis	CCLRP0884	SocEJ-067		3.8	SocEJ-000	Inclusive Community Involvement
							Report Clarifications Updates and
Presley	Dennis	CCLRP0884	SocEJ-070		3.8	SocEJ-021	Corrections
							Report Clarifications Updates and
Presley	Dennis	CCLRP0884	SocNC-109		3.8	SocEJ-013	Corrections
				Aurora/St. Anthony			
				Neighborhood			
				Development			
Presley	Nieta	CCLRP0522	EcoEE-4	Corporation	5.1	EcoEE-002	Economic Conditions
				Aurora/St. Anthony			
				Neighborhood			
				Development			
Presley	Nieta	CCLRP0522	EngPG-66	Corporation	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
				Aurora/St. Anthony			
				Neighborhood			
				Development			
Presley	Nieta	CCLRP0522	EngPG-69	Corporation	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking

Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0522	EngTI-13	Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation	6.3	EngTI-011	Effects on Other Transportation Facilities and Services
Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0904	PubPI-009	Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation	3.8	PubPI-007	Inclusive Community Involvement
Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0522	SocEJ-013	Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation	3.8	SocEJ-004	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0522	SocEJ-015	Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation	3.8	SocEJ-004	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0522	SocEJ-018	Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation	3.8	SocEJ-004	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0522	SocEJ-019	Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation	3.8	SocEJ-004	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0522	SocEJ-021	Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation	3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0904	SocEJ-088	Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation	3.8	SocEJ-012	Inclusive Community Involvement
Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0522	SocEJ-095	Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation	3.8	SocEJ-001	Businesses
Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0904	SocNC-010	Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation	3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Prien	Patricia	CCLRP0455	ProPM-200		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Prien	Patricia	CCLRP0455	SocEU-8		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
Pry	Arthur	CCLRP0138	SocEJ-074		3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing

Pry	Arthur	CCLRP0138	SocNC-055		3.8	SocEJ-012	Inclusive Community Involvement
Pry	Arthur	CCLRP0138	SocNC-121		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation
Quinlan	Michael	CCLRP0106	ProALT-394		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Quinlan	Michael	CCLRP0106	ProPM-256		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Quinlan	Michael	CCLRP0106	ProPURP-167		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Radzwill	Jo	CCLRP0742	EngPG-65		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Radzwill	Jo	CCLRP0742	NatAQ-18		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
Radzwill	Jo	CCLRP0742	PlaTE-142		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Radzwill	Jo	CCLRP0742	PlaTP-171		6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
Radzwill	Jo	CCLRP0742	ProALT-059		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Rahman	Zainool	CCLRP0630	PlaTE-83		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Rahman	Zainool	CCLRP0630	PlaTP-071		6.1	PlaTP-084	Bus System Impact
Rahman	Zainool	CCLRP0630	ProALT-630		2.3	ProALT-021	Alignment
Rasmussen	David	CCLRP0565	ProALT-145		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Rasmussen	David	CCLRP0565	SocNC-223		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Rasmussen	David	CCLRP0492	SocSS-6		6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Rastegari	Holly	CCLRP0577	ProALT-614		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Rastegari	Holly	CCLRP0577	SocNC-142		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Rayan	Mary and Rajen	CCLRP0080	ProALT-447		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Rayan	Mary and Rajen	CCLRP0080	ProPURP-242		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Rebman	Ryan	CCLRP0422	ProPM-077	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Rebman	Ryan	CCLRP0422	ProPURP-181	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Reiling	David	CCLRP0871	EcoEE-6		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Reiling	David	CCLRP0871	NatAQ-16		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
Reiling	David	CCLRP0871	ProALT-568		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Reiling	David	CCLRP0871	ProALT-616		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Reiling	David	CCLRP0871	SocLU-012		3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics
Reiling	David	CCLRP0871	SocNC-197		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Reinhardt	Duane	CCLRP0418	ProPM-130	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Reinhardt	Duane	CCLRP0418	ProPURP-131	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Reiter	James	CCLRP0598	ProALT-309		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Reiter	James	CCLRP0598	SocNC-157		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Remmers	Michael	CCLRP0864	PlaTE-159	North End Business Association	8.1	ProFSt-007	Capital Funding Strategy
Remmers	Michael	CCLRP0864	ProALT-387	North End Business Association	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Remmers	Michael	CCLRP0864	SocNC-218	North End Business Association	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Renikoff	Rich	CCLRP0846	EcoEE-101		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions

Renikoff	Rich	CCLRP0846	EcoEE-94		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Renikoff	Rich	CCLRP0846	ProALT-333		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Renikoff	Rich	CCLRP0846	ProALT-374		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Rensvold	Ryan	CCLRP0420	ProPM-076	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Rensvold	Ryan	CCLRP0420	ProPURP-027	Ecolab Inc. MICAHA (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	PlaTE-107	MICAHA (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	3.8	SocEJ-027	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	PlaTP-173	MICAHA (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	2.3	PlaTP-111	Stations
Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	PlaTP-174	MICAHA (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	6.1	PlaTP-124	Transit Effects
Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	ProALT-106	MICAHA (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	ProHLP-038	MICAHA (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	6.3	ProHLP-029	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Distance/Paths to Stations
Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	PubPI-068	MICAHA (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	3.2	PubPI-036	Community Involvement
Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	PubPI-082	MICAHA (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	11	PubPI-044	Public Comment Process
Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	SocEJ-047	MICAHA (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	SocEJ-060	MICAHA (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	3.8	SocEJ-028	Environmental Justice
Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	SocNC-001	MICAHA (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	3.8	SocEJ-012	Inclusive Community Involvement
Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	SocNC-004	MICAHA (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation
Rewald	Betsy	CCLRP0557	ProALT-248		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Rewald	Betsy	CCLRP0557	SocNC-173		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Reynolds	Betty	CCLRP0116	SocEJ-032		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation

Rice	Rebecca	CCLRP0140	EngBP-19		6.3	EngBP-005	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station Design
Rice	Rebecca	CCLRP0140	EngCI-42		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Rice	Rebecca	CCLRP0140	SocEJ-057		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0084	EngPG-13	Pioneer Press Sports	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0084	PlaTP-147	Pioneer Press Sports	2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0792	PlaTP-152		6.1	PlaTF-008	Travel Time
Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0792	ProALT-025		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0084	ProALT-029	Pioneer Press Sports	6.1	ProALT-019	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0084	ProALT-043	Pioneer Press Sports	2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0084	ProALT-044	Pioneer Press Sports	2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0792	ProALT-046		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0084	ProALT-352	Pioneer Press Sports	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0084	ProHLP-076	Pioneer Press Sports	2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0084	SocSS-049	Pioneer Press Sports	3.7	SocSS-003	Safety and Security
Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478	EngBP-38		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478	EngRW-9		6.2	EngRW-005	Congestion
Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478	EngTI-35		6.2	EngTI-019	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478	EngTI-6		4.6	EngTI-005	Air Quality
Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478	NatAQ-15		4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478	NR-37		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478	NR-53		2.3	NR-013	Miscellaneous
Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478	PlaTE-15		6.3	PlaTE-028	Effects on Other Transportation Facilities and Services
Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478	PlaTE-99		3.2	PlaTE-024	Community Cohesion
Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478	ProALT-169		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478	SocSoc-003		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Ries	Jody	CCLRP0694	ProPM-113	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Ries	Jody	CCLRP0694	ProPURP-186	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project

Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0539	NatVA-16	PPERRIA (Prospect park and East River Road Improvement Association)	3.6	NatVA-007	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0807	NatVA-21		3.6	NatVA-007	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0539	PlaTP-087	PPERRIA (Prospect park and East River Road Improvement Association)	3.2	PlaTP-092	U of M
Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0539	PlaTP-118	PPERRIA (Prospect park and East River Road Improvement Association)	6.1	PlaTP-107	Transit Effects
Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0807	PlaTP-127		3.2	PlaTP-025	U of M
Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0807	PlaTP-202		6.2	PlaTP-136	Effects on Roadways
Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0539	ProALT-033	PPERRIA (Prospect park and East River Road Improvement Association)	2.3	ProALT-008	University of Minnesota
Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0807	ProALT-419		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0539	ProALT-537	PPERRIA (Prospect park and East River Road Improvement Association)	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0807	ProHLP-051		2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota
Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0539	ProProjBdj-016	PPERRIA (Prospect park and East River Road Improvement Association)	2.3	ProProjBdj-009	University of Minnesota
Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0807	ProProjBdj-024		2.3	ProProjBdj-009	University of Minnesota
Risko	Georgi	CCLRP0310	ProALT-327		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Risko	Georgi	CCLRP0310	SocSC-001		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Roach	Tammi	CCLRP0568	ProALT-255		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Roach	Tammi	CCLRP0568	SocNC-071		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Roberts	Sarah	CCLRP0174	PlaTE-62	University of Minnesota	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project

Roberts	Sarah	CCLRP0174	PlaTP-052	University of Minnesota	2.3	ProALT-030	Alternatives Analysis
Roberts	Sarah	CCLRP0174	ProALT-115	University of Minnesota	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Roberts	Sarah	CCLRP0174	ProALT-152	University of Minnesota	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Roberts	Sarah	CCLRP0174	ProALT-315	University of Minnesota	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Roberts	Sarah	CCLRP0174	ProALT-488	University of Minnesota	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Robinson	Beatrice	CCLRP0564	ProALT-427		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Robinson	Beatrice	CCLRP0564	ProPURP-253		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Robinson	Chris	CCLRP0940	EngPG-9		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Robinson	Chris	CCLRP0939	EngRW-22		6.2	EngRW-011	Congestion
Robinson	Chris	CCLRP0940	EngRW-32		6.2	EngRW-011	Congestion
Robinson	Chris	CCLRP0940	ProALT-174		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Robinson	Chris	CCLRP0939	ProHLP-123		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Robinson	Chris	CCLRP0939	PubPI-027		11	PubPI-015	Public Comment Process
Robinson	Chris	CCLRP0940	SocEE-9		4	SocEE-003	Environmental Effects
Rockstad	Karen	CCLRP0217	ProALT-414		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Rockstad	Karen	CCLRP0217	SocNC-240		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Rogalski	Mary Jo	CCLRP0429	ProALT-030		2.3	ProALT-008	University of Minnesota
Rogers	Patricia	CCLRP0092	ProFSt-007		8.1	ProFSt-007	Capital Funding Strategy
Rogers	Patricia	CCLRP0092	ProHLP-083		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Rogers	Patricia	CCLRP0092	ProPOL-32		11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
Rosenthal	Vic	CCLRP0788	EngPG-84	Jewish Community Action	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Rosenthal	Vic	CCLRP0788	PlaTE-13	Jewish Community Action	2.3	PlaTE-002	Stations
Rosenthal	Vic	CCLRP0788	PlaTP-204	Jewish Community Action	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
Rosenthal	Vic	CCLRP0788	ProPOL-4	Jewish Community Action	3.2	EngCI-003	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Rosenthal	Vic	CCLRP0788	SocEJ-053	Jewish Community Action	3.8	SocEJ-008	Affordable Housing
Rosenthal	Vic	CCLRP0788	SocEJ-055	Jewish Community Action	3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
Rosenthal	Vic	CCLRP0788	SocNC-011	Jewish Community Action	3.2	SocNC-003	Community Involvement
Ross	Cyndi	CCLRP0713	ProPM-139	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Ross	Cyndi	CCLRP0713	ProPURP-058	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Rossbach	Jack	CCLRP0913	EcoEE-9		5.1	EcoEE-002	Economic Conditions

				Report Clarifications Updates and		
Rossbach	Jack	CCLRP0913	PlaTE-115	6.1	PlaTF-009	Corrections
Rossbach	Jack	CCLRP0913	PlaTE-93	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Rossbach	Jack	CCLRP0913	PlaTF-10	1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
Rossbach	Jack	CCLRP0913	PlaTP-222	6.1	PlaTF-008	Travel Time
Rossbach	Jack	CCLRP0913	ProHLP-092	1	ProHLP-019	Who Will Benefit?
Rossi	Robert	CCLRP0480	ProALT-036	2.3	ProALT-008	University of Minnesota
Rossi	Robert	CCLRP0480	ProALT-038	6.2	ProALT-017	Congestion
Rossi	Robert	CCLRP0480	ProALT-396	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Rossi	Robert	CCLRP0480	ProHLP-033	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Rossi	Robert	CCLRP0480	ProHLP-115	3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
Roth	Ben	CCLRP0251	PlaTE-116	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Roth	Ben	CCLRP0251	ProALT-221	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
Roth	Ben	CCLRP0251	ProALT-416	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003	EcoEE-56	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003	EngEng-5	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003	ProALT-344	2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003	ProALT-468	2.3	ProALT-016	Cost Effectiveness
Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003	ProALT-498	2.3	ProALT-021	Alignment
Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003	ProHLP-075	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003	SocEJ-008	3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003	SocEJ-093	3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003	SocNC-003	3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Rounds	Shawn	CCLRP0037	SocSS-13	6.3	EngBP-011	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Rowen	Harold	CCLRP0118	ProALT-227	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Rowley	Steve	CCLRP0656	ProPM-100	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Rowley	Steve	CCLRP0656	ProPURP-074	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Rowley	Steve	CCLRP0656	SocNC-012	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Ruble	Patrick	CCLRP0511	ProALT-240	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Ruble	Patrick	CCLRP0511	SocNC-169	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Ruhr	Rick	CCLRP0626	ProPM-107	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Ruhr	Rick	CCLRP0626	ProPURP-138	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Ruhr	Rick	CCLRP0626	ProPURP-217	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Russell	Margaret	CCLRP0319	ProALT-195	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Russell	Margaret	CCLRP0319	SocNC-063	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Ruzza	John R.	CCLRP0523	NR-61	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact

MICAH (Metropolitan
Interfaith Council on
Affordable Housing)

Ruzza	John R.	CCLRP0523	PlaTP-048	MICAH (Metropolitan Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
Ruzza	John R.	CCLRP0523	ProALT-034	MICAH (Metropolitan Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	2.3	ProALT-025	Stations
Ruzza	John R.	CCLRP0523	PubPI-064	MICAH (Metropolitan Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	3.2	PubPI-035	Community Involvement
Ruzza	John R.	CCLRP0523	SocEJ-006	MICAH (Metropolitan Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	3.8	SocEJ-001	Businesses
Ruzza	John R.	CCLRP0523	SocEJ-038	MICAH (Metropolitan Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	EngUT-1	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	EngUT-10	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	EngUT-17	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	EngUT-20	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	EngUT-22	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	EngUT-23	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-006	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	EngUT-3	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	EngUT-4	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	EngUT-7	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	EngUT-8	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	ProALT-017	District Energy St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	ProHLP-005	District Energy St. Paul	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	ProProjBdj-001	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	ProProjBdj-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	SocEU-16	District Energy St. Paul	4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
Sabby	Dean	CCLRP0574	ProALT-119		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Sabby	Dean	CCLRP0574	SocNC-074		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Saldivar	Israel	CCLRP0618	ProALT-150		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Saldivar	Israel	CCLRP0618	SocNC-094		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Sandhei	Peder	CCLRP0306	EcoEE-24		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Sandhei	Peder	CCLRP0306	PlaTE-152		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Sandhei	Peder	CCLRP0306	ProALT-467		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Sandhei	Peder	CCLRP0306	ProPURP-049		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Sandhei	Peder	CCLRP0306	ProPURP-117		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Savino	Laurie	CCLRP0668	PlaTE-91	Ecolab Inc.,	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Savino	Laurie	CCLRP0668	ProPM-081	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Savino	Laurie	CCLRP0668	ProPURP-014	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Sawyer	Timothy and Sally	CCLRP0076	EngPG-71		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Sawyer	Timothy and Sally	CCLRP0076	EngPG-73		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Sawyer	Timothy and Sally	CCLRP0076	ProALT-040		3.3	ProALT-003	Acquisitions and Displacements/Relocations
Sawyer	Sally	CCLRP0076	ProALT-089		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Schack	Sherry	CCLRP0221	ProALT-270		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Schack	Sherry	CCLRP0221	SocNC-165		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Schadauer	Mike	CCLRP0015	ProALT-230		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Schadauer	Mike	CCLRP0015	ProProjBdj-014		2.3	ProProjBdj-007	Grade Separation
Schadegg	Mark	CCLRP0556	ProALT-397		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Schadegg	Mark	CCLRP0556	SocNC-111		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Schaff	Julie	CCLRP0410	ProPM-048	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Schaff	Julie	CCLRP0410	ProPURP-067	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Schany	Alanna	CCLRP0704	ProPM-034	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Schany	Alanna	CCLRP0704	ProPURP-087	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Scheller	David	CCLRP0318	ProHLP-046		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Scheller	David	CCLRP0318	SocNC-187		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Schletty	Lorraine	CCLRP0097	ProALT-194		2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Schmidt	Bruce	CCLRP0396	ProPM-234		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Schmidt	Bruce	CCLRP0396	ProPURP-088		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project

Schmidt	Steve	CCLRP0885	ProALT-128		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Schmit	John	CCLRP0762	ProALT-405		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Schmit	John	CCLRP0762	ProALT-438		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Schmit	John	CCLRP0762	ProALT-443		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Schmitz	Timothy	CCLRP0705	ProPM-202	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Schmitz	Timothy	CCLRP0705	ProPURP-142	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Schout	Christopher	CCLRP0304	EcoEE-48		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Schout	Christopher	CCLRP0304	PlaTE-77		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Schout	Christopher	CCLRP0304	ProALT-192		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Schout	Christopher	CCLRP0304	ProPURP-195		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Schramm	Andreas	CCLRP0635	ProALT-440		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Schramm	Andreas	CCLRP0635	ProALT-502		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Schroeder	Ernie	CCLRP0873	EcoEE-68	North End Business Association	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Schroeder	Ernie	CCLRP0873	PlaTE-35	North End Business Association	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Schroeder	Ernie	CCLRP0873	PlaTE-69	North End Business Association	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Schroeder	Ernie	CCLRP0873	ProALT-238	North End Business Association	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Schultz	Cindy	CCLRP0655	EngCI-16	Schultz Consulting, LLC	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Schultz	Cindy	CCLRP0655	EngCI-26	Schultz Consulting, LLC	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Schultz	Cindy	CCLRP0655	EngPG-6	Schultz Consulting, LLC	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Schultz	Cindy	CCLRP0655	ProALT-072	Schultz Consulting, LLC	1	ProPURP-012	In Favor of Project
Schultz	Eleanor	CCLRP0165	ProPURP-114		1	ProPURP-002	Who Will Benefit?
Schultz	Eleanor	CCLRP0165	SocEJ-025		3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
Schutz	Larry	CCLRP0115	EngCI-50		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Schutz	Larry	CCLRP0115	ProALT-286		2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	EcoEE-20	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions

Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	EngBP-29	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	6.3	EngBP-003	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station Design
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	EngBP-46	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	EngCI-5	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	3.2	EngCI-003	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	EngPG-54	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0458	EngPG-67	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0458	NatVA-13	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	NatVA-33	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	PlaTP-017	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0458	PlaTP-140	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	PlaTP-181	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	6.1	PlaTP-061	Bus System Impact
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0458	PlaTP-206	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	6.1	PlaTP-044	LRT System Design
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0458	PlaTP-240	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	ProALT-031	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	2.3	ProALT-021	Alignment
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	ProALT-041	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	6.1	ProALT-024	LRT System Design

Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	ProALT-507	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	PubPI-021	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	3.2	PubPI-013	Community Involvement
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0458	PubPI-043	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	3.8	PubPI-007	Inclusive Community Involvement
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0907	PubPI-086	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	3.8	PubPI-007	Inclusive Community Involvement
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0458	SocEJ-039	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	SocLU-008	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0458	SocLU-033	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics
Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	SocSS-26	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Schwidorski	Marijo	CCLRP0202	ProALT-075		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Schwidorski	Marijo	CCLRP0202	SocNC-137		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Scobey	Fredda	CCLRP0739	ProALT-262	Riverside Plaza Tenant Association	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Scobey	Fredda	CCLRP0739	ProALT-269	Riverside Plaza Tenant Association	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Scott	Patricia	CCLRP0938	ProHLP-059		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Scott	Patricia	CCLRP0938	PubPI-026		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
Scott	Patricia	CCLRP0938	SocEJ-081		3.8	SocEJ-027	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Scott	Patricia	CCLRP0938	SocNC-008		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation
Scott	Patricia	CCLRP0938	SocNC-198		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Scurato	Francy	CCLRP0016	PlaTP-179		6.1	PlaTP-105	LRT Park and Rides
Scurato	Francy	CCLRP0016	ProALT-543		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Seabold	Jim	CCLRP0314	EcoEE-43		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Seabold	Jim	CCLRP0314	PlaTE-58		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Seabold	Jim	CCLRP0314	ProALT-149		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Seabold	Jim	CCLRP0314	ProPURP-247		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Sear	Esther	CCLRP0114	PlaTP-251		2.3	PlaTP-067	Stops
Sear	Esther	CCLRP0114	ProALT-087		2.3	ProALT-004	Alternatives Analysis

Sear	Esther	CCLRP0114	SocEJ-087	3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
Sear	Esther	CCLRP0114	SocSS-56	3.7	EngBP-015	Safety and Security
Senkler	Charles	CCLRP0278	PlaTE-73	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Senkler	Charles	CCLRP0278	ProALT-245	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Senkler	Charles	CCLRP0278	PubPI-039	3.2	PubPI-020	Community Involvement
Seufert	Jim	CCLRP0101	EngPG-49	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Seufert	Jim	CCLRP0101	PlaTP-207	2.3	PlaTP-045	Stations
						Report Clarifications Updates and
Seufert	Jim	CCLRP0101	ProALT-229	6.1	ProALT-019	Corrections
Seufert	Jim	CCLRP0101	ProALT-624	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Seufert	Jim	CCLRP0101	ProHLP-022	2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota
Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0642	EngPG-14	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0642	NatAQ-20	4.6	NatAQ-003	Air Quality
Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0916	PlaTP-185	2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0916	PlaTP-224	2.3	ProALT-030	Alternatives Analysis
Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0642	ProALT-013	1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0785	ProALT-139	2.3	ProALT-028	Miscellaneous
						Alternatives Analysis (LRT &
Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0642	ProALT-244	2.3	ProALT-046	Buses)
Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0916	ProALT-611	1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0785	ProHLP-079	1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
						Report Clarifications Updates and
Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0642	ProPM-281	6.1	ProPM-003	Corrections
Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0642	ProPOL-39	1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
						Evaluation Relative to Project Goals
Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0085	ProProjBdj-026	10.1	ProProjBdj-012	and Objectives
Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0785	ProPURP-082	1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0642	SocEJ-012	3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0916	SocEU-1	4.11	SocEU-002	Energy
Shamrokh	Shereen	CCLRP0513	ProALT-161	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Shamrokh	Shereen	CCLRP0513	SocNC-239	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Sharp	Sonja	CCLRP0182	ProALT-022	2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Sharp	Sonja	CCLRP0182	ProALT-482	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Sharp	Sonja	CCLRP0182	ProPOL-16	3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
Sharp	Sonja	CCLRP0182	ProPURP-092	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Sheahan	Stephen	CCLRP0317	ProALT-085	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Sheahan	Stephen	CCLRP0317	SocNC-233	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Sheehan	Gregory M.	CCLRP0345	EcoEE-116	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Sheehan	Gregory M.	CCLRP0345	PlaTE-193	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Sheehan	Gregory M.	CCLRP0536	ProALT-284	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Sheehan	Gregory M.	CCLRP0345	ProALT-599	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Sheehan	Gregory M.	CCLRP0345	SocEE-23	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
Sheehy	Lee	CCLRP0764	ProALT-228	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
			City of Minneapolis			

Sheehy	Lee	CCLRP0764	ProPOL-37	City of Minneapolis	11	PlaTP-131	Public Comment Process
Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	EngCI-32	Hamline Midway Coalition	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	EngPG-57	Hamline Midway Coalition	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	EngTI-30	Hamline Midway Coalition	6.2	EngTI-016	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	NatAQ-5	Hamline Midway Coalition	4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	NatNV-9	Hamline Midway Coalition	4.7	NatNV-005	Noise
Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	NatVA-7	Hamline Midway Coalition	3.6	NatVA-006	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	NR-56	Hamline Midway Coalition	6.1	NR-018	Bus System Impact
Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	PlaTE-67	Hamline Midway Coalition	3.2	PlaTE-025	Community Cohesion
Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	PlaTP-049	Hamline Midway Coalition	6.3	PlaTP-073	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	PlaTP-066	Hamline Midway Coalition	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	PlaTP-124	Hamline Midway Coalition	2.3	ProALT-010	Stations
Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	PlaTP-148	Hamline Midway Coalition	6.1	PlaTP-061	Bus System Impact
Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	ProPOL-43	Hamline Midway Coalition	3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	PubPI-046	Hamline Midway Coalition	3.2	PubPI-024	Community Involvement
Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	SocEJ-024	Hamline Midway Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	SocLU-003	Hamline Midway Coalition	3.1	SocLU-001	Land Use and Socio-Economics
Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	SocP4-7	Coalition	3.5	SocP4-006	Parklands and Recreation Areas
Shubatt	Pat	CCLRP0416	ProALT-621	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Shubatt	Pat	CCLRP0416	ProPURP-086	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Simonsen	Sonja	CCLRP0818	ProALT-254		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075	EngRW-28		6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion
Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075	PlaTE-131		6.1	PlaTF-008	Travel Time
Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075	ProALT-091		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075	ProALT-214		2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)

Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075	ProALT-476		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075	ProALT-562		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075	ProProjBdj-023		10.1	ProProjBdj-006	Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075	ProProjBdj-029		10.1	ProProjBdj-006	Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075	PubPI-041		11	PubPI-015	Public Comment Process
				St. Paul Area Chamber of Commerce			
Simpson	David	CCLRP0817	ProALT-204		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Singerhouse	Tony	CCLRP0179	PlaTE-163		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Singerhouse	Tony	CCLRP0179	ProALT-480		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Singerhouse	Tony	CCLRP0179	ProALT-541		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Singerhouse	Tony	CCLRP0179	ProALT-582		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Singerhouse	Tony	CCLRP0179	ProHLP-062		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
Singerhouse	Tony	CCLRP0179	SocSS-10		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Singerhouse	Tony	CCLRP0179	SocSS-15		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Singh	Shakunla	CCLRP0609	ProALT-220		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Singh	Shakunla	CCLRP0609	SocNC-132		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Singleton	Connie	CCLRP0753	EngRW-3		6.2	EngRW-003	Effects on Roadways
Singleton	Connie	CCLRP0753	PlaTP-058		2.3	ProALT-030	Alternatives Analysis
Singleton	Connie	CCLRP0753	PlaTP-153		6.1	PlaTP-080	LRT System Design
Singleton	Connie	CCLRP0753	ProALT-039		2.3	ProALT-008	University of Minnesota
Singleton	Connie	CCLRP0753	ProALT-097		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Singleton	Connie	CCLRP0753	ProALT-439		2.3	PlaTP-077	Alignment
Singleton	Connie	CCLRP0931	ProHLP-020		2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota
Sink	Jill	CCLRP0433	ProALT-343		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Sink	Jill	CCLRP0433	ProPURP-228		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Skreves	Jeff	CCLRP0915	PlaTE-180		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Skreves	Jeff	CCLRP0915	ProALT-355		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Skreves	Jeff	CCLRP0915	ProHLP-057		2.3	ProHLP-015	Miscellaneous
Skreves	Jeff	CCLRP0915	PubPI-060		3.2	PubPI-011	Community Involvement
Skreves	Jeff	CCLRP0915	SocSoc-001		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation
Smith	Alphonsine	CCLRP0005	PlaTE-38		3.2	PlaTE-020	Community Cohesion
Smith	Alphonsine	CCLRP0005	ProALT-250		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Smith	Alphonsine	CCLRP0005	ProALT-420		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Smith	Alphonsine	CCLRP0005	SocEJ-022		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
Smith	Alphonsine	CCLRP0005	SocNC-219		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Smith	Barb	CCLRP0747	ProFSt-009		8.1	ProFSt-007	Capital Funding Strategy
Smith	Barb	CCLRP0747	SocEJ-036		3.8	SocEJ-000	Inclusive Community Involvement
				District Energy - St. Paul			Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Smith	Ken	CCLRP0820	EngCI-8		4.1	EngUT-001	

Smith	Ken	CCLRP0820	EngCI-9	District Energy - St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Smith	Ken	CCLRP0820	EngUT-18	District Energy - St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Smith	Ken	CCLRP0820	ProALT-575	District Energy - St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Smith	Timothy	CCLRP0619	ProALT-263		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Smith	Timothy	CCLRP0619	SocNC-234		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Snyder	John	CCLRP0162	EcoEE-144		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Snyder	John	CCLRP0162	PlaPla-10		2.3	PlaPla-008	Grade Separation
Snyder	John	CCLRP0162	ProALT-028		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Snyder	John	CCLRP0162	ProALT-413		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Sobiech	Richard	CCLRP0542	EngCI-47	TKDA	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Sobiech	Richard	CCLRP0542	ProALT-433	TKDA	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Sommers	Joy	CCLRP0353	EcoEE-28		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Sommers	Joy	CCLRP0353	PlaTE-90		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Sommers	Joy	CCLRP0353	ProALT-160		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Sommers	Joy	CCLRP0353	ProPURP-041		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Soni	Ravindra	CCLRP0640	ProPM-249	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Soni	Ravindra	CCLRP0640	ProPURP-233	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Soroka	Robert	CCLRP0528	EngUT-6	Marshall Field's	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Soroka	Robert	CCLRP0528	EngUT-9	Marshall Field's	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
Soroka	Robert	CCLRP0528	ProPM-294	Marshall Field's	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Sosniecki	Ted	CCLRP0589	ProALT-499		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Sosniecki	Ted	CCLRP0589	ProALT-565		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Spanjers	Ella	CCLRP0089	ProALT-450		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Sparr	Peter	CCLRP0594	ProALT-463		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Sparr	Peter	CCLRP0594	SocNC-159		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Spaulding	Bob	CCLRP0461	NR-33	Capital River District Council Downtwon	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Spaulding	Bob	CCLRP0461	PlaTP-070	Capital River District Council Downtwon	6.1	PlaTP-083	Transit Effects
Sperling	Amy	CCLRP0218	ProALT-534		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Sperling	Amy	CCLRP0218	SocNC-207		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Squillace	Laurie	CCLRP0673	ProPM-287	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Squillace	Laurie	CCLRP0673	ProPURP-075	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Stakston	Sarah	CCLRP0009	EcoEE-97		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Stakston	Sarah	CCLRP0110	ProALT-004		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project

Stakston	Sarah	CCLRP0009	ProALT-067		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Stakston	Sarah	CCLRP0009	ProALT-125		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Staloch	Peter	CCLRP0757	EcoEE-74		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Staloch	Peter	CCLRP0757	PlaTP-121		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Staloch	Peter	CCLRP0757	ProALT-103		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Staloch	Peter	CCLRP0757	ProALT-529		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Stark	Russ	CCLRP0176	EngBP-17	St. Paul Bicycle Advisory Board	6.3	EngBP-003	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station Design
Stark	Russ	CCLRP0176	EngBP-33	St. Paul Bicycle Advisory Board	6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Stark	Russ	CCLRP0176	EngBP-43	St. Paul Bicycle Advisory Board	6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Stein	Eve	CCLRP0929	ProHLP-024		6.1	ProHLP-023	Transit Effects
Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166	EcoEE-142		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166	NatAQ-4		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166	PlaTE-103		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166	PlaTE-119		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166	PlaTE-168		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166	PlaTP-082		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166	ProALT-370		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166	SocEE-19		4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166	SocEE-7		6.2	SocEE-004	Congestion
Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166	SocEJ-096		3.8	SocEJ-000	Inclusive Community Involvement
Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166	SocNC-013		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
Stewart	Jackie	CCLRP0372	PlaTE-16	Minnesota Senir Federation Affordable Housing Committee	2.3	PlaTE-027	Stops
Stokes	Dave	CCLRP0808	EngCI-56	Midway Chamber of Commerce	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Stokes	Dave	CCLRP0808	ProALT-631	Midway Chamber of Commerce	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	EngPG-19	Midway Used and Rare Books	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	EngPG-5	Midway Used and Rare Books	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	EngRW-1	Midway Used and Rare Books	3.2	EngRW-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	EngRW-20	Midway Used and Rare Books	6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion
Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	EngTI-17	Midway Used and Rare Books	6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion

Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	EngTI-22	Midway Used and Rare Books	6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	NatNV-10	Midway Used and Rare Books	4.7	NatNV-005	Noise
Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	ProALT-264	Midway Used and Rare Books	2.3	ProALT-016	Cost Effectiveness
Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	ProALT-555	Midway Used and Rare Books	2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	ProHLP-008	Midway Used and Rare Books	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	SocNC-152	Midway Used and Rare Books	3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	SocNC-216	Midway Used and Rare Books	3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	SocSS-52	Midway Used and Rare Books	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Strelau	Tina	CCLRP0690	ProPM-020	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Strelau	Tina	CCLRP0690	ProPURP-185	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Strickland	Verretta	CCLRP0643	PlaTE-80		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Strickland	Verretta	CCLRP0643	PlaTP-146		2.3	PlaTP-118	Alignment
Strickland	Verretta	CCLRP0643	PlaTP-196		2.3	PlaTP-093	Stations
Strickland	Verretta	CCLRP0643	ProALT-023		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
Strom	Vernon	CCLRP0774	PubPI-057		11	PubPI-031	Information Availability
Strom	Vernon	CCLRP0774	PubPI-074		11	PubPI-031	Information Availability
Sullivan	Kristie D.	CCLRP0041	EcoEE-85	Securian Financial Group	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Sullivan	Kristie D.	CCLRP0041	ProALT-452	Securian Financial Group	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Swanholm	John	CCLRP0777	EcoEE-82	St. Joseph's Hospital	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Swanholm	John	CCLRP0777	NatAQ-1	St. Joseph's Hospital	4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
Swanholm	John	CCLRP0777	PlaTE-92	St. Joseph's Hospital	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Swanholm	John	CCLRP0777	PlaTP-195	St. Joseph's Hospital	2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
Swanholm	John	CCLRP0777	ProHLP-119	St. Joseph's Hospital	2.3	ProALT-010	Stations
Swanson	Katherine	CCLRP0718	ProPM-068	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Swanson	Katherine	CCLRP0718	ProPURP-244	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Swanson	Michael	CCLRP0388	ProPM-027	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Swanson	Michael	CCLRP0726	ProPM-191	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Swanson	Michael	CCLRP0388	ProPURP-034	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project

Swanson	Michael	CCLRP0726	ProPURP-254	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Sweeney	Laura	CCLRP0775	EcoEE-150		1	EcoEE-013	Who Will Benefit?
							Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact
Sweeney	Laura	CCLRP0775	EngBP-6		6.3	EngBP-016	and Mitigation
Sweeney	Laura	CCLRP0775	PlaTE-186		6.1	PlaTE-013	Bus System Impact
Sweeney	Laura	CCLRP0775	PlaTE-55		6.1	PlaTE-013	Bus System Impact
Sweeney	Laura	CCLRP0775	PlaTP-154		2.3	PlaTP-019	Stations
Sweeney	Laura	CCLRP0775	ProPURP-200		1	ProPURP-002	Who Will Benefit?
Sweet	Antwen	CCLRP0057	ProALT-026		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Swentik	Raelynn	CCLRP0686	ProPM-251	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Swentik	Raelynn	CCLRP0686	ProPURP-126	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Szulim	David	CCLRP0315	ProALT-545		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Szulim	David	CCLRP0315	SocNC-101		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Tabaka	Judy	CCLRP0122	SocSS-047		3.7	SocSS-004	Safety and Security
Tabrizi	Mat	CCLRP0614	ProALT-265		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Tabrizi	Mat	CCLRP0614	SocNC-044		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Tawil	Lawrence	CCLRP0486	ProALT-403		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous
Taylor	Kris	CCLRP0875	PlaTE-33	Ecolab	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Taylor	Kris	CCLRP0875	PlaTP-210	Ecolab	6.1	PlaTP-046	Transit Effects
Taylor	Kris	CCLRP0875	ProALT-093	Ecolab	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Taylor	Kris	CCLRP0875	ProALT-553	Ecolab	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Thacker	Loren	CCLRP0664	PlaTE-145	Ecolab Inc.,	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Thacker	Loren	CCLRP0664	ProALT-505	Ecolab Inc.,	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
							Impact and Mitigation for
Thao	Pen	CCLRP0935	PubPI-023		3.2	PubPI-014	Community Businesses
Thao	Pen	CCLRP0935	SocNC-023		3.2	SocNC-007	Community Involvement
Thatcher	Jennifer	CCLRP0606	ProALT-181		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Thatcher	Jennifer	CCLRP0606	SocNC-202		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Thera	Shawn	CCLRP0869	NR-51	City of St. Paul	11	NR-005	Miscellaneous
Thera	Shawn	CCLRP0869	ProALT-548	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Thera	Shawn	CCLRP0869	SocLU-032	City of St. Paul	3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics
				Midwest Staffing			
Thoemke	Brian	CCLRP0821	ProALT-465	Group	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Thomas	David Evan	CCLRP0285	PlaTE-31		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Thomas	David Evan	CCLRP0285	ProALT-083		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Thomas	David Evan	CCLRP0285	ProALT-217		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Thomas	David Evan	CCLRP0285	ProPURP-101		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
				Minnesota			
				Department of			
Thompson	Dennis	CCLRP0381	EngBP-14	Natural Resources	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact
							and Mitigation
Thompson	Jana	CCLRP0730	ProPM-250	Ecolab Pest	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				Elimination			

Thompson	Jana	CCLRP0730	ProPURP-128	Ecolab Pest Elimination	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Thompson	Joan	CCLRP0769	EcoEE-15		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Thompson	Joan	CCLRP0769	EcoEE-78		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Thompson	Joan	CCLRP0769	ProALT-321		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				MN Wiring & Cable Company			
Thompson	Joan	CCLRP0837	ProALT-341		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Thompson	Joan	CCLRP0769	SocNC-070		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
Thompson	John	CCLRP0374	ProALT-035		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Thompson	John	CCLRP0374	ProALT-061		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				Securian Financial Group, Inc.			
Thompson	Karen	CCLRP0344	EcoEE-38		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
				Securian Financial Group, Inc.			
Thompson	Karen	CCLRP0344	ProALT-335		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				Securian Financial Group, Inc.			
Thompson	Karen	CCLRP0344	ProPURP-136		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Thooft	Travis	CCLRP0627	EcoEE-27		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Thooft	Travis	CCLRP0627	PlaTE-34		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Thooft	Travis	CCLRP0627	ProALT-136		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Thooft	Travis	CCLRP0627	ProPURP-144		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Thorkelsen	David	CCLRP0862	EcoEE-12		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Thorkelsen	David	CCLRP0862	EcoEE-2		5.1	EcoEE-002	Economic Conditions
Thorkelsen	David	CCLRP0862	PlaTP-209		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Thorkelsen	David	CCLRP0862	ProALT-151		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Thorkelsen	David	CCLRP0862	ProALT-600		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Thorkelsen	David	CCLRP0862	SocLU-028		3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics
Thormodsgard	Diane	CCLRP0083	EcoEE-92		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Thormodsgard	Diane	CCLRP0083	EcoEE-99		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Thormodsgard	Diane	CCLRP0763	EngRW-27		6.2	EngTI-004	Congestion
Thormodsgard	Diane	CCLRP0083	EngTI-5		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Thormodsgard	Diane	CCLRP0083	ProALT-104		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Thormodsgard	Diane	CCLRP0083	ProALT-349		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Thormodsgard	Diane	CCLRP0763	ProALT-351		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Thormodsgard	Diane	CCLRP0083	ProALT-411		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Thormodsgard	Diane	CCLRP0763	ProALT-640		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Thormodsgard	Diane	CCLRP0083	ProFSt-012		8.1	ProFSt-009	Capital Funding Strategy
Thur	Lois	CCLRP0192	EngRW-29		6.2	EngRW-010	Effects on Roadways
Thur	Lois	CCLRP0192	PlaTE-196		6.1	PlaTE-013	Bus System Impact
Thur	Lois	CCLRP0192	PlaTP-054		6.1	PlaTP-061	Bus System Impact
Thur	Lois	CCLRP0192	ProALT-453		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
							Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
Thur	Lois	CCLRP0192	ProALT-536		2.3	ProALT-033	
Thur	Lois	CCLRP0192	SocNC-009		3.2	SocNC-002	Community Cohesion

Thur Tiers	Lois George	CCLRP0192	SocNC-053		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
Tilsen	Janie	CCLRP0264	ProALT-076		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Tilsen	Janie	CCLRP0576	ProALT-366		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Tippett	Roger	CCLRP0576	SocNC-119		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Tippett	Roger	CCLRP0398	ProPM-189		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Tippett	Roger	CCLRP0398	ProPURP-054		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Tivyvan	Elena	CCLRP0575	ProALT-201		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Tivyvan	Elena	CCLRP0575	SocNC-183		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Tjelta	Brenda	CCLRP0674	ProPM-168	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Tjelta	Brenda	CCLRP0674	ProPURP-237	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Toia	Richard	CCLRP0581	ProALT-596		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Toia	Richard	CCLRP0581	SocNC-058		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Toren	Shannon	CCLRP0663	ProPM-178	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Toren	Shannon	CCLRP0663	ProPURP-056	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Trinh	Marlyna	CCLRP0790	EcoEE-59	Kim Hung Mall	5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
Trinh	Marlyna	CCLRP0790	EngPG-16	Kim Hung Mall	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Trinkle	Elizabeth	CCLRP0693	ProPM-289	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Trinkle	Elizabeth	CCLRP0693	ProPURP-102	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Triplett	Tom	CCLRP0336	PlaTE-14		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Triplett	Tom	CCLRP0336	PlaTE-59		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Triplett	Tom	CCLRP0336	ProALT-328		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Triplett	Tom	CCLRP0336	ProPURP-246		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Triviski	Mary	CCLRP0725	ProPM-303	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Triviski	Mary	CCLRP0725	ProPURP-033	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Tufford	Marie	CCLRP0267	ProALT-532		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Tufford	Marie	CCLRP0267	SocNC-123		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Turnipseed	Eric	CCLRP0351	EcoEE-36	The Automation Station, Inc.	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Turnipseed	Eric	CCLRP0351	PlaTE-71	The Automation Station, Inc.	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Turnipseed	Eric	CCLRP0351	ProALT-216	The Automation Station, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Turnipseed	Eric	CCLRP0351	ProPURP-164	The Automation Station, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Ulmer	Patrick	CCLRP0216	PlaTE-146	Ecolab, Inc.	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Ulmer	Patrick	CCLRP0216	ProALT-324	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Urman	Janina	CCLRP0421	ProPM-180	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Urman	Janina	CCLRP0421	ProPURP-106	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Urman	Trevor	CCLRP0197	ProALT-485		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Urman	Trevor	CCLRP0197	SocNC-188		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Utecht	Ryan	CCLRP0570	ProALT-538		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Utecht	Ryan	CCLRP0570	SocNC-077		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Vadnais	Emmy	CCLRP0927	EngRW-18		6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion

Vadnais	Emmy	CCLRP0927	PlaTP-024		6.2	PlaTP-022	Congestion
Vadnais	Kathy	CCLRP0508	ProALT-602		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Vadnais	Kathy	CCLRP0508	SocNC-062		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Valente	Brenda	CCLRP0658	ProPM-110	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Valente	Brenda	CCLRP0658	ProPURP-161	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Vanasek	Rob	CCLRP0900	PlaTP-060		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
Vanasek	Rob	CCLRP0900	ProALT-241		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Vanasek	Rob	CCLRP0900	SocNC-211		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Vanderborght	W.P	CCLRP0806	PlaPla-9		6.1	PlaPla-010	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Vanderborght	W.P	CCLRP0806	ProFSt-010		8.1	ProFSt-007	Capital Funding Strategy
Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781	EngBP-7	Transit for Livable Communities	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781	EngCI-37	Transit for Livable Communities	3.2	EngCI-003	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781	NR-24	Transit for Livable Communities	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781	PlaTE-87	Transit for Livable Communities	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781	PlaTE-9	Transit for Livable Communities	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781	ProALT-015	Transit for Livable Communities	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781	ProALT-045	Transit for Livable Communities	2.3	ProALT-010	Stations
Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781	ProPURP-030	Transit for Livable Communities	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781	SocNC-019	Transit for Livable Communities	3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781	SocP4-1	Transit for Livable Communities	3.5	SocP4-001	Parklands and Recreation Areas
Vanheuklom	Norene	CCLRP0596	ProALT-200		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Vanheuklom	Norene	CCLRP0596	SocNC-113		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Vegas	John	CCLRP0235	PlaTE-154	Ecolab	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Vegas	John	CCLRP0235	ProALT-065	Ecolab	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Vegas	John	CCLRP0235	ProPM-002	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Vento	Andrea	CCLRP0527	PlaTP-199	Friends of the Parks and Trails	6.3	PlaTP-042	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Vento	Andrea	CCLRP0527	SocP4-4	Friends of the Parks and Trails	3.5	SocP4-004	Parklands and Recreation Areas
Vetsch	Bernice	CCLRP0259	PlaTE-1		3.2	EcoEE-020	Neighborhood Preservation
Vetsch	Bernice	CCLRP0259	ProALT-256		2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)

Vetsch	Bernice	CCLRP0259	ProHLP-041	2.3	ProHLP-031	Stops
Vibar	Nancy	CCLRP0784	EngPG-76	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Vibar	Nancy	CCLRP0784	NatNV-17	4.7	NatNV-005	Noise
Vibar	Nancy	CCLRP0784	NR-17	3.2	NR-023	Impact and Mitigation for
Vibar	Nancy	CCLRP0784	ProALT-371	1	PlaTP-130	Community Businesses
Vickers	Mavis	CCLRP0007	ProPM-005	3.1	SocLU-003	Not in Favor of Project
Vickers	Mavis	CCLRP0007	ProPURP-205	1	ProHLP-019	Land Use
Vickers	Mavis	CCLRP0007	SocEJ-075	3.8	SocEJ-010	Who Will Benefit?
Vickers	Mavis	CCLRP0007	SocNC-172	3.2	SocNC-001	Affordable Housing
Vickers	Mavis	CCLRP0007	SocSS-25	6.3	EngBP-001	Community Cohesion
Vido	Jose	CCLRP0276	EcoEE-52	5.1	EcoEE-008	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact
Vido	Jose	CCLRP0276	PlaTE-52	1	EngTI-003	and Mitigation
Vido	Jose	CCLRP0276	ProALT-226	2.3	ProALT-001	Economic Conditions
Vido	Jose	CCLRP0276	ProPURP-150	2.3	ProALT-001	In Favor of Project
Vij	Lokesh	CCLRP0364	ProPM-230	1	ProPURP-009	Alternatives Analysis
Vij	Lokesh	CCLRP0364	ProPURP-174	1	ProPURP-009	Alternatives Analysis
Vockrodt	Robert	CCLRP0027	ProALT-325	2.3	ProALT-001	In Favor of Project
Vockrodt	Robert	CCLRP0027	ProALT-384	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Vockrodt	Robert	CCLRP0027	ProPM-142	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Vono	Micah	CCLRP0366	ProPM-101	1	ProPURP-009	Alternatives Analysis
Vono	Micah	CCLRP0366	ProPURP-231	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Vopatek	Caroline	CCLRP0220	ProALT-426	2.3	ProALT-001	In Favor of Project
Vopatek	Caroline	CCLRP0220	SocNC-225	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Vue	Chan	CCLRP0060	PlaTE-2	5.3	PlaTE-017	Alternatives Analysis
W	R M	CCLRP0447	EcoEE-98	3.2	EcoEE-014	Development Effects
W	R M	CCLRP0447	NatVA-26	3.6	NatVA-008	Impact and Mitigation for
W	R M	CCLRP0447	PlaTP-089	1	ProPURP-002	Community Businesses
W	R M	CCLRP0447	PlaTP-129	2.3	PlaTP-011	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
W	R M	CCLRP0447	ProALT-010	2.3	PlaTP-039	Who Will Benefit?
W	R M	CCLRP0447	PubPI-007	11	PubPI-004	Grade Separation
W	R M	CCLRP0447	SocNC-028	3.2	SocNC-001	Grade Separation
W	R M	CCLRP0447	SocNC-103	3.2	SocNC-001	Public Involvement
Wahi	Dinesh	CCLRP0728	ProPM-185	1	ProPURP-009	Community Cohesion
Wahi	Dinesh	CCLRP0728	ProPURP-090	1	ProPURP-009	Community Cohesion
Wallace	Julia	CCLRP0751	PlaTE-155	2.3	ProALT-001	In Favor of Project
Wallace	Julia	CCLRP0751	SocEJ-068	3.8	SocEJ-000	In Favor of Project
Walsh	Agnes	CCLRP0265	ProALT-407	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Walsh	Agnes	CCLRP0265	SocNC-200	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Walz	Joe	CCLRP0241	EngBP-42	6.3	EngBP-002	Alternatives Analysis

Northland Insurance
Group

Walz	Joe	CCLRP0241	ProALT-428	Northland Insurance Group	2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
Walz	Joe	CCLRP0241	ProPURP-015	Northland Insurance Group	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Walz	Joe	CCLRP0241	SocEU-3	Northland Insurance Group	4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0476	EngTI-29		6.2	EngTI-004	Congestion
Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0476	PlaTE-65		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0755	PlaTE-84		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0456	ProALT-304		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0755	ProALT-358		1	ProHLP-019	Who Will Benefit?
Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0755	ProALT-402		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous
Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0477	ProALT-590		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous
Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0456	ProALT-604		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous
Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0476	ProHLP-107		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0755	SocSS-054		3.7	SocSS-002	Safety and Security
Warner	Dave	CCLRP0053	ProALT-173		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Warner	Dave	CCLRP0053	ProALT-279		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470	EngBP-37		6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470	EngPG-20		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470	EngPG-7		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470	EngTI-16		6.2	EngTI-014	Effects on Roadways
Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470	PlaPla-3		1	PlaPla-007	Not in Favor of Project
Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470	ProHLP-063		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470	ProHLP-078		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Warns	Benita	CCLRP0453	PubPI-003		11	PubPI-003	Public Comment Process
Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470	PubPI-032		11	PubPI-017	Public Involvement
Warns	Benita	CCLRP0453	PubPI-072		11	PubPI-015	Public Comment Process
Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470	PubPI-077		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470	SocEJ-007		3.8	SocEJ-027	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470	SocEJ-014		3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470	SocEJ-089		3.8	SocEJ-015	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470	SocNC-150		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470	SocNC-153		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
Warns	Michael D.	CCLRP0471	EngBP-4		6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Warns	Michael D.	CCLRP0471	EngPG-8		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
Warns	Michael D.	CCLRP0471	NR-42		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Warns	Michael D.	CCLRP0471	ProALT-027		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
Warns	Michael D.	CCLRP0471	ProHLP-009		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment

Warns	Michael D.	CCLRP0471	PubPI-034		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
Warns	Michael D.	CCLRP0471	SocEJ-017		3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
Warzala	David	CCLRP0896	PlaTE-166	Central Corridor Partnership	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Warzala	David	CCLRP0896	ProALT-109	Central Corridor Partnership	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185	EcoEE-8		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185	EngCI-49		3.2	EngCI-001	Congestion
Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185	EngRW-30		6.2	EngRW-014	Congestion
Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185	EngTI-43		6.2	EngTI-022	Congestion
Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185	PlaTE-149		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185	PlaTE-72		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185	PlaTP-182		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185	ProALT-484		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185	ProHLP-070		3.1	ProHLP-014	Stations
Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185	SocEJ-085		3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185	SocLU-022		3.1	SocLU-003	Land Use
Watters	Ellen	CCLRP0770	EcoEE-119		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Watters	Ellen	CCLRP0770	EngCI-46		3.2	EngCI-003	Community Businesses
Watters	Ellen	CCLRP0770	PlaTE-44		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Watters	Ellen	CCLRP0770	ProALT-319		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Wee	David J.	CCLRP0198	ProALT-222		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Welling	Chip	CCLRP0464	ProALT-020		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Welling	Chip	CCLRP0830	ProALT-519		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Wells	Mary	CCLRP0516	ProALT-118		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Wells	Mary	CCLRP0516	SocNC-037		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Wensman	Charlie	CCLRP0644	ProPM-143		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Wensman	Charlie	CCLRP0644	ProPURP-123		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Wentzel	David	CCLRP0498	ProALT-287		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Wentzel	David	CCLRP0498	SocNC-220		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Werner	Cindy	CCLRP0572	ProALT-063		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Werner	Cindy	CCLRP0572	SocNC-124		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Wesley	Thomas	CCLRP0613	ProALT-189		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Wesley	Thomas	CCLRP0613	SocNC-238		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
West	Michael	CCLRP0567	ProALT-199		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
West	Michael	CCLRP0567	SocNC-105		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	EngCI-15	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	4.9	EngCI-006	Hazardous or Regulated Materials

Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	EngCI-17	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	4.2	EngCI-008	Water Resources
Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	EngTI-26	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	NatAQ-21	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	4.6	NatAQ-004	Air Quality
Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	NatNV-15	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	4.7	NatNV-002	Noise
Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	ProHLP-056	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	SocEE-5	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	SocEJ-066	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	SocHI-4	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	3.4	SocHI-003	Cultural Resources
Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	SocHM-1	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	4.9	SocHM-001	Hazardous or Regulated Materials
Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	SocSC-5	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	9	SocSC-002	Secondary and Cumulative Impacts
Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	SocSS-33	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	6.2	EngRW-003	Effects on Roadways
Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	SocSS-38	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Whaley	Caroline	CCLRP0390	ProPM-233	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Whaley	Caroline	CCLRP0390	ProPURP-050	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
White	Anne	CCLRP0171	EngCI-34		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
White	Anne	CCLRP0171	PlaTP-085		3.2	PlaTP-090	Community Involvement
White	Anne	CCLRP0171	ProALT-167		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
White	Anne	CCLRP0459	ProALT-589		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

White	Anne	CCLRP0171	PubPI-011		3.8	PubPI-009	Inclusive Community Involvement
White	Anne	CCLRP0171	PubPI-012		11	PubPI-010	Public Involvement
White	Anne	CCLRP0171	PubPI-025		3.8	PubPI-007	Inclusive Community Involvement
White	Anne	CCLRP0171	PubPI-030		3.8	PubPI-009	Inclusive Community Involvement
White	Anne	CCLRP0171	PubPI-031		3.2	PubPI-016	Community Involvement
White	Anne	CCLRP0171	PubPI-052		3.8	PubPI-009	Inclusive Community Involvement
White	Anne	CCLRP0459	PubPI-059		3.2	PubPI-032	Community Involvement
White	Anne	CCLRP0171	PubPI-067		3.2	PubPI-011	Community Involvement
							Coordinate with Other Community
White	Anne	CCLRP0171	PubPI-085		3.1	PubPI-045	Plans
White	Anne	CCLRP0171	SocNC-213		3.2	PubPI-024	Community Involvement
White	Chris	CCLRP0636	PlaTE-194		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
White	Chris	CCLRP0636	ProALT-019		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
White	Chris	CCLRP0636	ProPM-197		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
White	Jim	CCLRP0124	NR-19		11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
White	Jim	CCLRP0125	NR-59		11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
White	Jim	CCLRP0918	ProALT-638		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
White	Jim	CCLRP0123	ProPOL-42		11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
White	Jim	CCLRP0918	ProPURP-133		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
Wichmann	Gerald	CCLRP0373	ProPM-196	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Wichmann	Gerald	CCLRP0373	ProPURP-044	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Wicht	Daniel R.	CCLRP0236	EngTI-44		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
							Impact and Mitigation for
Wicht	Daniel R.	CCLRP0236	PlaTE-120		3.2	PlaTE-008	Community Businesses
							Alternatives Analysis (LRT &
Wicht	Daniel R.	CCLRP0236	ProALT-283		2.3	ProALT-033	Buses)
							Alternatives Analysis (LRT &
Wicht	Daniel R.	CCLRP0236	ProALT-431		2.3	ProALT-006	Buses)
Wickstrom	Doris	CCLRP0331	ProHLP-047		2.3	PlaTP-020	Stations
				Securian Financial			
Wiebold	Claudia	CCLRP0173	PlaTE-170	Group	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
				Securian Financial			
Wiebold	Claudia	CCLRP0173	ProPM-007	Group	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				St Paul Association			
Wiener	June	CCLRP0547	ProALT-137	of Realtors	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Wietrecki	Michael	CCLRP0451	ProHLP-066		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Wilber	Susan	CCLRP0160	PlaTE-41	Ecolab	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Wilber	Susan	CCLRP0160	ProHLP-055	Ecolab	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Wilber	Susan	CCLRP0160	ProPURP-103	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Willand	Lois	CCLRP0195	EngTI-39		6.2	EngTI-021	Congestion
Willand	Lois	CCLRP0195	PlaTE-5		6.3	PlaTE-023	Parking
Willand	Lois	CCLRP0195	ProPOL-25		2.3	ProALT-021	Alignment
Williams	Richard	CCLRP0151	EcoEE-83		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions

Williams	Richard	CCLRP0151	NR-1		8.1	NR-026	Capital Funding Strategy
Williams	Richard	CCLRP0151	ProPM-060		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
Williams	Richard	CCLRP0151	SocEJ-049		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Williams	Russ	CCLRP0172	PlaTE-50	University of Minnesota Medical Center, Fairview	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Williams	Russ	CCLRP0172	ProPM-215	University of Minnesota Medical Center, Fairview	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Willis	Mari	CCLRP0120	ProALT-132		11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
Wills	Lorance	CCLRP0517	ProALT-258		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Wills	Lorance	CCLRP0517	SocSC-004		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139	EcoEE-126		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139	EcoEE-137		5.1	EcoEE-011	Economic Conditions
Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139	EngBP-12		6.3	EngBP-017	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139	NatVA-15		3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139	NR-41		11	NR-009	Public Involvement
Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139	NR-45		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139	NR-63		11	NR-003	Project Contracting
Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139	PlaTP-134		2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139	SocNC-025		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation
Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139	SocSS-020		3.7	SocSS-004	Safety and Security
Woelfel	Jerry	CCLRP0207	EcoEE-66		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Woelfel	Jerry	CCLRP0207	PlaTE-10		2.3	PlaTE-002	Stations
Woelfel	Jerry	CCLRP0207	PlaTE-188		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
Woelfel	Jerry	CCLRP0207	ProALT-049		8.1	ProALT-011	Capital Funding Strategy
Woelfel	Jerry	CCLRP0207	ProPM-285		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Woelfel	Jerry	CCLRP0207	ProPURP-052		1	ProPURP-010	Who Will Benefit?
Woelfel	Jerry	CCLRP0207	SocNC-134		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
Wolsey	Wayne	CCLRP0430	ProHLP-029		2.3	ProHLP-024	Miscellaneous
Woodward	Steven	CCLRP0479	NatVA-18	Design Center	3.6	NatVA-005	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Woodward	Steven	CCLRP0791	NatVA-19	Design Center	3.6	NatVA-005	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Woodward	Steven	CCLRP0479	NatVA-24	Design Center	3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
Wright	Michael	CCLRP0914	EngBP-20		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
Wright	Michael	CCLRP0914	PlaTE-136		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Wright	Michael	CCLRP0914	ProHLP-073		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
XXXX	Harold	CCLRP0155	ProPURP-214		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Yacoub	James	CCLRP0624	ProALT-066		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Yacoub	James	CCLRP0624	SocNC-092		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Yang	Chouchee	CCLRP0056	EcoEE-76		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions

Yang	Davone	CCLRP0493	ProALT-133		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Yang	Davone	CCLRP0493	SocNC-192		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Yang	Fue C	CCLRP0055	ProPM-195		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
Yang	Mary	CCLRP0512	ProALT-129		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Yang	Mary	CCLRP0512	SocNC-054		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Yang	Pa Nhia	CCLRP0731	ProPM-122	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Yang	Pa Nhia	CCLRP0731	ProPURP-023	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Yang	Teng	CCLRP0058	PubPI-061		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
Yost	Linda	CCLRP0354	EcoEE-29		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Yost	Linda	CCLRP0354	ProALT-577		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Yost	Linda	CCLRP0354	ProPURP-224		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Young	Rickey	CCLRP0858	EcoEE-67		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Young	Rickey	CCLRP0858	ProALT-510		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
Zabel	Joseph	CCLRP0393	ProPM-123	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Zabel	Joseph	CCLRP0393	ProPURP-146	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Zee	Priscilla	CCLRP0799	EcoEE-124		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
Zee	Priscilla	CCLRP0799	EngCI-44		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
Zee	Priscilla	CCLRP0799	PlaTE-100		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Zee	Priscilla	CCLRP0799	ProALT-517		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Zieman	Brian	CCLRP0701	ProPM-155	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Zieman	Brian	CCLRP0701	ProPURP-095	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
Zuehlke	Joshua	CCLRP0312	ProALT-608		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
Zuehlke	Joshua	CCLRP0312	SocNC-051		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
		CCLRP0531	EcoEE-1	Summit-University Planning Council	5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
		CCLRP0298	EcoEE-107		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
		CCLRP0443	EcoEE-159	Univeristy of Minnesota	5.1	EcoEE-015	Economic Conditions
		CCLRP0038	EcoEE-160		1	EcoEE-013	Who Will Benefit?
		CCLRP0531	EcoEE-64	Summit-University Planning Council	5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
		CCLRP0485	EcoEE-69	Equity Coalition	5.1	EcoEE-011	Economic Conditions
		CCLRP0443	EngBP-22	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
		CCLRP0298	EngBP-23		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
		CCLRP0280	EngBP-45	Lexington Hamline Community Council	6.3	EngBP-009	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
		CCLRP0485	EngCI-7	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
		CCLRP0532	EngPG-21	District 7 Planning Council	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking

CCLRP0532	EngPG-25	District 7 Planning Council	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
CCLRP0485	EngPG-36	Equity Coalition	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
CCLRP0532	EngPG-40	District 7 Planning Council	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
CCLRP0531	EngPG-51	Summit-University Planning Council	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
CCLRP0531	EngPG-55	Summit-University Planning Council	6.3	EngPG-002	Parking
CCLRP0531	EngPG-59	Summit-University Planning Council	6.3	EngPG-002	Parking
CCLRP0532	EngPG-79	District 7 Planning Council	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
CCLRP0531	EngPG-85	Summit-University Planning Council	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
CCLRP0485	EngRW-11	Equity Coalition	6.2	EngRW-008	Congestion
CCLRP0531	EngRW-12	Summit-University Planning Council	6.2	EngRW-011	Congestion
CCLRP0532	EngRW-21	District 7 Planning Council	6.2	EngRW-005	Congestion
CCLRP0287	EngRW-24		6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion
CCLRP0443	EngRW-4	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.2	EngRW-004	Congestion
CCLRP0532	EngRW-6	District 7 Planning Council	6.2	EngRW-005	Congestion
CCLRP0271	EngRW-7Building		6.1	PlaTP-114	Transit Effects
CCLRP0287	EngTI-37		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
CCLRP0485	NatAQ-9	Equity Coalition	4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
CCLRP0443	NatNV-11	Univeristy of Minnesota	4.8	NatNV-003	Vibration
CCLRP0485	NatNV-2	Equity Coalition	4.7	NatNV-004	Noise
CCLRP0443	NatNV-4	Univeristy of Minnesota	4.8	NatNV-003	Vibration
CCLRP0443	NatNV-5	Univeristy of Minnesota	4.8	NatNV-003	Vibration
CCLRP0485	NatVA-14	Equity Coalition	3.6	NatVA-002	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
CCLRP0485	NatVA-2	Equity Coalition	3.6	NatVA-002	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
CCLRP0531	NatVA-25	Summit-University Planning Council	3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
CCLRP0532	NatVA-34	District 7 Planning Council	3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
CCLRP0298	NR-2		6.1	NR-021	Bus System Impact

CCLRP0443	NR-39	Univeristy of Minnesota	3	ProPM-018	Report Corrections Needed
CCLRP0485	NR-43	Equity Coalition District 7 Planning	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
CCLRP0532	NR-55	Council	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
CCLRP0485	NR-7	Equity Coalition	11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
CCLRP0443	PlaPla-12	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.1	PlaPla-010	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-002	Univeristy of Minnesota District 7 Planning	6.3	PlaTP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
CCLRP0532	PlaTP-004	Council	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-005	Univeristy of Minnesota District 7 Planning	6.3	PlaTP-005	Parking
CCLRP0532	PlaTP-018	Council	2.3	PlaTP-015	Stations
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-019	Univeristy of Minnesota District 7 Planning	2.3	PlaTP-017	Stations
CCLRP0532	PlaTP-020	Council	2.3	ProHLP-003	Stations
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-028	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.2	PlaTP-025	U of M
CCLRP0531	PlaTP-033	Summit-University Planning Council	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
CCLRP0531	PlaTP-041	Summit-University Planning Council District 7 Planning	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
CCLRP0532	PlaTP-051	Council	6.3	PlaTP-042	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-057	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-068	University of Minnesota
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-084	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.1	PlaTP-080	LRT System Design
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-102	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-136	Univeristy of Minnesota	6	ProPM-021	Report Corrections Needed
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-138	Univeristy of Minnesota	6	ProPM-021	Report Corrections Needed
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-143	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.1	PlaTP-116	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-155	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.2	PlaTP-008	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections

CCLRP0443	PlaTP-160	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.2	PlaTP-008	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
CCLRP0532	PlaTP-164	District 7 Planning Council	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-172	Univeristy of Minnesota	1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
CCLRP0280	PlaTP-183	Lexington Hamline Community Council	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
CCLRP0280	PlaTP-184	Lexington Hamline Community Council	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-186	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-017	Stations
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-197	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.1	PlaTP-041	LRT System Design
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-218	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-053	Stations
CCLRP0531	PlaTP-229	Summit-University Planning Council	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-236	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.2	PlaTP-025	U of M
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-247	Univeristy of Minnesota	4.1	PlaTP-066	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
CCLRP0443	PlaTP-253	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-068	University of Minnesota
CCLRP0485	ProALT-052	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-022	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
CCLRP0485	ProALT-186	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-022	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
CCLRP0443	ProALT-311	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProALT-012	University of Minnesota
CCLRP0026	ProALT-373		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
CCLRP0026	ProALT-462		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
CCLRP0287	ProALT-629		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
CCLRP0287	ProHLP-001		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
CCLRP0485	ProHLP-011	Equity Coalition	3.8	ProHLP-030	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
CCLRP0443	ProHLP-016	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.2	EngRW-017	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
CCLRP0532	ProHLP-023	District 7 Planning Council	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
CCLRP0443	ProHLP-025	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.2	ProHLP-012	U of M
CCLRP0443	ProHLP-027	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota

CCLRP0443	ProHLP-028	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProHLP-011	Stations
CCLRP0280	ProHLP-030	Lexington Hamline Community Council	2.3	ProHLP-003	Stations
CCLRP0443	ProHLP-032	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota
CCLRP0443	ProHLP-077	Univeristy of Minnesota	5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
CCLRP0443	ProHLP-082	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota
CCLRP0443	ProHLP-085	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota
CCLRP0443	ProHLP-087	Univeristy of Minnesota	5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
CCLRP0443	ProHLP-090	Univeristy of Minnesota	5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
CCLRP0443	ProHLP-103	Univeristy of Minnesota	5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
CCLRP0443	ProHLP-108	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.2	ProHLP-012	U of M
CCLRP0443	ProHLP-109	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-020	Stations
CCLRP0443	ProHLP-110	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProHLP-011	Stations
CCLRP0443	ProHLP-113	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProHLP-011	Stations
CCLRP0443	ProPM-043	Univeristy of Minnesota	5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
CCLRP0443	ProPM-061	Univeristy of Minnesota	5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
CCLRP0443	ProPM-121	Univeristy of Minnesota	6	ProPM-021	Report Corrections Needed
CCLRP0443	ProPM-181	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProPM-011	University of Minnesota
CCLRP0443	ProPM-205	Univeristy of Minnesota	6	ProPM-021	Report Corrections Needed
CCLRP0485	ProPM-245	Equity Coalition	3.1	ProPM-013	Land Use and Socio-Economics
CCLRP0485	ProPM-300	Equity Coalition	3.1	ProPM-008	Impact
CCLRP0280	ProPOL-11	Lexington Hamline Community Council	3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
CCLRP0485	ProPOL-17	Equity Coalition	3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
CCLRP0485	ProPOL-18	Equity Coalition	3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact

CCLRP0531	ProPOL-19	Summit-University Planning Council	3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
CCLRP0443	ProProjBdj-021	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProProjBdj-009	University of Minnesota Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
CCLRP0287	ProPURP-013	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProALT-033	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
CCLRP0443	ProPURP-032	District 7 Planning Council	6.2	EngRW-017	
CCLRP0532	PubPI-017	Summit-University Planning Council	3.2	PubPI-046	Community Involvement
CCLRP0531	PubPI-035	District 7 Planning Council	3.2	PubPI-002	Neighborhood Preservation
CCLRP0532	PubPI-069	Lexington Hamline Community Council	11	PubPI-037	Information Availability
CCLRP0280	PubPI-080		3.2	PubPI-036	Community Involvement
CCLRP0298	PubPI-084		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
CCLRP0531	SocCR-6	Summit-University Planning Council	3.4	SocCR-002	Cultural Resources
CCLRP0280	SocEJ-004	Lexington Hamline Community Council	3.8	SocEJ-001	Businesses
CCLRP0532	SocEJ-010	District 7 Planning Council	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
CCLRP0532	SocEJ-023	District 7 Planning Council	3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
CCLRP0485	SocEJ-027	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-009	Affordable Housing
CCLRP0298	SocEJ-033		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
CCLRP0485	SocEJ-035	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
CCLRP0485	SocEJ-042	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
CCLRP0485	SocEJ-058	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-022	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
CCLRP0485	SocEJ-064	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
CCLRP0485	SocEJ-065	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
CCLRP0280	SocEJ-078	Lexington Hamline Community Council	3.8	SocEJ-013	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
CCLRP0485	SocEJ-090	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
CCLRP0485	SocEJ-091	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-011	Inclusive Community Involvement
CCLRP0485	SocEJ-098	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-000	Inclusive Community Involvement
CCLRP0443	SocHM-3	Univeristy of Minnesota	4.9	SocHM-003	Hazardous or Regulated Materials
CCLRP0443	SocLU-010	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.1	SocLU-007	Land Use

CCLRP0443	SocLU-014	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.1	SocLU-009	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
CCLRP0280	SocLU-015	Lexington Hamline Community Council	3.1	SocLU-010	Zoning
CCLRP0443	SocLU-016	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.1	SocLU-016	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
CCLRP0443	SocLU-027	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.1	SocLU-017	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
CCLRP0443	SocLU-034	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.1	SocLU-017	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
CCLRP0443	SocLU-035	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.1	SocLU-016	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
CCLRP0485	SocLU-036	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-017	Affordable Housing
CCLRP0485	SocNC-005	Equity Coalition	3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
CCLRP0485	SocNC-014	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-013	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
CCLRP0485	SocNC-018	Equity Coalition	3.2	SocNC-006	Neighborhood Preservation
CCLRP0532	SocNC-104	District 7 Planning Council	3.2	SocNC-006	Neighborhood Preservation
CCLRP0485	SocNC-179	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-012	Inclusive Community Involvement
CCLRP0485	SocSoc-004	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-027	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
CCLRP0485	SocSS-045	Equity Coalition	6.3	SocEJ-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
CCLRP0532	SocSS-57	District 7 Planning Council	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation

Central Corridor LRT AA/DEIS Public Comments Index
Sorted by Comment Code
5/6/2009

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
EcoEE-1			CCLRP0531	Summit-University Planning Council	5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-10	Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0212	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-100	Bachmann	Sigrid	CCLRP0081		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-101	Renikoff	Rich	CCLRP0846		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-102	Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-103	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	5.1	EcoEE-015	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-104	Lamberton	Abigail	CCLRP0039		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-105	Arnold	Scott	CCLRP0650		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-106	Lambert	Clay	CCLRP0766		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-107			CCLRP0298		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-108	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-109	Bieganeck	Justin	CCLRP0305		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-11	Park	Rand	CCLRP0654		5.1	EcoEE-007	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-110	Celt	Adam	CCLRP0338		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-112	Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
				McNally Smith College of Music			
EcoEE-113	Mcnally	Jack	CCLRP0286		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-114	Anderson	Peter	CCLRP0849		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-115	Dzwonkowski	Ken	CCLRP0073		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-116	Sheehan	Gregory M.	CCLRP0345		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-117	Osborne	Shawne	CCLRP0289		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-118	Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-119	Watters	Ellen	CCLRP0770		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-12	Thorkelsen	David	CCLRP0862		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-120	Brauer	George Ulrich	CCLRP0796		3.2	EngCI-003	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EcoEE-121	Muschler	Eric	CCLRP0042		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-122	Dewitt	John	CCLRP0184		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-123	Hart	Sean	CCLRP0204		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-124	Zee	Priscilla	CCLRP0799		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
				TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners			
EcoEE-125	Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0754		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
EcoEE-126	Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-127	Delavega	Bob	CCLRP0780		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-128	Berger	Robert D	CCLRP0230		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-129	Harens	Thomas	CCLRP0273	Invention Solutions	1	EcoEE-017	Who Will Benefit?
EcoEE-13	Khaliq	Nathaniel	CCLRP0899	NAACP - St. Paul	5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-130	Mattlin	Rev. Margaret	CCLRP0109		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-131	Blissenbach	Paul	CCLRP0194		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-132	Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-133	Peterson	Steve	CCLRP0156		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-134	Grotheim	Kevin	CCLRP0010		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-135	Larson	Cheryl	CCLRP0077		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-136	Flint	Philice Ann	CCLRP0131		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-137	Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139		5.1	EcoEE-011	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-138	Pahs	Matthew	CCLRP0048		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-139	Keturakat	Carol	CCLRP0050		5.1	EcoEE-012	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-14	Mitchell	Christopher	CCLRP0215		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-140	Lendway	Lisa	CCLRP0288		5.1	EcoEE-002	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-141	Collins	Tom	CCLRP0856	St. Paul Port Authority	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-142	Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-143	Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086		5.1	EcoEE-018	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-144	Snyder	John	CCLRP0162		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-145	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		5.1	EcoEE-019	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-146	Pasiuk	Joel	CCLRP0415		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-147	Lee	Choua	CCLRP0934		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-148	Peterson	Alan	CCLRP0423	The Realty Matrix, Inc.	5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-149	Hilleman	Monte	CCLRP0439	St. Paul Port Authority	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-15	Thompson	Joan	CCLRP0769		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-150	Sweeney	Laura	CCLRP0775		1	EcoEE-013	Who Will Benefit?
EcoEE-151	Lund	Kristen	CCLRP0108		3.2	EcoEE-020	Neighborhood Preservation
EcoEE-152	Downey	Keith	CCLRP0749	Minneapolis Regional Chamber of Commerce	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-153	Dubois	Josh	CCLRP0002		3.2	EcoEE-020	Neighborhood Preservation
EcoEE-154	Lowder	Lorrie	CCLRP0845	St. Paul Port Authority	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-155	Lendway	Lisa	CCLRP0288		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-156	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-157	Inserra	Andy	CCLRP0270		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-159			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	5.1	EcoEE-015	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-160			CCLRP0038		1	EcoEE-013	Who Will Benefit?

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
EcoEE-17	Huynh	Nghi	CCLRP0793		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-18	Ireland	Mark	CCLRP0284		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-19	Lindmen	Karen	CCLRP0932	ACORN	5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-2	Thorkelsen	David	CCLRP0862		5.1	EcoEE-002	Economic Conditions
				District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls			
EcoEE-20	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-21	Bollman	Alex	CCLRP0300		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-22	Mccumber	Julia John	CCLRP0395	Ecolab	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-23	Haugen	Eunice	CCLRP0332		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-24	Sandhei	Peder	CCLRP0306		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-25	Handzija	Haris	CCLRP0334		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-26	Huovinen	Suzette	CCLRP0247	Securian Financial Group	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-27	Thooft	Travis	CCLRP0627		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-28	Sommers	Joy	CCLRP0353		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-29	Yost	Linda	CCLRP0354		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-3	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	5.1	EcoEE-003	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-30	Keena	Judith	CCLRP0342		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-31	Law	Kate	CCLRP0352	Gander Mountain	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-32	Hale	Carla	CCLRP0245	Securian Financial Group	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-33	Pitera	Gino	CCLRP0277		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-34	Mcbroom	Amy	CCLRP0365		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
				Securian Retirement Services			
EcoEE-35	Kinney	Mary C.	CCLRP0246		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
				The Automation Station, Inc.			
EcoEE-36	Turnipseed	Eric	CCLRP0351		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-37	Jaeschke	Carl	CCLRP0678	Ecolab Inc., Securian Financial Group, Inc.	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-38	Thompson	Karen	CCLRP0344		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-39	Lewis	Diana	CCLRP0409	Ecolab Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-4	Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0522		5.1	EcoEE-002	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-40	Pena	Luis Brown	CCLRP0350		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
				Nardini Fire Equipment Company, Inc.			
EcoEE-41	Nardini	Tom	CCLRP0639		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-42	Lickness	Georgia	CCLRP0335		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-43	Seabold	Jim	CCLRP0314		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-44	Murphy	Gary L.	CCLRP0307	Graphic Exhibits, Inc.	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-45	Auron	Matt	CCLRP0773		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
EcoEE-46	Mcdowell	Rob	CCLRP0279		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-47	Gravelle	Theresa	CCLRP0408	Ecolab, Inc	5.1	EcoEE-010	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-48	Schout	Christopher	CCLRP0304		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-49	Dinkel	Billy	CCLRP0880		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-50	Hunter	Coralie	CCLRP0258		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-51	Nelson	Ross	CCLRP0427		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-52	Vido	Jose	CCLRP0276		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
				Central Corridor Partnership			
EcoEE-53	Beeson	Rick	CCLRP0886		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-54	Hollander	Judith	CCLRP0326		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-55	Larson	Heidi	CCLRP0348	Goff & Howard, Inc.	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-56	Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-57	Pendelton	Adrian	CCLRP0189		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-58	Gude	Mike	CCLRP0183		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-59	Trinh	Marlyna	CCLRP0790	Kim Hung Mall	5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-6	Reiling	David	CCLRP0871		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
				Central Corridor Equity Coalition			
EcoEE-60	Burt	Veronica	CCLRP0902		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-61	Muschler	Eric	CCLRP0042		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-62	Fernandez	Adria	CCLRP0164		5.1	EcoEE-002	Economic Conditions
				Summit-University Planning Council			
EcoEE-64			CCLRP0531		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-65	Hargens	Amy	CCLRP0633		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-66	Woelfel	Jerry	CCLRP0207		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-67	Young	Rickey	CCLRP0858		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
				North End Business Association			
EcoEE-68	Schroeder	Ernie	CCLRP0873		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-69			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	5.1	EcoEE-011	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-7	Benson	Marie	CCLRP0473		5.1	EcoEE-002	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-70	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
				St. Paul Trades and Labor 70			
EcoEE-71	Jones	Matt	CCLRP0903		5.1	EcoEE-011	Economic Conditions
				Amherst Wilder Foundation			
EcoEE-72	Binger	Craig	CCLRP0855		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-73	Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-74	Staloch	Peter	CCLRP0757		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-75	Greene	David	CCLRP0893		5.1	EcoEE-012	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-76	Yang	Chouchee	CCLRP0056		5.1	EcoEE-009	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-77	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-78	Thompson	Joan	CCLRP0769		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
EcoEE-79	Foote	Dan	CCLRP0853		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-8	Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-81	Hilleman	Monte	CCLRP0868	St. Paul Port Authority	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-82	Swanholm	John	CCLRP0777	St. Joseph's Hospital	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-83	Williams	Richard	CCLRP0151		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-84	Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-85	Sullivan	Kristie D.	CCLRP0041	Securian Financial Group	5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
				Minneapolis Regional Chamber of Commerce			
EcoEE-86	Downey	Keith	CCLRP0749		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-87	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		1	EcoEE-013	Who Will Benefit?
EcoEE-88	Behnke	Brad	CCLRP0349		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-89	Anderson	Steve	CCLRP0347		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-9	Rossbach	Jack	CCLRP0913		5.1	EcoEE-002	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-90	Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-91	Lamb	Pat	CCLRP0152		5.1	EcoEE-002	Economic Conditions
	Thormodsgar						
EcoEE-92	d	Diane	CCLRP0083		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-93	Herbison	Priscilla	CCLRP0096		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-94	Renikoff	Rich	CCLRP0846		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
				Minnesota Department of Transportation			
EcoEE-95	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-97	Stakston	Sarah	CCLRP0009		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
EcoEE-98	W	R M	CCLRP0447		3.2	EcoEE-014	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
	Thormodsgar						
EcoEE-99	d	Diane	CCLRP0083		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
				Minnesota Department of Transportation			Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station Design
EngBP-1	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436		6.3	EngBP-003	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-10	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngBP-010	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-11	Hauser	Steven	CCLRP0232		6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-12	Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139		6.3	EngBP-017	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-13	Chouinard	Joe	CCLRP0474		6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
				Minnesota Department of Natural Resources			Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-14	Thompson	Dennis	CCLRP0381		6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-15	Nelson	Paul	CCLRP0857		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
EngBP-16	Markle	David	CCLRP0472	St. Paul Bicycle Advisory Board	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-17	Stark	Russ	CCLRP0176		6.3	EngBP-003	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station Design
EngBP-18	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436		6.3	EngBP-004	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-19	Rice	Rebecca	CCLRP0140	Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.3	EngBP-005	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station Design
EngBP-2	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436		6.3	EngBP-004	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-20	Wright	Michael	CCLRP0914		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-22			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-23			CCLRP0298	Minneapolis Television Network	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-24	Akre	John	CCLRP0652		6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-25	Lamb	Pat	CCLRP0152		6.3	EngBP-006	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Distance/Paths to Stations
EngBP-26	Fernandez	Adria	CCLRP0164		6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-27	Dewitt	John	CCLRP0184	Minnesota Department of Transportation District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-28	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436		6.3	EngBP-003	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station Design
EngBP-29	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.3	EngBP-003	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station Design
EngBP-3	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-30	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-31	Axelson	Nina	CCLRP0786	St. Anthony Park Community Council	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-32	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895	Citizens for Effective Transit	6.3	EngBP-016	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-33	Stark	Russ	CCLRP0176	St. Paul Bicycle Advisory Board	6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
EngBP-34	Hauser	Steven	CCLRP0232	Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-35	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436		6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-36	Murphy	Shaun	CCLRP0666		6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-37	Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470		6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-38	Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-39	Pierce	Alexandra	CCLRP0356		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-4	Warns	Michael D.	CCLRP0471		6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-40	Patrikus	Helen	CCLRP0333		6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-42	Walz	Joe	CCLRP0241	Northland Insurance Group St. Paul Bicycle Advisory Board	6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-43	Stark	Russ	CCLRP0176		6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-44	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	Minnesota Department of Transportation Lexington Hamline Community Council District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	6.3	EngBP-008	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-45			CCLRP0280		6.3	EngBP-009	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-46	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-47	Dillery	John	CCLRP0313		6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-48	Ireland	Mark	CCLRP0284		6.3	EngBP-012	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-49	Haugee	Eric	CCLRP0088	Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-5	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-51	Miller	Orlyn	CCLRP0848	University of Minnesota	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-6	Sweeney	Laura	CCLRP0775		6.3	EngBP-016	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
EngBP-7	Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781	Transit for Livable Communities	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-8	Chouinard	Joe	CCLRP0474		6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngBP-9	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngBP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngCI-1	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-10	Bessette	Andy	CCLRP0551	St. Paul Travelers	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngCI-11	Bessette	Andy	CCLRP0551	St. Paul Travelers	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngCI-12	Johnson	Jennifer Johnson	CCLRP0714	Minnesota Public Radio	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngCI-13	Buth	William	CCLRP0540	BOMA (Building Owners & Managers Association)	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngCI-14	Johnson	Jennifer Johnson	CCLRP0714	Minnesota Public Radio	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-15	Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	4.9	EngCI-006	Hazardous or Regulated Materials
EngCI-16	Schultz	Cindy	CCLRP0655	Schultz Consulting, LLC	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-17	Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	4.2	EngCI-008	Water Resources
EngCI-18	Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-19	Morris	David	CCLRP0836		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-2	Kasel	Terri	CCLRP0905		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-20	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-21	Lambert	Clay	CCLRP0766		3.2	EngCI-005	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-22	Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0754	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	3.2	EngCI-005	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-23	Hauser	Steven	CCLRP0232		4.2	EngCI-008	Water Resources

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
EngCI-24	Mather	Darin	CCLRP0018		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-25	Boyle	Marge	CCLRP0132		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-26	Schultz	Cindy	CCLRP0655	Schultz Consulting, LLC	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-27	Inman	Karen	CCLRP0004	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-28	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-29	Delavega	Bob	CCLRP0780		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-3	Maykoski	Anita	CCLRP0163		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-30	Gilbert	Doug	CCLRP0208		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-32	Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	Hamline Midway Coalition	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-33	Haugee	Eric	CCLRP0088		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-34	White	Anne	CCLRP0171		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-35	Fritts	Lori	CCLRP0826		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-36	Fritts	Lori	CCLRP0859	Transit for Livable Communities	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-37	Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781		3.2	EngCI-003	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-38	Besette	Andy	CCLRP0551	St. Paul Travelers	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-39	Le	Tyler	CCLRP0025	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-4	Bachmann	Sigrid	CCLRP0081		6.3	EngCI-002	Parking
EngCI-40	Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0212		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-41	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-42	Rice	Rebecca	CCLRP0140		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
EngCI-43	Huynh	Nghi	CCLRP0793		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-44	Zee	Priscilla	CCLRP0799		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-45	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-46	Watters	Ellen	CCLRP0770		3.2	EngCI-003	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-47	Sobiech	Richard	CCLRP0542	TKDA	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-49	Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-5	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	3.2	EngCI-003	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-50	Schutz	Larry	CCLRP0115		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-51	Johnson	Carolynn	CCLRP0136		3.2	ProPOL-004	Community Involvement
EngCI-52	Jensen	Tom	CCLRP0379	U.S. Department of Transportation	6.3	EngCI-009	Miscellaneous
EngCI-53	Mattlin	Rev. Margaret	CCLRP0109		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-54	Matthews	Delores	CCLRP0867	Pilgrim Baptist Church	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-55	Kriel	Robert	CCLRP0078		3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-56	Stokes	Dave	CCLRP0808	Midway Chamber of Commerce	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-57	Buth	William	CCLRP0540	BOMA (Building Owners & Managers Association)	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngCI-6	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		6.3	EngCI-004	Parking
EngCI-7			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
EngCI-8	Smith	Ken	CCLRP0820	District Energy - St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngCI-9	Smith	Ken	CCLRP0820	District Energy - St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngEng-10	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0467		6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
EngEng-11	Nigoff	Mindy	CCLRP0442	National Geiodetic Survey	3.1	EngEng-001	Land Use and Socio-Economics

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
EngEng-2	Johnson	Jennifer Johnson	CCLRP0714	Minnesota Public Radio	3.2	EngCI-010	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngEng-3	Hruby	Maryanne	CCLRP0063	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	6.3	PlaTE-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station Design
EngEng-4	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457		6.2	EngTI-024	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
EngEng-5	Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003	City of St. Paul	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngEng-6	Celt	Adam	CCLRP0338		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
EngEng-7	McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0878		6.2	EngRW-014	Congestion
EngEng-9	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul Ecolab Inc., Pioneer Press Sports Chocolat Celeste Kim Hung Mall Midway Used and Rare Books Subway District 7 Planning Council District 7 Planning Council City of St. Paul Office of the City Council City of St. Paul	3.2	EngCI-001	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
EngPG-10	Massey	Gloria Y	CCLRP0001		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-11	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-12	Davalos	Janell	CCLRP0676		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-13	Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0084		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-14	Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0642		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-15	Leonard	Mary	CCLRP0426		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-16	Trinh	Marlyna	CCLRP0790		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-17	Hammond	Mary J.	CCLRP0339		6.3	EngPG-003	Parking
EngPG-18	Minderman	Nicholas	CCLRP0104		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-19	Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-2	Lunde	Jackie & Jeff	CCLRP0343		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-20	Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-21			CCLRP0532		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-22	Bernick	Herbert	CCLRP0021		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-23	Hennen	David	CCLRP0047		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-24	Haugee	Eric	CCLRP0088		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-25			CCLRP0532		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-26	Anonymous	X	CCLRP0488	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking	
EngPG-27	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking	
EngPG-28	Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking	
EngPG-29	Dillery	John	CCLRP0313	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking	
EngPG-3	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking	
EngPG-30	Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking	
EngPG-31	Hauser	Steven	CCLRP0232	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking	
EngPG-32	Bolar	Barb	CCLRP0797	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking	

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
EngPG-33	Bolar	Barb	CCLRP0797		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-34	Hruby	Maryanne	CCLRP0063		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-35	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-36			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-37	Mather	Darin	CCLRP0018		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-38	Engle	Dolores	CCLRP0263		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-39	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-4	Kasel	Terri	CCLRP0905		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-40			CCLRP0532	District 7 Planning Council	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-41	McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0466		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-42	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-43	Miels	Gayle	CCLRP0137		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-44	Bolar	Barb	CCLRP0797		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-45	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul Hamline Midway Coalition,	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-46	Leach	Betsy	CCLRP0460	District 11	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-47	Pauling	Steve	CCLRP0190		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-48	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-002	Parking
EngPG-49	Seufert	Jim	CCLRP0101		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-5	Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	Midway Used and Rare Books	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-50	Johnson	Carolynn	CCLRP0136		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-51			CCLRP0531	Summit-University Planning Council	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-52	Dillery	John	CCLRP0313		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-53	Bolar	Barb	CCLRP0889		6.3	EngPG-002	Parking
EngPG-54	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-55			CCLRP0531	Summit-University Planning Council	6.3	EngPG-002	Parking
EngPG-56	Dowell	Larry	CCLRP0892	St. Paul Chamber of Commerce	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-57	Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	Hamline Midway Coalition	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-58	Croft	Julie	CCLRP0930		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-59			CCLRP0531	Summit-University Planning Council	6.3	EngPG-002	Parking
EngPG-6	Schultz	Cindy	CCLRP0655	Schultz Consulting, LLC	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-60	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
EngPG-61	Lamb	Pat	CCLRP0152		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-62	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-63	Khaliq	Nathaniel	CCLRP0899	NAACP - St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-65	Radzwill	Jo	CCLRP0742		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-66	Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0522	Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-67	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0458		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-68	Peng	Lesley	CCLRP0040		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-69	Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0522	Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-7	Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-70	Greene	Roger	CCLRP0872	HealthEast Care System	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-71	Sawyer	Timothy and Sally	CCLRP0076		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-72	Anastasia	Tony	CCLRP0861		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-73	Sawyer	Timothy and Sally	CCLRP0076		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-74	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-75	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-76	Vibar	Nancy	CCLRP0784		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-77	Lamb- Onayega	Angela	CCLRP0150		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-78	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-79			CCLRP0532	District 7 Planning Council	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-8	Warns	Michael D.	CCLRP0471		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-80	Berg	Bara	CCLRP0941		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-81	Huynh	Nghi	CCLRP0793		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-82	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	Merriam Park Community Council	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-83	Axelson	Nina	CCLRP0786	St. Anthony Park Community Council	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-84	Rosenthal	Vic	CCLRP0788	Jewish Community Action Summit-University Planning Council	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
EngPG-85			CCLRP0531		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
EngPG-9	Robinson	Chris	CCLRP0940		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
				Midway Used and Rare			Impact and Mitigation for
EngRW-1	Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	Books	3.2	EngRW-001	Community Businesses
EngRW-10	Minderman	Nicholas	CCLRP0104		6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion
EngRW-11			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	6.2	EngRW-008	Congestion
				Summit-University Planning			
EngRW-12			CCLRP0531	Council	6.2	EngRW-011	Congestion
EngRW-13	Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0484		6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion
EngRW-14	Benson	Marie	CCLRP0473		6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion
EngRW-15	Keturakat	Carol	CCLRP0050		6.2	EngRW-004	Congestion
EngRW-16	Barta	Rob	CCLRP0188		6.2	EngRW-010	Effects on Roadways
EngRW-17	Iacono	Michael	CCLRP0130		6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion
EngRW-18	Vadnais	Emmy	CCLRP0927		6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion
EngRW-19	Pinney	Gregory	CCLRP0741		6.2	EngRW-011	Congestion
EngRW-2	Anderson	Janet	CCLRP0067		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
				Midway Used and Rare			
EngRW-20	Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	Books	6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion
				District 7 Planning Council			
EngRW-21			CCLRP0532		6.2	EngRW-005	Congestion
EngRW-22	Robinson	Chris	CCLRP0939		6.2	EngRW-011	Congestion
EngRW-23	Anderson	Peter	CCLRP0849		6.2	EngRW-012	Effects on Roadways
EngRW-24			CCLRP0287		6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion
EngRW-25	Everett	Leslie	CCLRP0743		6.2	EngRW-013	University of Minnesota
EngRW-26	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		6.2	EngRW-014	Congestion
	Thormodsgar						
EngRW-27	d	Diane	CCLRP0763		6.2	EngTI-004	Congestion
EngRW-28	Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075		6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion
EngRW-29	Thur	Lois	CCLRP0192		6.2	EngRW-010	Effects on Roadways
EngRW-3	Singleton	Connie	CCLRP0753		6.2	EngRW-003	Effects on Roadways
EngRW-30	Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185		6.2	EngRW-014	Congestion
EngRW-31	Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086		6.2	EngRW-011	Congestion
EngRW-32	Robinson	Chris	CCLRP0940		6.2	EngRW-011	Congestion
EngRW-33	Kriel	Robert	CCLRP0078		6.2	EngRW-014	Congestion
EngRW-4			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.2	EngRW-004	Congestion
EngRW-5	Boyle	Marge	CCLRP0132		6.2	EngRW-002	Congestion
				District 7 Planning Council			
EngRW-6			CCLRP0532		6.2	EngRW-005	Congestion
EngRW-7Building			CCLRP0271		6.1	PlaTP-114	Transit Effects
				Minnesota Department of			
EngRW-8	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	Transportation	11	EngRW-007	Agency Coordination

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
EngRW-9	Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478		6.2	EngRW-005	Congestion
EngTI-1	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482	Citizens for Effective Transit	6.2	EngTI-001	Congestion
EngTI-10	Everett	Leslie	CCLRP0743		6.2	EngRW-013	University of Minnesota
EngTI-11	McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0878		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
EngTI-12	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895	Citizens for Effective Transit Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood	6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
EngTI-13	Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0522	Development Corporation Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.3	EngTI-011	Effects on Other Transportation Facilities and Services Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
EngTI-14	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436		6.2	EngTI-012	Grade Separation
EngTI-15	Feismia	Ann	CCLRP0030		2.3	EngTI-013	Effects on Roadways
EngTI-16	Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470		6.2	EngTI-014	
EngTI-17	Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	Midway Used and Rare Books	6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
EngTI-18	Hilleman	Monte	CCLRP0868	St. Paul Port Authority	6.2	EngTI-004	Congestion
EngTI-19	Goldstein	Jules	CCLRP0772		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
EngTI-20	Massey	Gloria Y	CCLRP0001		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
EngTI-21	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	6.2	EngTI-015	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
EngTI-22	Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	Midway Used and Rare Books	6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
EngTI-23	Mather	Darin	CCLRP0018		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
EngTI-24	Markle	David	CCLRP0752		6.2	EngTI-004	Congestion
EngTI-25	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	Minnesota Department of Transportation US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
EngTI-26	Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
EngTI-27	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
EngTI-28	Delavega	Bob	CCLRP0780		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
EngTI-29	Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0476		6.2	EngTI-004	Congestion
EngTI-3	Dinkel	Billy	CCLRP0880		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
EngTI-30	Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	Hamline Midway Coalition	6.2	EngTI-016	Congestion
EngTI-31	Engle	Dolores	CCLRP0263		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
EngTI-32	Boyle	Marge	CCLRP0132		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
EngTI-33	Leighton	Karen	CCLRP0240	Securian Financial Group, Inc.	6.2	EngTI-004	Congestion

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
EngTI-34	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		6.2	EngTI-018	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
EngTI-35	Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478		6.2	EngTI-019	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
EngTI-36	Auron	Matt	CCLRP0773		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
EngTI-37			CCLRP0287		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
EngTI-38	Minderman	Nicholas	CCLRP0104		6.2	EngTI-020	Congestion
EngTI-39	Willand	Lois	CCLRP0195		6.2	EngTI-021	Congestion
EngTI-4	Dunne	Thomas M.	CCLRP0355	TKDA	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
EngTI-40	Lemmons	Bruce	CCLRP0020		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
EngTI-41	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0839		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
				Minneapolis Regional Chamber of Commerce			
EngTI-42	Klingel	Todd	CCLRP0760		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
EngTI-43	Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185		6.2	EngTI-022	Congestion
EngTI-44	Wicht	Daniel R.	CCLRP0236		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
EngTI-45	Goldman	Rich	CCLRP0651		2.3	EngTI-023	Grade Separation
EngTI-46	Kelliher	Mark	CCLRP0445		6.2	EngTI-004	Congestion
EngTI-47	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
	Thormodsgard						
EngTI-5		Diane	CCLRP0083		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
EngTI-6	Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478		4.6	EngTI-005	Air Quality
				Citizens for Effective Transit			
EngTI-7	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895		6.2	EngTI-010	Congestion
EngTI-8	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	2.3	EngTI-007	Stations
				Twin Cities Habitat for Humanity			
EngTI-9	Haigh	Sue	CCLRP0909		6.2	EngTI-004	Congestion
							Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngUT-1	Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngUT-10	Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Distribution Systems
EngUT-11	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council	4.2	EngUT-004	Water Resources
EngUT-12	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council	4.2	EngUT-004	Water Resources
EngUT-13	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council	4.2	EngUT-004	Water Resources
EngUT-14	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council	4.2	EngUT-004	Water Resources
				Capitol Region Watershed District			
EngUT-15	Piram	Robert	CCLRP0375		4.2	EngUT-004	Water Resources
							Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngUT-17	Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngUT-18	Smith	Ken	CCLRP0820	District Energy - St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
EngUT-19	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngUT-2	Fremder	George	CCLRP0191		4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngUT-20	Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngUT-21	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council	4.1	EngUT-005	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngUT-22	Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngUT-23	Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-006	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngUT-24	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngUT-3	Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngUT-4	Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngUT-5	Johnson	Jennifer Johnson	CCLRP0714	Minnesota Public Radio	4.1	EngUT-003	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngUT-6	Soroka	Robert	CCLRP0528	Marshall Field's	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngUT-7	Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngUT-8	Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
EngUT-9	Soroka	Robert	CCLRP0528	Marshall Field's	4.1	EngUT-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
NatAQ-1	Swanholm	John	CCLRP0777	St. Joseph's Hospital	4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
NatAQ-10	Lowder	Lorrie	CCLRP0845	St. Paul Port Authority	4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
NatAQ-11	Hart	Sean	CCLRP0204		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
NatAQ-12	Pierce	Alexandra	CCLRP0356		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
NatAQ-13	Paiko	Frank	CCLRP0436	Minnesota Department of Transportation	4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
NatAQ-14	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
NatAQ-15	Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478		4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
NatAQ-16	Reiling	David	CCLRP0871		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
NatAQ-17	Leach	Betsy	CCLRP0460	Hamline Midway Coalition, District 11	4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
NatAQ-18	Radzwill	Jo	CCLRP0742		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
NatAQ-19	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
NatAQ-20	Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0642		4.6	NatAQ-003	Air Quality
				US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA			
NatAQ-21	Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428		4.6	NatAQ-004	Air Quality
NatAQ-22	Auron	Matt	CCLRP0773		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
NatAQ-23	Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
				Citizens for Effective Transit			
NatAQ-24	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895		4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
NatAQ-25	Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
NatAQ-26	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
NatAQ-27	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
NatAQ-28	Arnold	Scott	CCLRP0650		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
NatAQ-3	Hunter	Coralie	CCLRP0258		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
NatAQ-30	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council	4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
NatAQ-4	Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
NatAQ-5	Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	Hamline Midway Coalition	4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
				Amherst Wilder Foundation			
NatAQ-6	Binger	Craig	CCLRP0855		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
NatAQ-7	Murphy	Shaun	CCLRP0666		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
				Citizens for Effective Transit			
NatAQ-8	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482		4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
NatAQ-9			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	4.6	NatAQ-002	Air Quality
NatNV-1	Conrad	Will	CCLRP0024		4.6	NatAQ-001	Air Quality
				Midway Used and Rare Books			
NatNV-10	Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038		4.7	NatNV-005	Noise
NatNV-11			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	4.8	NatNV-003	Vibration
NatNV-12	Hart	Sean	CCLRP0204		4.7	NatNV-001	Noise
NatNV-13	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		4.7	NatNV-002	Noise
NatNV-14	Perez	Chris	CCLRP0017		4.7	NatNV-001	Noise
				US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA			
NatNV-15	Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428		4.7	NatNV-002	Noise
				Minnesota Public Radio			
NatNV-16	Johnson	Jennifer Johnson	CCLRP0714		4.8	NatNV-003	Vibration
NatNV-17	Vibar	Nancy	CCLRP0784		4.7	NatNV-005	Noise
				Hamline Midway Coalition, District 11			
NatNV-18	Leach	Betsy	CCLRP0460		4.7	NatNV-005	Noise
				Minnesota Public Radio			
NatNV-19	Johnson	Jennifer Johnson	CCLRP0714		4.7	NatNV-004	Noise

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
NatNV-2			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	4.7	NatNV-004	Noise
NatNV-20	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482	Citizens for Effective Transit	4.7	NatNV-004	Noise
NatNV-21	Harris	Ginny	CCLRP0813		4.7	NatNV-005	Noise
NatNV-22	Anderson	Janet	CCLRP0067		4.7	NatNV-005	Noise
NatNV-23	Nakajima	Dianne	CCLRP0031		4.7	NatNV-005	Noise
NatNV-3	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	4.7	NatNV-002	Noise
NatNV-4			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	4.8	NatNV-003	Vibration
NatNV-5			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	4.8	NatNV-003	Vibration
NatNV-6	Fuller	Jacque	CCLRP0303		4.7	NatNV-001	Noise
NatNV-7	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	4.7	NatNV-001	Noise
NatNV-8	Anonymous	X	CCLRP0488		4.7	NatNV-005	Noise
NatNV-9	Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	Hamline Midway Coalition	4.7	NatNV-005	Noise
NatVA-1	Fritts	Lori	CCLRP0859		2.3	NatVA-001	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
NatVA-10	Keturakat	Carol	CCLRP0050		3.6	NatVA-005	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-11	Davis	Leslie	CCLRP0761	Architect Environmental Group	3.6	NatVA-005	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-12	Miels	Gayle	CCLRP0137		3.6	NatVA-006	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-13	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0458	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-14			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.6	NatVA-002	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-15	Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139		3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-16	Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0539	PPERRIA (Prospect park and East River Road Improvement Association)	3.6	NatVA-007	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-17	Cowles	Page Knudsen	CCLRP0006		3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-18	Woodward	Steven	CCLRP0479	Design Center	3.6	NatVA-005	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-19	Woodward	Steven	CCLRP0791	Design Center	3.6	NatVA-005	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-2			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.6	NatVA-002	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-20	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.6	NatVA-006	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-21	Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0807		3.6	NatVA-007	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-22	Brooks	Barbara	CCLRP0483	MN Jewish Theatre Company	3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-23	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-24	Woodward	Steven	CCLRP0479	Design Center	3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
NatVA-25			CCLRP0531	Summit-University Planning Council	3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-26	W	R M	CCLRP0447		3.6	NatVA-008	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-27	Fuller	Jacquie	CCLRP0303		3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-28	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	3.6	NatVA-005	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-29	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-3	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	3.4	NatVA-003	Cultural Resources
NatVA-30	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.6	NatVA-006	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-31	O'Brien	Kathleen	CCLRP0437	University of Minnesota	3.6	NatVA-009	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-32	Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0484		3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-33	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-34			CCLRP0532	District 7 Planning Council McNally Smith College of Music	3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-35	Mcnally	Jack	CCLRP0286		3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-4	Jones	Seitu Kenneth	CCLRP0550		3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-6	Lendway	Lisa	CCLRP0288		3.6	NatVA-005	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-7	Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	Hamline Midway Coalition	3.6	NatVA-006	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-8	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	3.6	NatVA-002	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatVA-9	Anderson	Amy	CCLRP0340		3.6	NatVA-004	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
NatWB-1	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council	4.2	NatWB-001	Water Resources
NatWB-2	Lorenzen	William	CCLRP0441	United State Department of Agriculture	4.2	NatWB-001	Water Resources
NR-1	Williams	Richard	CCLRP0151		8.1	NR-026	Capital Funding Strategy
NR-10	Axelson	Nina	CCLRP0786	St. Anthony Park Community Council	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-11	Leitte	Lynn	CCLRP0045		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-12	Frost	Libby	CCLRP0734		2.3	ProALT-021	Alignment
NR-13	Engen	Bryce	CCLRP0675		11	NR-010	Miscellaneous
NR-14	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	11	NR-009	Public Involvement
NR-15	Anderson	Marilyn	CCLRP0113		6.1	NR-021	Bus System Impact
NR-16	Pauling	Steve	CCLRP0190		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-17	Vibar	Nancy	CCLRP0784		3.2	NR-023	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
NR-18	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-19	White	Jim	CCLRP0124		11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
NR-2			CCLRP0298		6.1	NR-021	Bus System Impact

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
NR-20	Payne	Ancil	CCLRP0906		6.1	NR-012	Transit Effects
NR-21	Leitte	Lynn	CCLRP0045		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-22	Gude	Mike	CCLRP0183		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-23	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul Transit for Livable Communities	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-24	Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-25	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		2.3	NR-008	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
NR-26	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0802		11	NR-002	Project Contracting
NR-27	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-28	Gude	Mike	CCLRP0183		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-29	Leitte	Lynn	CCLRP0045		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-3	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.3	NR-001	Parking Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
NR-30	Ledin	Steve	CCLRP0883		3.2	NR-025	
NR-31	Payne	Ancil	CCLRP0906		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-32	Greene	David	CCLRP0032		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-33	Spaulding	Bob	CCLRP0461	Capital River District Council Downtwon Merriam Park Community Council	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-34	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-35	Jarvenpa	Alan	CCLRP0141		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-36	Inman	Karen	CCLRP0004		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-37	Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-38	Chouinard	Joe	CCLRP0474		6.1	NR-018	Bus System Impact
NR-39			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	3	ProPM-018	Report Corrections Needed
NR-4	Grant	Sam	CCLRP0177		3.2	NR-024	Community Involvement
NR-41	Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139		11	NR-009	Public Involvement
NR-42	Warns	Michael D.	CCLRP0471		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-43			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition Minnesota Life Insurance Company, A Securian Financial Group Affiliate	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-44	Agrimson	Gerry	CCLRP0225		2.3	NR-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
NR-45	Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-46	Paul	Roxanne	CCLRP0112		6.1	NR-021	Bus System Impact
NR-47	Nye	Janet	CCLRP0911		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-48	Flint	Philice Ann	CCLRP0131		6.1	NR-007	Transit Effects
NR-49	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		6.1	PlaTP-134	Transit Effects

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
NR-5	Kincaid	Michael	CCLRP0082		2.3	NR-022	Other Corridors
NR-50	Lamb	Pat	CCLRP0152		6.1	NR-021	Bus System Impact
NR-51	Thera	Shawn	CCLRP0869	City of St. Paul	11	NR-005	Miscellaneous
NR-52	Mather	Darin	CCLRP0018		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-53	Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478		2.3	NR-013	Miscellaneous
NR-54	Hauser	Steven	CCLRP0232		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-55			CCLRP0532	District 7 Planning Council	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-56	Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	Hamline Midway Coalition	6.1	NR-018	Bus System Impact
				Minneapolis Department of			
				Public Works			
NR-57	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457		11	NR-011	Report Corrections
NR-58	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-59	White	Jim	CCLRP0125		11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
NR-60	Cowles	Jay	CCLRP0756		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
				MICAH (Metropolitan			
				Interfaith Council on			
				Affordable Housing)			
NR-61	Ruzza	John R.	CCLRP0523		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
NR-62	Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180	Office of the City Council	6.1	NR-017	Bus System Impact
NR-63	Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139		11	NR-003	Project Contracting
NR-7			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
NR-8	Coleman	Kenerica	CCLRP0153		6.1	NR-021	Bus System Impact
				Minneapolis Television			
				Network			
NR-9	Akre	John	CCLRP0652		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
PlaPla-1	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaPla-001	Transit Effects
PlaPla-10	Snyder	John	CCLRP0162		2.3	PlaPla-008	Grade Separation
							Report Clarifications Updates and
PlaPla-11	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		6.1	PlaPla-009	Corrections
							Report Clarifications Updates and
PlaPla-12			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.1	PlaPla-010	Corrections
PlaPla-2	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaPla-002	LRT System Design
PlaPla-3	Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470		1	PlaPla-007	Not in Favor of Project
PlaPla-4	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		3.1	PlaPla-003	Zoning
PlaPla-5	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		6.1	PlaPla-004	Transit Effects
PlaPla-6	Lindmen	Karen	CCLRP0932	ACORN	3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
PlaPla-7	Markle	David	CCLRP0472		2.3	PlaPla-006	Cost Effectiveness
PlaPla-8	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		2.3	PlaPla-011	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
							Report Clarifications Updates and
PlaPla-9	Vanderborght	W.P	CCLRP0806		6.1	PlaPla-010	Corrections

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
PlaTE-012	Jarvenpa	Alan	CCLRP0141		3.2	SocNC-020	Neighborhood Preservation
PlaTE-1	Vetsch	Bernice	CCLRP0259		3.2	EcoEE-020	Neighborhood Preservation
PlaTE-10	Woelfel	Jerry	CCLRP0207		2.3	PlaTE-002	Stations
PlaTE-100	Zee	Priscilla	CCLRP0799		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTE-101	Kennedy	Denis	CCLRP0357		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTE-102	Greene	Roger	CCLRP0872	HealthEast Care System	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-103	Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTE-104	Fox	Stephanie	CCLRP0891		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-105	Hadley	Linda	CCLRP0699	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-106	Hegdahl	Nancy	CCLRP0720	Ecolab Inc., MICAH (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-107	Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	Office of the City Council	3.8	SocEJ-027	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
PlaTE-108	Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
PlaTE-109	Herbison	Priscilla	CCLRP0096		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-11	Dutton	Lisa	CCLRP0243		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-110	Nardini	Tom	CCLRP0639	Nardini Fire Equipment Company, Inc.	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-111	O'Brien	Keri	CCLRP0249		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-112	Hartung	Jill	CCLRP0711	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-113	Johnson	Karen	CCLRP0383	Ecolab	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-114	Herman	Randy	CCLRP0254		6.3	PlaTE-007	Parking Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
PlaTE-115	Rossbach	Jack	CCLRP0913		6.1	PlaTF-009	
PlaTE-116	Roth	Ben	CCLRP0251		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-118	Hess	James	CCLRP0697	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-119	Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-120	Wicht	Daniel R.	CCLRP0236		3.2	PlaTE-008	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
PlaTE-121	Kennedy	Michele	CCLRP0712	Ecolab Inc., Securian Financial Group, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-122	Leighton	Karen	CCLRP0240		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-123	Paulson	Al	CCLRP0228		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-124	Anderson	Peter	CCLRP0849		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-125	Inserra	Andy	CCLRP0270		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-126	Lickness	Georgia	CCLRP0335		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-127	Klingel	Todd	CCLRP0760	Minneapolis Regional Chamber of Commerce St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTE-128	Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
PlaTE-129	Johnson	Rick	CCLRP0011		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-13	Rosenthal	Vic	CCLRP0788	Jewish Community Action	2.3	PlaTE-002	Stations
PlaTE-130	Blissenbach	Paul	CCLRP0194		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-131	Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075		6.1	PlaTF-008	Travel Time
PlaTE-132	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		8.1	PlaTE-009	Capital Funding Strategy
PlaTE-133	Johnson	John G.	CCLRP0325		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-134	Piotrowski	Jane	CCLRP0327		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTE-135	Dewitt	John	CCLRP0184		6.1	PlaTE-010	Transit Effects
PlaTE-136	Wright	Michael	CCLRP0914		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTE-137	Gude	Mike	CCLRP0183		6.1	PlaTE-011	Bus System Impact
PlaTE-138	Levitt	Mark	CCLRP0293	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-139	Hruby	Maryanne	CCLRP0063		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-14	Triplett	Tom	CCLRP0336		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-140	Ledin	Steve	CCLRP0883		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				City of Lakes Chamber of			
				Commerce			
PlaTE-141	Fischer	Sharon	CCLRP0748		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-142	Radzwill	Jo	CCLRP0742		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-143	Keena	Judith	CCLRP0342		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-144	Fox	Stephanie	CCLRP0891		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-145	Thacker	Loren	CCLRP0664	Ecolab Inc.,	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-146	Ulmer	Patrick	CCLRP0216	Ecolab, Inc.	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-147	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-148	Herman	Andrea	CCLRP0921		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-149	Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
							Effects on Other Transportation
							Facilities and Services
PlaTE-15	Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478		6.3	PlaTE-028	
PlaTE-150	Hale	Carla	CCLRP0245	Securian Financial Group	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-151	Geurkink	Kerry	CCLRP0244		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-152	Sandhei	Peder	CCLRP0306		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-153	Maccafferty	Siobhan	CCLRP0346		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-154	Vegas	John	CCLRP0235	Ecolab	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-155	Wallace	Julia	CCLRP0751		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTE-156	Nelson	Ross	CCLRP0427		6.1	PlaTE-013	Bus System Impact
PlaTE-157	Casto	Jane	CCLRP0667	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-158	Celt	Adam	CCLRP0338		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
				North End Business			
				Association			
PlaTE-159	Remmers	Michael	CCLRP0864		8.1	ProFSt-007	Capital Funding Strategy

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
PlaTE-16	Stewart	Jackie	CCLRP0372	Minnesota Senior Federation Affordable Housing Committee	2.3	PlaTE-027	Stops Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
PlaTE-160	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0776		6.1	ProALT-018	
PlaTE-161	Mcdowell	Rob	CCLRP0279		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-162	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895	Citizens for Effective Transit	6.1	PlaTE-013	Bus System Impact
PlaTE-163	Singerhouse	Tony	CCLRP0179		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-164	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-165	Bjornstad	Stacy	CCLRP0205		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-166	Warzala	David	CCLRP0896	Central Corridor Partnership	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-167	Mack	Andrea L	CCLRP0250		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-168	Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-169	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council Securian Retirement Services	3.1	PlaTE-014	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
PlaTE-17	Kinney	Mary C.	CCLRP0246		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-170	Wiebold	Claudia	CCLRP0173	Securian Financial Group	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-171	Cornelius	Kristen	CCLRP0107		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-172	Campbell	Keith	CCLRP0206		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-173	Benson	Marie	CCLRP0473		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-174	Behnke	Brad	CCLRP0349		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-175	Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-176	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		6.2	PlaTE-015	Congestion
PlaTE-177	Peterson	Steve	CCLRP0156		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTE-178	Jacobs	Randall	CCLRP0879		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-18	Haugen	Eunice	CCLRP0332		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-180	Skreves	Jeff	CCLRP0915		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-181	Bjornstad	Stacy	CCLRP0205		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
PlaTE-182	Bieganeck	Justin	CCLRP0305		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-183	Muschler	Eric	CCLRP0042		3.1	PlaTE-016	Land Use
PlaTE-184	Johnson	Rick	CCLRP0011		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTE-185	Hammond	Mary J.	CCLRP0339		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-186	Sweeney	Laura	CCLRP0775		6.1	PlaTE-013	Bus System Impact
PlaTE-187	Hilleman	Monte	CCLRP0868	St. Paul Port Authority	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-188	Woelfel	Jerry	CCLRP0207		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-189	Conrad	Will	CCLRP0024		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-19	Nakajima	Dianne	CCLRP0031		6.1	PlaTE-029	Transit Effects

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
PlaTE-190	Law	Kate	CCLRP0352	Gander Mountain	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-191	Grover	Tom	CCLRP0659	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-192	Inserra	Andy	CCLRP0270		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-193	Sheehan	Gregory M.	CCLRP0345		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-194	White	Chris	CCLRP0636		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-195	Jacobs	Randall	CCLRP0879		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTE-196	Thur	Lois	CCLRP0192		6.1	PlaTE-013	Bus System Impact
PlaTE-197	Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-198	Erdman	Art	CCLRP0737		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-199	Lindh	Ruth	CCLRP0648		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-2	Vue	Chan	CCLRP0060		5.3	PlaTE-017	Development Effects
PlaTE-20	Howe	Kirsten	CCLRP0157		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-21	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		3.2	NR-024	Community Involvement
PlaTE-22	Binger	Craig	CCLRP0855	Amherst Wilder Foundation	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-23	Pena	Luis Brown	CCLRP0350		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
				Central Corridor Partnership			
PlaTE-24	Grzywinski	Joan	CCLRP0894		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTE-25	Pollak	Melisa	CCLRP0337		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-26	Bailey	Kevin L.	CCLRP0324		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-27	Kingston	Tom	CCLRP0771	Wilder Foundation	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-28	Murphy	Gary L.	CCLRP0307	Graphic Exhibits, Inc.	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
				Minnesota Department of Transportation			
PlaTE-29	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436		2.3	PlaTE-018	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses) Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
PlaTE-3	Kiihn	Ross G.	CCLRP0330		3.2	PlaTE-008	Community Businesses
PlaTE-30	Hill	Brian	CCLRP0294		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTE-31	Thomas	David Evan	CCLRP0285		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-32	McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0878		2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
PlaTE-33	Taylor	Kris	CCLRP0875	Ecolab	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-34	Thooft	Travis	CCLRP0627		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
				North End Business Association			
PlaTE-35	Schroeder	Ernie	CCLRP0873		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTE-36	Cowles	Page Knudsen	CCLRP0006		2.3	PlaTE-019	Grade Separation
PlaTE-37	Hess	James	CCLRP0697	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-38	Smith	Alphonsine	CCLRP0005		3.2	PlaTE-020	Community Cohesion
PlaTE-39	Crain	Zach	CCLRP0877		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTE-4	Lendway	Lisa	CCLRP0288		3.2	PlaTE-025	Community Cohesion
PlaTE-40	Casto	Jane	CCLRP0667	Ecolab Inc.,	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
PlaTE-41	Wilber	Susan	CCLRP0160	Ecolab	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-42	Lynn	Sheri	CCLRP0103		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTE-43	Handzija	Haris	CCLRP0334		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-44	Watters	Ellen	CCLRP0770		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTE-45	Lewis	Diana	CCLRP0409	Ecolab	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-47	Mishek	Mark	CCLRP0887	United Hospital	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-48	McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0466		3.2	PlaTE-022	Community Cohesion
PlaTE-49	Howe	Kirsten	CCLRP0157		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-5	Willand	Lois	CCLRP0195		6.3	PlaTE-023	Parking
PlaTE-50	Williams	Russ	CCLRP0172	University of Minnesota Medical Center, Fairview Twin Cities Habitat for Humanity	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-51	Haigh	Sue	CCLRP0909		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-52	Vido	Jose	CCLRP0276		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-53	Haugee	Eric	CCLRP0088		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-54	Martinson	Jonathan	CCLRP0323		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-55	Sweeney	Laura	CCLRP0775		6.1	PlaTE-013	Bus System Impact
PlaTE-56	Hunter	Coralie	CCLRP0258		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-57	Hokanson	Natalie	CCLRP0274		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-58	Seabold	Jim	CCLRP0314		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-59	Triplett	Tom	CCLRP0336		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-60	McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0878		3.2	PlaTE-025	Community Cohesion
PlaTE-61	McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0878		3.2	PlaTE-024	Community Cohesion
PlaTE-62	Roberts	Sarah	CCLRP0174	University of Minnesota	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-63	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		6.3	PlaTF-006	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Distance/Paths to Stations
PlaTE-65	Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0476		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
PlaTE-66	Moeller	Jim	CCLRP0281		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-67	Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	Hamline Midway Coalition North End Business Association	3.2	PlaTE-025	Community Cohesion
PlaTE-69	Schroeder	Ernie	CCLRP0873		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-7	Holbrook	Chris	CCLRP0425		6.2	PlaTE-026	Congestion
PlaTE-70	Huovinen	Suzette	CCLRP0247	Securian Financial Group The Automation Station, Inc.	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-71	Turnipseed	Eric	CCLRP0351		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-72	Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-73	Senkler	Charles	CCLRP0278		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-75	Montgomery	Vince	CCLRP0847		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-76	Mack	Andrea L	CCLRP0250		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTE-77	Schout	Christopher	CCLRP0304		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title	
PlaTE-79	Peterson	Jeff	CCLRP0860	Ecolab	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project	
PlaTE-8	Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0212	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project	
PlaTE-80	Strickland	Verretta	CCLRP0643	City of Lakes Chamber of Commerce	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project	
PlaTE-81	Fischer	Sharon	CCLRP0748		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project	
PlaTE-83	Rahman	Zainool	CCLRP0630	Securian Financial Group	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project	
PlaTE-84	Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0755		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project	
PlaTE-85	Hale	Carla	CCLRP0245		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project	
PlaTE-86	Nelson	Paul	CCLRP0857		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
PlaTE-87	Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781	Transit for Livable Communities	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
PlaTE-88	Close	Bob	CCLRP0260	Transit for Livable Communities	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project	
PlaTE-89	Pierce	Alexandra	CCLRP0356		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
PlaTE-9	Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781	Transit for Livable Communities	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
PlaTE-90	Sommers	Joy	CCLRP0353	Ecolab Inc., St. Joseph's Hospital	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project	
PlaTE-91	Savino	Laurie	CCLRP0668		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project	
PlaTE-92	Swanholm	John	CCLRP0777		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project	
PlaTE-93	Rossbach	Jack	CCLRP0913		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project	
PlaTE-95	Larson	Heidi	CCLRP0348		Goff & Howard, Inc.	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-96	Condon	Susan	CCLRP0695		Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-97	Geurkink	Kerry	CCLRP0244		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
PlaTE-98	Peterson	David F.	CCLRP0876		Parsons	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTE-99	Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478		3.2	PlaTE-024	Community Cohesion	
PlaTF-1	Erkel	James	CCLRP0302		TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	6.1	PlaTF-002	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
PlaTF-10	Rossbach	Jack	CCLRP0913	1		ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project	
PlaTF-11	Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0754	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	1	PlaTF-003	In Favor of Project	
PlaTF-12	Anderson	Steve	CCLRP0347	City of St. Paul	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project	
PlaTF-14	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407		6.1	PlaTF-012	Transit Effects	
PlaTF-2	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895	Citizens for Effective Transit	1	PlaTF-011	Not in Favor of Project	
PlaTF-3	Fritts	Lori	CCLRP0859	Minneapolis Television Network	1	PlaTF-003	In Favor of Project	
PlaTF-4	Akre	John	CCLRP0652		1	PlaTF-003	In Favor of Project	
PlaTF-5	Dewitt	John	CCLRP0184	2.3	PlaTF-013	Selection of Locally Preferred Alternative		

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
PlaTF-6	O'Brien	Kathleen	CCLRP0744	University of Minnesota Minneapolis Department of	6.1	PlaTF-005	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
PlaTF-7	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Public Works	6.1	PlaTF-004	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
PlaTF-8	Cowles	Jay	CCLRP0756		1	PlaTF-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTF-9	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0787	Merriam Park Community Council	1	PlaTF-003	In Favor of Project
PlaTP-001	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	6.3	PlaTP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
PlaTP-002			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.3	PlaTP-002	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
PlaTP-003	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	6.2	PlaTP-003	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
PlaTP-004			CCLRP0532	District 7 Planning Council	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
PlaTP-005			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.3	PlaTP-005	Parking
PlaTP-006	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	3.1	PlaTP-006	Land Use
PlaTP-007	Hruby	Maryanne	CCLRP0063		1	ProHLP-019	Who Will Benefit?
PlaTP-008	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.2	PlaTP-008	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
PlaTP-009	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.2	PlaTP-008	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
PlaTP-010	Erkel	James	CCLRP0302		6.1	PlaTP-135	Transit Effects
PlaTP-011	Everett	Leslie	CCLRP0193		2.3	PlaTP-009	University of Minnesota
PlaTP-012	Lendway	Lisa	CCLRP0288		2.3	PlaTP-010	Grade Separation
PlaTP-013	Bexell	Luther	CCLRP0798		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
PlaTP-014	Kasel	Terri	CCLRP0905		2.3	PlaTP-012	Cost Effectiveness
PlaTP-015	Dewitt	John	CCLRP0184		2.3	PlaTP-013	Alignment
PlaTP-016	Lendway	Lisa	CCLRP0288		2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
PlaTP-017	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
PlaTP-018			CCLRP0532	District 7 Planning Council	2.3	PlaTP-015	Stations
PlaTP-019			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-017	Stations
PlaTP-020			CCLRP0532	District 7 Planning Council	2.3	ProHLP-003	Stations
PlaTP-021	Benson	Marie	CCLRP0473		2.3	PlaTP-019	Stations
PlaTP-022	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2.3	PlaTP-020	Stations

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
PlaTP-023	Goldstein	Jules	CCLRP0772		2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
PlaTP-024	Vadnais	Emmy	CCLRP0927		6.2	PlaTP-022	Congestion
PlaTP-025	Batulis	Scott	CCLRP0865	St. Joseph's Hospital	2.3	ProALT-010	Stations
PlaTP-026	Anderson	Janet	CCLRP0067		2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
PlaTP-027	Baker	Kay	CCLRP0881		2.3	PlaTP-024	Stations
PlaTP-028			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.2	PlaTP-025	U of M
PlaTP-029	Herman	Andrea	CCLRP0921		2.3	ProALT-010	Stations
PlaTP-030	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	PlaTP-026	Stations
PlaTP-031	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	City of St. Paul	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
PlaTP-032	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	Summit-University Planning Council	2.3	EngTI-007	Stations
PlaTP-033			CCLRP0531	Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
PlaTP-034	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0787	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
PlaTP-035	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	City of St. Paul	3.2	PlaTP-025	U of M
PlaTP-036	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406		2.3	PlaTP-029	Stations
PlaTP-037	Dillery	John	CCLRP0313		2.3	PlaTP-030	Stations
PlaTP-039	Berg	Bara	CCLRP0941		2.3	PlaTP-032	Stops
PlaTP-040	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul Summit-University Planning Council	3.1	PlaTP-006	Land Use
PlaTP-041			CCLRP0531		2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
PlaTP-042	Eckerly	Eunice	CCLRP0341		2.3	PlaTP-020	Stations
PlaTP-043	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	2.3	PlaTP-029	Stations
PlaTP-044	Boyle	Marge	CCLRP0132		2.3	PlaTP-034	Stations
PlaTP-045	Mulkern	Rik	CCLRP0448		2.3	PlaTP-010	Grade Separation
PlaTP-046	Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180	Office of the City Council Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
PlaTP-047	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	MICAH (Metropolitan Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	2.3	PlaTP-030	Stations
PlaTP-048	Ruzza	John R.	CCLRP0523		2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
PlaTP-049	Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	Hamline Midway Coalition	6.3	PlaTP-073	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
PlaTP-050	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-074	LRT System Design
PlaTP-051			CCLRP0532	District 7 Planning Council	6.3	PlaTP-042	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
PlaTP-052	Roberts	Sarah	CCLRP0174	University of Minnesota	2.3	ProALT-030	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
PlaTP-053	Heiland	Theresa	CCLRP0462	Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
PlaTP-054	Thur	Lois	CCLRP0192		6.1	PlaTP-061	Bus System Impact
PlaTP-055	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	2.3	PlaTP-077	Alignment
PlaTP-056	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	3.6	PlaTP-078	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
PlaTP-057			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-068	University of Minnesota
PlaTP-058	Singleton	Connie	CCLRP0753		2.3	ProALT-030	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTP-059	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		11	PlaTP-131	Public Comment Process
PlaTP-060	Vanasek	Rob	CCLRP0900		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
PlaTP-061	Peterson	Steve	CCLRP0156		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
PlaTP-062	Brauer	George Ulrich	CCLRP0035		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
PlaTP-063	McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0466		6.1	PlaTP-079	LRT System Design
PlaTP-064	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-080	LRT System Design
							Pedestrians & Bicyclists -
PlaTP-065	Ovenshire	RuthAnne	CCLRP0937		6.3	PlaTF-006	Distance/Paths to Stations
PlaTP-066	Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	Hamline Midway Coalition	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
				Minneapolis Television Network			
PlaTP-067	Akre	John	CCLRP0652	Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
							Report Clarifications Updates and
PlaTP-068	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436		6.2	EngRW-017	Corrections
PlaTP-069	Markle	David	CCLRP0752		6.1	PlaTF-008	Travel Time
				Capital River District Council Downtwon			
PlaTP-070	Spaulding	Bob	CCLRP0461		6.1	PlaTP-083	Transit Effects
PlaTP-071	Rahman	Zainool	CCLRP0630		6.1	PlaTP-084	Bus System Impact
PlaTP-072	Miller	Orlyn	CCLRP0848	University of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
PlaTP-073	Goldman	Rich	CCLRP0651		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTP-075	Alto	Beth	CCLRP0238	Securian Financial Group	2.3	PlaTP-085	University of Minnesota
PlaTP-076	Poole	Jim	CCLRP0481		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
PlaTP-077	Dillery	John	CCLRP0313		6.1	PlaTP-086	LRT System Design
PlaTP-078	Markle	David	CCLRP0472		6.2	PlaTP-087	Congestion
PlaTP-079	Piotrowski	Jane	CCLRP0327		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
							Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station
PlaTP-080	Peng	Lesley	CCLRP0040		6.3	PlaTP-088	Design
PlaTP-081	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-089	Transit Effects
PlaTP-082	Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTP-083	Cowles	Jay	CCLRP0756		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTP-084			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.1	PlaTP-080	LRT System Design
PlaTP-085	White	Anne	CCLRP0171		3.2	PlaTP-090	Community Involvement
PlaTP-086	Herman	Andrea	CCLRP0044		6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
PlaTP-087	Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0539	PPERRIA (Prospect park and East River Road Improvement Association)	3.2	PlaTP-092	U of M
PlaTP-088	Hauser	Steven	CCLRP0232		2.3	ProALT-030	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTP-089	W	R M	CCLRP0447		1	ProPURP-002	Who Will Benefit?
PlaTP-090	Mattila	Laurie	CCLRP0033		6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
PlaTP-091	Markle	David	CCLRP0752		2.3	PlaTP-020	Stations
PlaTP-092	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		2.3	PlaTP-093	Stations
PlaTP-093	Dutton	Lisa	CCLRP0243		6.1	PlaTP-094	Supporting Bus Service
PlaTP-094	Peng	Lesley	CCLRP0040		2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
PlaTP-095	Leitte	Lynn	CCLRP0045		6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
PlaTP-096	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	Minnesota Department of Transportation Hamline Midway Coalition, District 11	6	ProPM-021	Report Corrections Needed Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
PlaTP-097	Leach	Betsy	CCLRP0460		6.3	PlaTP-042	Travel Time
PlaTP-098	Johnson	Craig	CCLRP0828		6.1	PlaTF-008	Safety and Security
PlaTP-099	Anonymous	X	CCLRP0488		3.7	PlaTP-096	In Favor of Project
PlaTP-100	Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0484	Merriam Park Community Council	1	PlaTP-129	
PlaTP-101	Heiland	Theresa	CCLRP0462	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.1	PlaTP-061	Bus System Impact
PlaTP-102			CCLRP0443		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
PlaTP-103	Iacono	Michael	CCLRP0130		6.1	PlaTP-097	Supporting Bus Service
PlaTP-104	Greene	David	CCLRP0893		6.1	PlaTP-098	Supporting Bus Service Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
PlaTP-105	Miels	Gayle	CCLRP0137		3.2	PlaTP-099	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station Design
PlaTP-106	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.3	EngBP-005	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
PlaTP-107	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436		6.2	PlaTP-101	Grade Separation
PlaTP-108	Mitchell	Christopher	CCLRP0215		2.3	PlaTP-010	Stations
PlaTP-109	Coleman	Kenerica	CCLRP0153		2.3	PlaTP-093	Effects on Roadways
PlaTP-110	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.2	PlaTP-102	
PlaTP-111	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
PlaTP-113	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	Minnesota Department of Transportation Citizens for Effective Transit	2.3	PlaTP-104	Grade Separation
PlaTP-114	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482		6.1	PlaTP-105	LRT Park and Rides
PlaTP-115	Jarvenpa	Alan	CCLRP0141		6.1	PlaTP-061	Bus System Impact
PlaTP-116	Everett	Leslie	CCLRP0068		2.3	PlaTP-009	University of Minnesota

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
PlaTP-117	Huber	John	CCLRP0526	Canadian Pacific Railway PPERRIA (Prospect park and East River Road Improvement Association)	6.1	PlaTP-106	Transit Effects
PlaTP-118	Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0539	Merriam Park Community Council	6.1	PlaTP-107	Transit Effects
PlaTP-119	Heiland	Theresa	CCLRP0462	Metropolitan Council	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
PlaTP-120	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435		3.2	PlaTP-025	U of M
PlaTP-121	Staloch	Peter	CCLRP0757		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTP-122	Boyle	Marge	CCLRP0132		6.1	PlaTP-108	Bus System Impact
PlaTP-123	Anastasia	Tony	CCLRP0861		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTP-124	Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	Hamline Midway Coalition	2.3	ProALT-010	Stations
PlaTP-125	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	2.3	PlaTP-093	Stations
PlaTP-126	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-110	LRT System Design
PlaTP-127	Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0807		3.2	PlaTP-025	U of M
PlaTP-128	Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086		2.3	PlaTP-111	Stations
PlaTP-129	W	R M	CCLRP0447		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
PlaTP-131	Matthews	Delores	CCLRP0867	Pilgrim Baptist Church Citizens for Effective Transit	6.1	PlaTP-112	Transit Effects
PlaTP-132	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482		6.1	PlaTF-008	Travel Time
PlaTP-134	Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139		2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
PlaTP-135	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.2	PlaTP-008	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
PlaTP-136			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	6	ProPM-021	Report Corrections Needed
PlaTP-137	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.3	PlaTP-005	Parking
PlaTP-138			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	6	ProPM-021	Report Corrections Needed
PlaTP-139	Abbey	David	CCLRP0072		6.2	EngRW-004	Congestion
PlaTP-140	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0458	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
PlaTP-141	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council	3.1	PlaTP-115	Coordinate with Other Community Plans
PlaTP-142	Feismia	Ann	CCLRP0030		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
PlaTP-143			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.1	PlaTP-116	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
PlaTP-144	Anderson	Janet	CCLRP0067		2.3	PlaTP-117	Alignment
PlaTP-145	Dillery	John	CCLRP0313		6.1	PlaTP-061	Bus System Impact
PlaTP-146	Strickland	Verretta	CCLRP0643		2.3	PlaTP-118	Alignment
PlaTP-147	Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0084	Pioneer Press Sports	2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
PlaTP-148	Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	Hamline Midway Coalition	6.1	PlaTP-061	Bus System Impact

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
PlaTP-149	Agrimson	Gerry	CCLRP0225	Minnesota Life Insurance Company, A Securian Financial Group Affiliate	2.3	PlaTP-119	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
PlaTP-150	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		2.3	ProALT-004	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTP-151	O'Brien	Kathleen	CCLRP0744	University of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
PlaTP-152	Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0792		6.1	PlaTF-008	Travel Time
PlaTP-153	Singleton	Connie	CCLRP0753		6.1	PlaTP-080	LRT System Design
PlaTP-154	Sweeney	Laura	CCLRP0775		2.3	PlaTP-019	Stations
PlaTP-155			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.2	PlaTP-008	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
PlaTP-156	Cornelius	Kristen	CCLRP0107		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTP-157	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.2	PlaTP-008	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
PlaTP-158	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0839		2.3	PlaTP-123	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
PlaTP-159	Markle	David	CCLRP0472		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
PlaTP-160			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.2	PlaTP-008	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
PlaTP-161	Haugee	Eric	CCLRP0088		6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
PlaTP-162	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		2.3	PlaTP-117	Alignment
PlaTP-163	Babcock	Stephen	CCLRP0256		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
PlaTP-164			CCLRP0532	District 7 Planning Council	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
PlaTP-165	Harris	Ginny	CCLRP0813		3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
PlaTP-166	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-080	LRT System Design
PlaTP-167	Barta	Rob	CCLRP0188		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
PlaTP-168	Markle	David	CCLRP0472		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
PlaTP-169	Garvey	Dyane	CCLRP0789	Building Owners Management Association	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
PlaTP-170	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2.3	PlaTP-056	University of Minnesota
PlaTP-171	Radzwill	Jo	CCLRP0742		6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
PlaTP-172			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
PlaTP-173	Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	MICAH (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	2.3	PlaTP-111	Stations
PlaTP-174	Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	MICAH (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	6.1	PlaTP-124	Transit Effects

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title	
PlaTP-175	Celeste	Celeste	CCLRP0121	Minnesota Department of Transportation City of St. Paul	6.3	PlaTP-125	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station Design	
PlaTP-176	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436		6.2	EngRW-017	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections	
PlaTP-177	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406		6.1	PlaTP-126	LRT System Design	
PlaTP-178	Pinney	Gregory	CCLRP0741		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation	
PlaTP-179	Scurato	Francy	CCLRP0016		6.1	PlaTP-105	LRT Park and Rides	
PlaTP-180	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406		6.1	PlaTP-134	Transit Effects	
PlaTP-181	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	City of St. Paul District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	6.1	PlaTP-061	Bus System Impact	
PlaTP-182	Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
PlaTP-183			CCLRP0280	Lexington Hamline Community Council	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service	
PlaTP-184			CCLRP0280	Lexington Hamline Community Council	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
PlaTP-185	Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0916	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation	
PlaTP-186			CCLRP0443		2.3	PlaTP-017	Stations	
PlaTP-187	Bolson	Kent	CCLRP0199		2.3	PlaTP-035	Grade Separation	
PlaTP-188	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	Merriam Park Community Council	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service	
PlaTP-189	Collins	Tom	CCLRP0856	St. Paul Port Authority	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project	
PlaTP-190	Lamb	Pat	CCLRP0152	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-134	Transit Effects	
PlaTP-191	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406		6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service	
PlaTP-192	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		2.3	PlaTP-034	Stations	
PlaTP-193	Dewitt	John	CCLRP0184	St. Joseph's Hospital	2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations	
PlaTP-194	Arnold	Scott	CCLRP0650		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
PlaTP-195	Swanholm	John	CCLRP0777		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation	
PlaTP-196	Strickland	Verretta	CCLRP0643		2.3	PlaTP-093	Stations	
PlaTP-197			CCLRP0443		Univeristy of Minnesota University of MN Health Center	6.1	PlaTP-041	LRT System Design
PlaTP-198	Bock	Terry	CCLRP0740		Friends of the Parks and Trails	1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
PlaTP-199	Vento	Andrea	CCLRP0527	Jewish Community Action	6.3	PlaTP-042	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation	
PlaTP-200	Hielsberg	Thomas	CCLRP0087		2.3	PlaTP-034	Stations	
PlaTP-202	Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0807		6.2	PlaTP-136	Effects on Roadways	
PlaTP-203	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		2.3	PlaTP-139	Selection of Locally Preferred Alternative	
PlaTP-204	Rosenthal	Vic	CCLRP0788		2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations	

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
PlaTP-205	Cox	Emily	CCLRP0738		1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
				District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls			
PlaTP-206	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0458		6.1	PlaTP-044	LRT System Design
PlaTP-207	Seufert	Jim	CCLRP0101		2.3	PlaTP-045	Stations
PlaTP-208	Gravelle	Theresa	CCLRP0408	Ecolab, Inc	1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
PlaTP-209	Thorkelsen	David	CCLRP0862		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTP-210	Taylor	Kris	CCLRP0875	Ecolab	6.1	PlaTP-046	Transit Effects
PlaTP-211	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0839		6.1	PlaTP-047	Bus System Impact
PlaTP-212	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	3.1	PlaTP-048	Stations
PlaTP-213	Mattila	Laurie	CCLRP0033		1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
PlaTP-214	Brauer	George Ulrich	CCLRP0035		6.1	PlaTF-010	Bus System Impact
PlaTP-215	Matthews	Delores	CCLRP0867	Pilgrim Baptist Church	2.3	PlaTP-050	Stops
							Report Clarifications Updates and
PlaTP-216	Hauser	Steven	CCLRP0232		6.1	PlaTP-051	Corrections
PlaTP-217	Dillery	John	CCLRP0313		2.3	PlaTP-052	Stations
PlaTP-218			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-053	Stations
PlaTP-219	Pahs	Matthew	CCLRP0048		2.3	PlaTP-054	Alignment
PlaTP-220	Mulkern	Rik	CCLRP0448		2.3	ProALT-030	Alternatives Analysis
				Citizens for Effective Transit			Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact
PlaTP-221	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895		6.3	PlaTP-042	and Mitigation
PlaTP-222	Rossbach	Jack	CCLRP0913		6.1	PlaTF-008	Travel Time
PlaTP-223	O'Brien	Kathleen	CCLRP0437	University of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-056	University of Minnesota
PlaTP-224	Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0916		2.3	ProALT-030	Alternatives Analysis
PlaTP-225	Holbrook	Chris	CCLRP0425		2.3	PlaTP-035	Grade Separation
PlaTP-226	Goff	Jim	CCLRP0272	J.G. Goff and Associates Merriam Park Community Council	6.1	PlaTP-057	Bus System Impact
PlaTP-227	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0787		6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
							Report Clarifications Updates and
PlaTP-228	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul Summit-University Planning Council	6.2	PlaTP-008	Corrections
PlaTP-229			CCLRP0531		6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
PlaTP-230	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	3.7	PlaTP-059	Safety and Security
PlaTP-231	Lemmons	Bruce	CCLRP0020		3.2	PlaTP-060	Community Cohesion
PlaTP-232	Haugee	Eric	CCLRP0088		6.1	PlaTP-061	Bus System Impact
PlaTP-233	Dillery	John	CCLRP0313		6.1	PlaTP-080	LRT System Design
PlaTP-234	Lunde	Jackie & Jeff	CCLRP0343	Subway	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
							Report Clarifications Updates and
PlaTP-235	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		6.1	PlaTP-062	Corrections
PlaTP-236			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.2	PlaTP-025	U of M

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
PlaTP-237	Kiihn	Ross G.	CCLRP0330		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
PlaTP-238	Everett	Leslie	CCLRP0068		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
PlaTP-239	Dillery	John	CCLRP0313		6.1	ProALT-024	LRT System Design
				District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls			
PlaTP-240	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0458		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
PlaTP-241	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0840		2.3	PlaTP-052	Stations
							Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
PlaTP-242	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.3	PlaTP-063	
PlaTP-243	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
PlaTP-244	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
PlaTP-245	Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0484		6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
							Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
PlaTP-247			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	4.1	PlaTP-066	
PlaTP-248	Huber	John	CCLRP0526	Canadian Pacific Railway	6.1	PlaTP-134	Transit Effects
PlaTP-249	Berger	Robert D	CCLRP0230		6.1	PlaTP-134	Transit Effects
PlaTP-250	Grans	Steve	CCLRP0361	Minnesota State Fair	6.1	PlaTP-134	Transit Effects
PlaTP-251	Sear	Esther	CCLRP0114		2.3	PlaTP-067	Stops
				Transit for Livable Communities			
PlaTP-252	Caso	Patience	CCLRP0829		6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
PlaTP-253			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-068	University of Minnesota
PlaTP-254	Frelix	Tanya	CCLRP0145		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
PlaTP-255	Bachmann	Sigrid	CCLRP0081		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTP-256	Cobb	Martha	CCLRP0910		2.3	PlaTP-070	University of Minnesota
PlaTP-257	Burd	David	CCLRP0454		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
PlaTP-258	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.1	PlaTP-083	Transit Effects
PlaTP-259	Anderson	Keith	CCLRP0898		6.1	PlaTF-008	Travel Time
				Minnesota Department of Transportation			Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
PlaTP-260	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436		6.2	PlaTP-072	
ProALT-001	Erkel	James	CCLRP0302		2.3	ProALT-036	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
				Merriam Park Community Council			
ProALT-002	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0787		6.1	PlaTP-046	Transit Effects
ProALT-004	Stakston	Sarah	CCLRP0110		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
				Minneapolis Television Network			
ProALT-005	Akre	John	CCLRP0652		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-006	Farrell	Chris	CCLRP0320		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-007	Blecha	Jennifer	CCLRP0634		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-008	Blissenbach	Paul	CCLRP0194		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-009	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProALT-010	W	R M	CCLRP0447		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
ProALT-011	Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0783		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-012	Kingston	Tom	CCLRP0771	Wilder Foundation	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-013	Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0642		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProALT-014	Pollak	Melisa	CCLRP0337		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				Transit for Livable Communities			
ProALT-015	Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-016	Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-017	Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	District Energy St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-018	Peterson	Jeff	CCLRP0860	Ecolab	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-019	White	Chris	CCLRP0636		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-020	Welling	Chip	CCLRP0464		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-022	Sharp	Sonja	CCLRP0182		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
ProALT-023	Strickland	Verretta	CCLRP0643		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
ProALT-024	Baker	Kay	CCLRP0881		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
ProALT-025	Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0792		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
ProALT-026	Sweet	Antwen	CCLRP0057		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
ProALT-027	Warns	Michael D.	CCLRP0471		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
ProALT-028	Snyder	John	CCLRP0162		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
							Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
ProALT-029	Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0084	Pioneer Press Sports	6.1	ProALT-019	
ProALT-030	Rogalski	Mary Jo	CCLRP0429		2.3	ProALT-008	University of Minnesota
				District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls			
ProALT-031	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178		2.3	ProALT-021	Alignment
ProALT-032	Pahs	Matthew	CCLRP0048		2.3	ProALT-010	Stations
				PPERRIA (Prospect park and East River Road Improvement Association) MICAH (Metropolitan Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)			
ProALT-033	Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0539		2.3	ProALT-008	University of Minnesota
							Stations
ProALT-034	Ruzza	John R.	CCLRP0523		2.3	ProALT-025	
ProALT-035	Thompson	John	CCLRP0374		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
ProALT-036	Rossi	Robert	CCLRP0480		2.3	ProALT-008	University of Minnesota
ProALT-037	Dillery	John	CCLRP0313		2.3	ProALT-008	University of Minnesota
ProALT-038	Rossi	Robert	CCLRP0480		6.2	ProALT-017	Congestion
ProALT-039	Singleton	Connie	CCLRP0753		2.3	ProALT-008	University of Minnesota
		Timothy and					Acquisitions and Displacements/Relocations
ProALT-040	Sawyer	Sally	CCLRP0076		3.3	ProALT-003	

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title	
ProALT-041	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	6.1	ProALT-024	LRT System Design	
ProALT-042	Hauser	Steven	CCLRP0232		6.1	ProALT-014	LRT System Design	
ProALT-043	Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0084		Pioneer Press Sports	2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
ProALT-044	Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0084		Pioneer Press Sports Transit for Livable Communities	2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
ProALT-045	Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781	Equity Coalition	2.3	ProALT-010	Stations	
ProALT-046	Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0792		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation	
ProALT-047	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous	
ProALT-048	Iacono	Michael	CCLRP0130	St. Paul Port Authority	2.3	ProALT-037	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)	
ProALT-049	Woelfel	Jerry	CCLRP0207		8.1	ProALT-011	Capital Funding Strategy	
ProALT-050	Iacono	Michael	CCLRP0130		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project	
ProALT-051	Pennington	Joan	CCLRP0795		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-052			CCLRP0485		3.8	SocEJ-022	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	
ProALT-053	Louder	Lorrie	CCLRP0438		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project	
ProALT-054	Nye	Janet	CCLRP0911		Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-055	Heiland	Theresa	CCLRP0462	2.3		ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-056	Erdman	Art	CCLRP0737	1		PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project	
ProALT-057	Duckwall	Adam	CCLRP0585		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-058	Maykoski	Anita	CCLRP0163	Capital City Partnershp	2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)	
ProALT-059	Radzwill	Jo	CCLRP0742		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project	
ProALT-060	Labosky	John	CCLRP0530		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-061	Thompson	John	CCLRP0374		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-062	Denys	Jennifer and Carl	CCLRP0252	Ecolab	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-063	Werner	Cindy	CCLRP0572		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-064	Johnson	Kathleen	CCLRP0503		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-065	Vegas	John	CCLRP0235		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project	
ProALT-066	Yacoub	James	CCLRP0624		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-067	Stakston	Sarah	CCLRP0009		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project	
ProALT-068	Eggum	Tom	CCLRP0831		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-069	Fischer	Sharon	CCLRP0748		City of Lakes Chamber of Commerce	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-070	Foote	Dan	CCLRP0853	2.3		ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-071	Bryski	Joseph	CCLRP0603	2.3		ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProALT-072	Schultz	Cindy	CCLRP0655	Schultz Consulting, LLC	1	ProPURP-012	In Favor of Project
ProALT-073	Bergman	Glenn A.	CCLRP0424	Peterson, Fram & Bergman	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-074	Jarvenpa	Alan	CCLRP0141		11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
ProALT-075	Schwiderski	Marijo	CCLRP0202		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-076	Tiers	George	CCLRP0264		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
				Twin Cities Habitat for Humanity			
ProALT-077	Haigh	Sue	CCLRP0909		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-078	Johnson	Rick	CCLRP0011		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-080	Dickinson	Jim	CCLRP0222		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
							Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
ProALT-081	Erkel	James	CCLRP0302	Midway Chamber of Commerce	6.1	ProALT-018	
ProALT-082	Auron	Matt	CCLRP0773		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-083	Thomas	David Evan	CCLRP0285		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-084	Platte	Georgia	CCLRP0316		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-085	Sheahan	Stephen	CCLRP0317		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-086	Fritz	Lauri	CCLRP0469		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-087	Sear	Esther	CCLRP0114		2.3	ProALT-004	Alternatives Analysis
					St. Paul Trades and Labor 70		
ProALT-088	Jones	Matt Timothy and	CCLRP0903	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-089	Sawyer	Sally	CCLRP0076	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project	
ProALT-090	Jungwirth	David	CCLRP0620	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-091	Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075	1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project	
ProALT-092	Easton	John	CCLRP0519	Ecolab	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-093	Taylor	Kris	CCLRP0875		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-094	Lam	Leisbel	CCLRP0501		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-095	Harens	Thomas	CCLRP0273	Inventiong Solutions	2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-096	Pasiuk	Dave	CCLRP0897		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-097	Singleton	Connie	CCLRP0753	Parsons Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-098	Gastoni	Vincent	CCLRP0533		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-099	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0787		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-100	Keljik	Karen	CCLRP0292		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-101	Hanson	Ryan	CCLRP0262		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-102	Doyle	Brendan	CCLRP0224		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-103	Staloch	Peter	CCLRP0757		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProALT-104	Thormodsgar	Diane	CCLRP0083		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
ProALT-105	Peterson	Jeff	CCLRP0860	Ecolab	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-106	Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	MICAH (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
ProALT-108	Grzywinski	Joan	CCLRP0894	Central Corridor Partnership	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-109	Warzala	David	CCLRP0896	Central Corridor Partnership	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-110	Nelson	Paul	CCLRP0857		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-111	Carlquist	Matthew	CCLRP0444		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-112	Carlson	Sharon	CCLRP0329		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-113	Dinkel	Billy	CCLRP0880		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-114	Brauer	George Ulrich	CCLRP0035		2.3	ProALT-004	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-115	Roberts	Sarah	CCLRP0174	University of Minnesota	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-116	Kelliher	Mark	CCLRP0445		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProALT-117	Karageorgiou	Elissaios	CCLRP0431		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-118	Wells	Mary	CCLRP0516		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-119	Sabby	Dean	CCLRP0574		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-120	Clarkin	Daniel	CCLRP0928		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-121	Belmonte	Joseph	CCLRP0558		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-122	Lee	Andrew	CCLRP0759		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-123	Huovinen	Suzette	CCLRP0247	Securian Financial Group	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-124	Bock	Terry	CCLRP0740	University of MN Health Center	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-125	Stakston	Sarah	CCLRP0009		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-126	Lund	Kristen	CCLRP0108		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-127	Christopherson	Philip	CCLRP0496		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-128	Schmidt	Steve	CCLRP0885		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-129	Yang	Mary	CCLRP0512		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-130	Faletti	A,amda	CCLRP0815	St. Paul Area Chambe of Commerce	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-131	Olson	Larry	CCLRP0833	Metro Plains Development	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-132	Willis	Mari	CCLRP0120		11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
ProALT-133	Yang	Davone	CCLRP0493		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-134	Goff	Phyllis	CCLRP0782		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-135	Goff	Phyllis	CCLRP0782		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProALT-136	Thooft	Travis	CCLRP0627		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-137	Wiener	June	CCLRP0547	St Paul Association of Realtors	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-138	Labey	Patty	CCLRP0541	Restoration Professionals	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-139	Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0785		2.3	ProALT-028	Miscellaneous
ProALT-140	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0776		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-141	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		2.3	ProALT-038	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-142	Geiger	Tera	CCLRP0569		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-143	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0776		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-144	Melander	Harry	CCLRP0832	St Paul Building and Contraction Trades Council	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-145	Rasmussen	David	CCLRP0565		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-146	German	Judy	CCLRP0497		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-147	Matteson	Paul	CCLRP0850		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-148	Ovenshire	RuthAnne	CCLRP0937		3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
ProALT-149	Seabold	Jim	CCLRP0314		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-150	Saldivar	Israel	CCLRP0618		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-151	Thorkelsen	David	CCLRP0862		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-152	Roberts	Sarah	CCLRP0174	University of Minnesota	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-153	Buchen	Daniel	CCLRP0583		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-154	Bushard	Barbara	CCLRP0211		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-155	Anastasia	Tony	CCLRP0861		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-156	Nakajima	Dianne	CCLRP0031		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProALT-157	Neimeyer	Jane	CCLRP0291		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-158	Dzwonkowski	Ken	CCLRP0073		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-159	Anderson	Keith	CCLRP0898		2.3	EngTI-023	Grade Separation
ProALT-160	Sommers	Joy	CCLRP0353		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-161	Shamrokh	Shereen	CCLRP0513		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-162	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-163	Pedersen	Millisa	CCLRP0520		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-164	Dixon	Caroline	CCLRP0590		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-165	Hein	Brigitte	CCLRP0309		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-166	Mccarty	Jack	CCLRP0625		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-167	White	Anne	CCLRP0171		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-169	Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProALT-170	Fischer	Sharon	CCLRP0748	City of Lakes Chamber of Commerce International Union of Painters & Allied Trades	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-171	Gavanda	Michael	CCLRP0535		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-172	Kuczaboski	Tony	CCLRP0588		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-173	Warner	Dave	CCLRP0053		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-174	Robinson	Chris	CCLRP0940		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-175	Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0484		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-176	Chapeau	Julie	CCLRP0229		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-177	Barraclough	Scott	CCLRP0617		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-178	Jurgens	Andrew	CCLRP0268		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-179	Payne	Ancil	CCLRP0906		2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-180	Horneck	Ryan	CCLRP0615		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-181	Thatcher	Jennifer	CCLRP0606		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-182	Oberg	Eric	CCLRP0515		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-183	Anderson	Kristyn	CCLRP0099		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-184	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0758		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProALT-185	Hermes	James	CCLRP0261		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-186			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-022	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
ProALT-187	Perez	Chris	CCLRP0017		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-188	Anderson	Warren	CCLRP0746		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous
ProALT-189	Wesley	Thomas	CCLRP0613		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-190	Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-191	Kennedy	Denis	CCLRP0357		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-192	Schout	Christopher	CCLRP0304		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-193	Nye	Janet	CCLRP0911		2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-194	Schletty	Lorraine	CCLRP0097		2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-195	Russell	Margaret	CCLRP0319		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-196	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0840		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-197	Doyle	Brendan	CCLRP0224		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-198	Diffley	Kathleen	CCLRP0214		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-199	West	Michael	CCLRP0567		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-200	Vanheuklom	Norene	CCLRP0596		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-201	Tivyan	Elena	CCLRP0575		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProALT-202	Downey	Keith	CCLRP0749	Minneapolis Regional Chamber of Commerce	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-203	Karageorgiou	Elissaios	CCLRP0431	St. Paul Area Chamber of Commerce	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-204	Simpson	David	CCLRP0817	Commerce	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-205	Baker	Bob	CCLRP0822	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-206	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
ProALT-207	Gale	Chris	CCLRP0213		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-208	Erdman	Art	CCLRP0737		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-209	Bolson	Kent	CCLRP0199		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-210	Firebaugh	Todd	CCLRP0852	Piper Jaffray	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-212	Larson	Randy	CCLRP0499		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-213	Drew	Alden	CCLRP0835		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-214	Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075		2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-215	Dubois	Josh	CCLRP0002	The Automation Station, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-216	Turnipseed	Eric	CCLRP0351	Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-217	Thomas	David Evan	CCLRP0285		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-218	Mensch	Mary	CCLRP0610		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-219	Harens	Thomas	CCLRP0273	Inventiong Solutions	2.3	ProALT-045	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-220	Singh	Shakunla	CCLRP0609		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-221	Roth	Ben	CCLRP0251		6.1	PlaTP-036	Supporting Bus Service
ProALT-222	Wee	David J.	CCLRP0198		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-223	Markle	David	CCLRP0752		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-224	Leitte	Lynn	CCLRP0045		6.1	ProALT-034	LRT Park and Rides
ProALT-225	Anonymous	X	CCLRP0924		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-226	Vido	Jose	CCLRP0276		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-227	Rowen	Harold	CCLRP0118		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-228	Sheehy	Lee	CCLRP0764	City of Minneapolis	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-229	Seufert	Jim	CCLRP0101		6.1	ProALT-019	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
ProALT-230	Schadauer	Mike	CCLRP0015		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-231	Ekstrums	Cheryl	CCLRP0925		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-232	Behnke	Brad	CCLRP0349		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-233	Hilleman	Monte	CCLRP0868	St. Paul Port Authority	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-234	Hurlbut	Robert	CCLRP0242		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-235	Ali	Abia	CCLRP0765		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-236	Hanson	Chad	CCLRP0582		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-237	Harvey	Gary	CCLRP0299		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProALT-238	Schroeder	Ernie	CCLRP0873	North End Business Association	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-239	Conrad	Will	CCLRP0024		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-240	Ruble	Patrick	CCLRP0511		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-241	Vanasek	Rob	CCLRP0900		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-242	Hargens	Amy	CCLRP0633		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-243	Fritz	Bev	CCLRP0028		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-244	Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0642		2.3	ProALT-046	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-245	Senkler	Charles	CCLRP0278		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-246	Johnson	Lisa	CCLRP0210		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-247	Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0754	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	2.3	ProALT-021	Alignment
ProALT-248	Rewald	Betsy	CCLRP0557		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-249	Brainerd	Mary	CCLRP0546	HealthPartners	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-250	Smith	Alphonsine	CCLRP0005		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProALT-252	Holm	Keith	CCLRP0505		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-253	Pham	Thu	CCLRP0562		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-254	Simonsen	Sonja	CCLRP0818		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-255	Roach	Tammi	CCLRP0568		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-256	Vetsch	Bernice	CCLRP0259			2.3	ProALT-029
ProALT-257	Matthews	Jeffery	CCLRP0573	2.3		ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-258	Wills	Lorance	CCLRP0517	2.3		ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-259	Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0212	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-260	McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0878		6.1	ProALT-047	Supporting Bus Service
ProALT-261	Dowell	Larry	CCLRP0892	St. Paul Chamber of Commerce Riverside Plaza Tenant Association	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-262	Scobey	Fredda	CCLRP0739		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-263	Smith	Timothy	CCLRP0619		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-264	Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	Midway Used and Rare Books	2.3	ProALT-016	Cost Effectiveness
ProALT-265	Tabrizi	Mat	CCLRP0614		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-266	Benson	Marie	CCLRP0473		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-267	Axelson	Nina	CCLRP0786	St. Anthony Park Community Council Living Portraits	11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
ProALT-268	Luepker	Ellen	CCLRP0071		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title	
ProALT-269	Scobey	Fredda	CCLRP0739	Riverside Plaza Tenant Association	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-270	Schack	Sherry	CCLRP0221		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-271	Fleming	Terri	CCLRP0819		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-272	Jiruska	Jennifer	CCLRP0290		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-273	Olsen	Terry	CCLRP0367		TKDA	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-274	Carlson	Dave	CCLRP0838		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-275	Odonell	Larry	CCLRP0128		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project	
ProALT-276	Neimeyer	Charles	CCLRP0559		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-277	Fox	Stephanie	CCLRP0891		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-278	Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167		2.3	ProALT-021	Alignment	
ProALT-279	Warner	Dave	CCLRP0053		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project	
ProALT-280	Betlej	Joseph	CCLRP0239		Advantus Capital Management	6.1	ProALT-019	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
ProALT-281	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project	
ProALT-282	D'Entremont	Elise	CCLRP0502	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis		
ProALT-283	Wicht	Daniel R.	CCLRP0236	2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)		
ProALT-284	Sheehan	Gregory M.	CCLRP0536	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis		
ProALT-285	Leitte	Lynn	CCLRP0045	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis		
ProALT-286	Schutz	Larry	CCLRP0115	2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)		
ProALT-287	Wentzel	David	CCLRP0498	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis		
ProALT-288	Anderson	Warren	CCLRP0917	2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous		
ProALT-289	Mcginley	Paul	CCLRP0814	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis		
ProALT-290	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous	
ProALT-291	Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis		
ProALT-292	O'Brien	Kathleen	CCLRP0744	University of Minnesota	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-293	Graham	Teresa	CCLRP0500	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis		
ProALT-294	Bush	Gale	CCLRP0601	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis		
ProALT-295	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)		
ProALT-296	Piper	Cameron	CCLRP0201	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis		
ProALT-297	Harens	Thomas	CCLRP0273	Inventiong Solutions	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-298	Mallon	Cassandra	CCLRP0665	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project	
ProALT-299	Levin	Margaret	CCLRP0816	Jewish Community Action	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-300	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0467	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project		
ProALT-301	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-302	Bushnell	William	CCLRP0093	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis		

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProALT-303	Hilleman	Monte	CCLRP0439	St. Paul Port Authority	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-304	Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0456		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProALT-305	Binger	Craig	CCLRP0855	Amherst Wilder Foundation	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-306	Moldenhauer	Stanley	CCLRP0269		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-307	Massey	Gloria Y	CCLRP0001		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProALT-308	Greene	Roger	CCLRP0872	HealthEast Care System	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-309	Reiter	James	CCLRP0598		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-310	Malone	Raejean	CCLRP0580		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-311			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProALT-012	University of Minnesota
ProALT-312	Hart	Sean	CCLRP0204		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-313	Mitchell	Christopher	CCLRP0215		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-314	Doucette	Kathleen	CCLRP0584		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-315	Roberts	Sarah	CCLRP0174	University of Minnesota	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-316	Beckstrom	John	CCLRP0600		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-317	Guldgn	Jeff	CCLRP0052		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-318	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-319	Watters	Ellen	CCLRP0770		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-320	Ireland	Mark	CCLRP0284		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-321	Thompson	Joan	CCLRP0769		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-322	Mead	Shannon	CCLRP0233		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-323	Avidor	Ken	CCLRP0653		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-324	Ulmer	Patrick	CCLRP0216	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProALT-325	Vockrodt	Robert	CCLRP0027		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-326	Holbrook	Chris	CCLRP0425		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-327	Risko	Georgi	CCLRP0310		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-328	Triplett	Tom	CCLRP0336		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-329	Bollman	Alex	CCLRP0300		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-330	Breining	Dennis	CCLRP0322		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-331	Le	Tyler	CCLRP0025		2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-332	Miller	Orlyn	CCLRP0848	University of Minnesota	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-333	Renikoff	Rich	CCLRP0846		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-334	Nye	Janet	CCLRP0911		2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-335	Thompson	Karen	CCLRP0344	Securian Financial Group, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-336	Gundersen	Jane	CCLRP0825		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProALT-337	Bauman	Gregory	CCLRP0255		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProALT-338	Bachmann	Sigrid	CCLRP0081		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-339	Everett	Leslie	CCLRP0193		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-340	Plunkett	J. Patrick	CCLRP0538	Morre, Costello & Hart, PLL MN Wiring & Cable Company	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-341	Thompson	Joan	CCLRP0837		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-342	Huebsch	Victoria	CCLRP0579		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-343	Sink	Jill	CCLRP0433		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-344	Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003		2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-345	Casey	Sheryl	CCLRP0677	Ecolab Inc.,	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-346	Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-347	Peterson	David F.	CCLRP0876	Parsons	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-348	Fedor	Dennis	CCLRP0219		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-349	Thormodsgar d	Diane	CCLRP0083		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-350	Lambert	Clay	CCLRP0766		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-351	Thormodsgar d	Diane	CCLRP0763		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-352	Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0084	Pioneer Press Sports	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-353	Herman	Randy	CCLRP0254		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-354	Johnson	Kenneth	CCLRP0440	St. Paul Port Authority	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-355	Skreves	Jeff	CCLRP0915		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProALT-356	Harris	Ginny	CCLRP0813		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-357	Fritts	Lori	CCLRP0859		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-358	Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0755		1	ProHLP-019	Who Will Benefit?
ProALT-359	Griffin	Tim	CCLRP0834	St. Paul Design Center	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-360	Maykoski	Anita	CCLRP0163		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-361	Ewing	Dixie	CCLRP0509		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-362	Lafrence	Andrew	CCLRP0544	KPMG	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-363	Dennie	Janice	CCLRP0578		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-364	Burd	David	CCLRP0454		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-365	Kingston	Tom	CCLRP0771	Wilder Foundation	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-366	Tilsen	Janie	CCLRP0576		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-367	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-368	Buggy	Jon	CCLRP0750	Ellerbe Becket	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-369	Olsen	Terry	CCLRP0745		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-370	Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-371	Vibar	Nancy	CCLRP0784		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProALT-372	Mohr	John	CCLRP0841	Lifetrack Resources	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-373			CCLRP0026		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-374	Renikoff	Rich	CCLRP0846		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-375	Geurkink	Kerry	CCLRP0244		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-376	Buth	William	CCLRP0811	BOMA (Building Owners & Managers Association)	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-377	Klingel	Todd	CCLRP0760	Chamber of Commerce	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-378	Hollencamp	Stephen	CCLRP0227		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-379	Close	Bob	CCLRP0260		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-380	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		6.1	ProALT-018	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
ProALT-381	Haugen	Eunice	CCLRP0332		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-382	Jacobs	Randall	CCLRP0879		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-383	Grzywinski	Joan	CCLRP0465	Central Corridor Partnership	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-384	Vockrodt	Robert	CCLRP0027		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-385	Johnson	Tamara	CCLRP0079		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-386	Blustein	Maureen	CCLRP0297		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-387	Remmers	Michael	CCLRP0864	North End Business Association	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-388	Johns	Brian	CCLRP0102		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-389	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
ProALT-390	Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167		5.1	EcoEE-008	Economic Conditions
ProALT-391	Lovelace	Earl	CCLRP0034		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-392	Beck	Paula	CCLRP0506		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-393	Marshall	Scott	CCLRP0587		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-394	Quinlan	Michael	CCLRP0106		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-395	Frey	Brian	CCLRP0616		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-396	Rossi	Robert	CCLRP0480		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-397	Schadegg	Mark	CCLRP0556		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-398	Pasiuk	Joan	CCLRP0901		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-399	Dewitt	John	CCLRP0184		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-400	Plackett	Marvin	CCLRP0926	Episcopal Homes	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-401	Murphy	Shaun	CCLRP0666		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-402	Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0755		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous
ProALT-403	Tawil	Lawrence	CCLRP0486		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous
ProALT-404	Pahs	Matthew	CCLRP0048		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-405	Schmit	John	CCLRP0762		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-406	Greene	David	CCLRP0893		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProALT-407	Walsh	Agnes	CCLRP0265		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-408	Bailey	Kevin L.	CCLRP0324		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-409	Dubois	Josh	CCLRP0002		11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
ProALT-410	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895	Citizens for Effective Transit	1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProALT-411	Thormodsgar	diane	CCLRP0083		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-412	Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
ProALT-413	Snyder	John	CCLRP0162		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-414	Rockstad	Karen	CCLRP0217		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-415	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-416	Roth	Ben	CCLRP0251		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-417	Ireland	Amy	CCLRP0824		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-418	Fellman	Lance	CCLRP0623		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-419	Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0807		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-420	Smith	Alphonsine	CCLRP0005		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
ProALT-421	Mcmahon	David	CCLRP0411	Ecolab	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-422	Hilleman	Monte	CCLRP0868	St. Paul Port Authority	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-423	Flood	Patrick	CCLRP0521		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-424	Bjornstad	Stacy	CCLRP0205		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-425	Hames	Dan	CCLRP0495		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-426	Vopatek	Caroline	CCLRP0220		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-427	Robinson	Beatrice	CCLRP0564		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-428	Walz	Joe	CCLRP0241	Northland Insurance Group	2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
ProALT-429	Guldgn	Jeff	CCLRP0052		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-430	Caso	Patience	CCLRP0829	Transit for Livable Communities	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-431	Wicht	Daniel R.	CCLRP0236		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-432	Galles	Dan	CCLRP0863		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-433	Sobiech	Richard	CCLRP0542	TKDA	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-434	Fritts	Lori	CCLRP0826		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-435	Nordenstrom	Dorothy	CCLRP0592		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-436	Markle	David	CCLRP0472		2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-437	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482	Citizens for Effective Transit	2.3	ProALT-039	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-438	Schmit	John	CCLRP0762		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProALT-439	Singleton	Connie	CCLRP0753		2.3	PlaTP-077	Alignment
ProALT-440	Schramm	Andreas	CCLRP0635		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				Minneapolis Regional Chamber of Commerce			
ProALT-441	Downey	Keith	CCLRP0749		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-442	Crain	Zach	CCLRP0877		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-443	Schmit	John	CCLRP0762		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-444	Meyer	Tara	CCLRP0504		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-445	Fernandez	Adria	CCLRP0164		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-446	Arrell	James & Nancy	CCLRP0091		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-447	Rayan	Mary and Rajen	CCLRP0080		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-448	Delavega	Bob	CCLRP0780		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-449	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-450	Spanjers	Ella	CCLRP0089		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-451	Nelson	Helen	CCLRP0604		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-452	Sullivan	Kristie D.	CCLRP0041	Securian Financial Group	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-453	Thur	Lois	CCLRP0192		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-454	Lincowski	Vi	CCLRP0622		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-455	Bernick	Herbert	CCLRP0021		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-456	Mohrbacher	Paul	CCLRP0823	Downtown District Councils	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-457	Bjornstad	Stacy	CCLRP0205		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-458	Moening	Mary Jo	CCLRP0621		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-459	Danielzuk	Steven	CCLRP0226		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
							Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
ProALT-460	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		6.1	ProALT-018	
ProALT-461	Mule	Daniel	CCLRP0595		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-462			CCLRP0026		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-463	Sparr	Peter	CCLRP0594		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-464	Kringler	Todd	CCLRP0275		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProALT-465	Thoemke	Brian	CCLRP0821	Midwest Staffing Group	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-466	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-467	Sandhei	Peder	CCLRP0306		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-468	Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003		2.3	ProALT-016	Cost Effectiveness
ProALT-469	Pena	Luis Brown	CCLRP0350		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-470	Murphy	Shaun	CCLRP0666		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				Central Corridor Partnership			
ProALT-471	Grzywinski	Joan	CCLRP0894	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-472	Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProALT-473	Gute	Mary	CCLRP0450	St. Paul Port Authority	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-474	Collins	Tom	CCLRP0856		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-475	Pahs	Matthew	CCLRP0048		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-476	Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProALT-477	Hielsberg	Thomas	CCLRP0087		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-478	Iacono	Michael	CCLRP0130		2.3	ProALT-040	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-479	Peterson	Steve	CCLRP0156		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-480	Singerhouse	Tony	CCLRP0179		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-481	Hanf	Benjamin	CCLRP0181		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-482	Sharp	Sonja	CCLRP0182		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-483	Gude	Mike	CCLRP0183		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-484	Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-485	Urman	Trevor	CCLRP0197		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-486	Hart	Sean	CCLRP0204		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-487	Beegle	Margaret	CCLRP0209		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous
ProALT-488	Roberts	Sarah	CCLRP0174	University of Minnesota Securian Trust Company	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-489	Dougherty	Bonnie	CCLRP0203		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-490	Mockovak	Paul	CCLRP0257		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-491	Inserra	Andy	CCLRP0270		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-492	Brand	Gary	CCLRP0282		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous
ProALT-493	Keena	Judith	CCLRP0342		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-494	Jefferson	Carla	CCLRP0491		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-495	Harvey	Robert	CCLRP0510		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-496	Losey	Daryl	CCLRP0555		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-497	Mulkern	Rik	CCLRP0561		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous
ProALT-498	Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003		2.3	ProALT-021	Alignment
ProALT-499	Sosniecki	Ted	CCLRP0589		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProALT-500	Popplewell	Frank	CCLRP0605		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-501	Bramlett	Derald	CCLRP0607	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-502	Schramm	Andreas	CCLRP0635	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-503	Perez	Chris	CCLRP0017	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-504	Bernick	Herbert	CCLRP0021		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-505	Thacker	Loren	CCLRP0664	Ecolab Inc., City of St. Paul District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-506	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-507	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-508	Indihar	Frank J	CCLRP0537	HealthEast Care System	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProALT-509	Lowder	Lorrie	CCLRP0845	St. Paul Port Authority	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-510	Young	Rickey	CCLRP0858		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-511	McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0878		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProALT-512	Maysack	Deborah	CCLRP0812	Arthritis Foundation	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-513	Plakut	Marvin	CCLRP0827	Episcopal Homes	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-514	Louder	Lorrie	CCLRP0438	St. Paul Port Authority	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-515	Lee	Annette	CCLRP0543	Mintahoe, Inc	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-516	Peterson	David F.	CCLRP0552	Parsons	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-517	Zee	Priscilla	CCLRP0799		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-518	Pratt	Richard	CCLRP0612		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-519	Welling	Chip	CCLRP0830		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-520	Overbye	John	CCLRP0196		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-521	Cornelius	Kristen	CCLRP0107		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-522	Carson	Marcia	CCLRP0518		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-523	Leighton	Karen	CCLRP0240	Securian Financial Group, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-524	Doyle	Brendan	CCLRP0224		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
ProALT-525	Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0783		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-526	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		2.3	ProALT-041	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-527	Gelbach	Deb	CCLRP0890		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProALT-528	Newcomb	Curtis	CCLRP0295		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-529	Staloch	Peter	CCLRP0757		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-530	Montgomery	Vince	CCLRP0847		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-531	Harriet	Harriet	CCLRP0148		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-532	Tufford	Marie	CCLRP0267		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-533	Olson	Randall	CCLRP0553	UEL (University Enterprise Laboratories, Inc)	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-534	Sperling	Amy	CCLRP0218		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-535	Mccauley	Philip	CCLRP0111		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-536	Thur	Lois	CCLRP0192	PPERRIA (Prospect park and East River Road Improvement Association)	2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-537	Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0539		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-538	Utecht	Ryan	CCLRP0570		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-539	O'Brien	Kathleen	CCLRP0437	University of Minnesota	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-540	Johnson	Grant	CCLRP0586		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-541	Singerhouse	Tony	CCLRP0179		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProALT-542	Cowles	Jay	CCLRP0756		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-543	Scurato	Francy	CCLRP0016		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-544	Inman	Karen	CCLRP0004		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-545	Szulim	David	CCLRP0315		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-546	Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180	Office of the City Council	2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-547	Honeywell	Cedar	CCLRP0266		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-548	Thera	Shawn	CCLRP0869	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-549	Gilbert	Doug	CCLRP0208		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-550	Crockett	Carol	CCLRP0253		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-551	Hennen	David	CCLRP0047		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-552	Fang	Pang	CCLRP0566		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-553	Taylor	Kris	CCLRP0875	Ecolab	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-554	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul Midway Used and Rare Books	2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-555	Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038		2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-556	Moua	Josie	CCLRP0321		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-557	Mishek	Mark	CCLRP0887	United Hospital City of Lakes Chamber of Commerce	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-558	Fischer	Sharon	CCLRP0748		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-559	Barnett	Bill	CCLRP0560		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-560	Bessette	Andy	CCLRP0551	St. Paul Travelers	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-561	Garvey	Terry	CCLRP0888		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-562	Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075		6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact
ProALT-563	Goff	Jim	CCLRP0272	J.G. Goff and Associates	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-564	Hagen	David	CCLRP0591		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-565	Sosniecki	Ted	CCLRP0589		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProALT-566	Anderson	Steve	CCLRP0347		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-567	Grotheim	Kevin	CCLRP0010		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-568	Reiling	David	CCLRP0871		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-569	Clark	Eric	CCLRP0143		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-570	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-571	Leicht	Lisa	CCLRP0494		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-572	Hokanson	Natalie	CCLRP0274		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-573	Dougherty	Bonnie	CCLRP0203	Securian Trust Company	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-574	Ireland	Mark	CCLRP0284		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-575	Smith	Ken	CCLRP0820	District Energy - St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title	
ProALT-576	Lunde	Jackie & Jeff	CCLRP0343	Subway	2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)	
ProALT-577	Yost	Linda	CCLRP0354		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-578	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		2.3	ProALT-028	Miscellaneous	
ProALT-579	Inserra	Andy	CCLRP0270		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-580	Handzija	Haris	CCLRP0334		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-581	Gatto	Pat	CCLRP0514		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-582	Singerhouse	Tony	CCLRP0179		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation	
ProALT-583	Abbey	David	CCLRP0072		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-584	Anderson	Warren	CCLRP0746		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous	
ProALT-585	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2.3	ProALT-005	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-586	Kriel	Robert	CCLRP0078	Building Owners Management Association	2.3	ProALT-042	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)	
ProALT-587	Garvey	Dyane	CCLRP0789		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-588	Cowles	Page Knudsen	CCLRP0006		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-589	White	Anne	CCLRP0459		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-590	Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0477		2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous	
ProALT-591	Kueppers	Kathy	CCLRP0593		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-593	Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0754		TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-594	Bieganek	Justin	CCLRP0305		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-595	O'Connell	Thomas	CCLRP0719		Ecolab Inc.,	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-596	Toia	Richard	CCLRP0581	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis		
ProALT-597	Murkowski	Mariss	CCLRP0175	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis		
ProALT-598	O'Hara	Laura	CCLRP0602	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis		
ProALT-599	Sheehan	Gregory M.	CCLRP0345	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project		
ProALT-600	Thorkelsen	David	CCLRP0862	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis		
ProALT-601	Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0476	2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous		
ProALT-602	Vadnais	Kathy	CCLRP0508	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis		
ProALT-603	Markle	David	CCLRP0472	2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation		
ProALT-604	Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0456	2.3	ProALT-007	Miscellaneous		
ProALT-605	Overbye	John	CCLRP0196	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis		
ProALT-606	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0776	2.3	ProALT-043	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)		
ProALT-607	Gallivan	Timothy	CCLRP0597		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-608	Zuehlke	Joshua	CCLRP0312		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-609	Blecha	Jennifer	CCLRP0634		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
ProALT-611	Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0916		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project	

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProALT-612	Lindstrom	Jonathan	CCLRP0571		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-613	Olsen	Terry	CCLRP0745		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-614	Rastegari	Holly	CCLRP0577		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-615	Lemmons	Bruce	CCLRP0020		2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-616	Reiling	David	CCLRP0871		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-617	Merrill	Michael	CCLRP0311		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-618	Harder	Terri	CCLRP0599		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-619	Guldgn	Jeff	CCLRP0052		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-620	Legi	Rickie	CCLRP0149		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-621	Shubatt	Pat	CCLRP0416	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProALT-622	Gude	Mike	CCLRP0183		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-623	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-624	Seufert	Jim	CCLRP0101		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-625	Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0054		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-626	Latta	David	CCLRP0548	US Bank	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-627	Iacono	Michael	CCLRP0130		2.3	ProALT-044	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-628	Hart	Bryan	CCLRP0328		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-629			CCLRP0287		2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-630	Rahman	Zainool	CCLRP0630		2.3	ProALT-021	Alignment
ProALT-631	Stokes	Dave	CCLRP0808	Midway Chamber of Commerce	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-632	Nedich	Biljana	CCLRP0563		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-633	Agrimson	Gerry	CCLRP0225	Minnesota Life Insurance Company, A Securian Financial Group Affiliate	2.3	ProALT-006	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProALT-634	Baker	Kay	CCLRP0881		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-635	Luries	Georgia	CCLRP0117		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-636	Jones	Preston	CCLRP0507		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-637	Buggy	Jon	CCLRP0750	Ellerbe Becket	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-638	White	Jim	CCLRP0918		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProALT-639	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProALT-640	Thormodsgar	Diane	CCLRP0763		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProFSt-001	Arth	David	CCLRP0800		8.1	ProFSt-001	Capital Funding Strategy
ProFSt-002	Buth	William	CCLRP0540	BOMA (Building Owners & Managers Association)	4.1	ProHLP-016	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title	
ProFSt-003	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	Minnesota Department of Transportation	8.1	ProFSt-003	Capital Funding Strategy	
ProFSt-004	Fritts	Lori	CCLRP0859		8.1	ProFSt-004	Capital Funding Strategy	
ProFSt-005	Dewitt	John	CCLRP0184		8.1	ProFSt-010	Capital Funding Strategy	
ProFSt-006	Keturakat	Carol	CCLRP0050		1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project	
ProFSt-007	Rogers	Patricia	CCLRP0092		8.1	ProFSt-007	Capital Funding Strategy	
ProFSt-008	Hart	Bryan	CCLRP0328		8.1	ProFSt-006	Capital Funding Strategy	
ProFSt-009	Smith	Barb	CCLRP0747		8.1	ProFSt-007	Capital Funding Strategy	
ProFSt-010	Vanderborght	W.P	CCLRP0806		8.1	ProFSt-007	Capital Funding Strategy	
ProFSt-011	Morris	David	CCLRP0836		8.1	ProFSt-008	Capital Funding Strategy	
ProFSt-012	Thormodsgar	d	Diane		CCLRP0083	8.1	ProFSt-009	Capital Funding Strategy
ProHLP-001					CCLRP0287	2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
ProHLP-002	Cox	Emily	CCLRP0738	CCLRP0738	2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota	
ProHLP-003	Buth	William	CCLRP0540	BOMA (Building Owners & Managers Association)	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment	
ProHLP-005	Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525		District Energy St. Paul	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-006	Bessette	Andy	CCLRP0551		St. Paul Travelers Midway Used and Rare	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-008	Sransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	Books	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment	
ProHLP-009	Warns	Michael D.	CCLRP0471		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment	
ProHLP-010	Mohrbacher	Paul	CCLRP0823	Downtown District Councils Equity Coalition	2.3	ProHLP-010	Stations	
ProHLP-011			CCLRP0485		3.8	ProHLP-030	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	
ProHLP-012	Pinney	Gregory	CCLRP0741		6.1	PlaTF-008	Travel Time	
ProHLP-013	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment	
ProHLP-014	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment	
ProHLP-016			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.2	EngRW-017	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections	
ProHLP-017	Booker-Butler	Glenice	CCLRP0922		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment	
ProHLP-018	Johnson	Craig	CCLRP0828		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation	
ProHLP-019	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	2.3	PlaTP-031	Alignment	
ProHLP-020	Singleton	Connie	CCLRP0931		2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota	
ProHLP-021	Mohrbacher	Paul	CCLRP0823	Downtown District Councils	2.3	ProHLP-010	Stations	
ProHLP-022	Seufert	Jim	CCLRP0101		2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota	
ProHLP-023			CCLRP0532	District 7 Planning Council	6.1	NR-014	Bus System Impact	
ProHLP-024	Stein	Eve	CCLRP0929		6.1	ProHLP-023	Transit Effects	
ProHLP-025			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.2	ProHLP-012	U of M	

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProHLP-026	Markle	David	CCLRP0752		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
ProHLP-027			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota
ProHLP-028			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProHLP-011	Stations
ProHLP-029	Wolsey	Wayne	CCLRP0430		2.3	ProHLP-024	Miscellaneous
ProHLP-030			CCLRP0280	Lexington Hamline Community Council	2.3	ProHLP-003	Stations
ProHLP-031	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	Council	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-032			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota
ProHLP-033	Rossi	Robert	CCLRP0480		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-034	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council	3.1	ProHLP-022	Impact
ProHLP-035	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council	3.1	SocLU-005	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
ProHLP-037	Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086		1	ProHLP-019	Who Will Benefit?
ProHLP-038	Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	MICAH (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	6.3	ProHLP-029	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Distance/Paths to Stations
ProHLP-041	Vetsch	Bernice	CCLRP0259		2.3	ProHLP-031	Stops
ProHLP-043	Mcgraw	Martha	CCLRP0135		2.3	ProHLP-015	Miscellaneous
ProHLP-044	Mcginto	Mike	CCLRP0919		2.3	ProHLP-015	Miscellaneous
ProHLP-045	Cobb	Martha	CCLRP0910		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
ProHLP-046	Scheller	David	CCLRP0318		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProHLP-047	Wickstrom	Doris	CCLRP0331		2.3	PlaTP-020	Stations
ProHLP-048	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
ProHLP-049	Kelliher	Mark	CCLRP0445		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProHLP-050	Benson	Marie	CCLRP0473		1	ProPURP-002	Who Will Benefit?
ProHLP-051	Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0807		2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota
ProHLP-052	Kriel	Robert	CCLRP0078		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
ProHLP-053	Johnson	Jennifer Johnson	CCLRP0714	Minnesota Public Radio	2.3	PlaTP-054	Alignment
ProHLP-054	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	3.1	ProHLP-014	Stations
ProHLP-055	Wilber	Susan	CCLRP0160	Ecolab	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProHLP-056	Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-057	Skreves	Jeff	CCLRP0915		2.3	ProHLP-015	Miscellaneous
ProHLP-058	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		1	ProHLP-019	Who Will Benefit?
ProHLP-059	Scott	Patricia	CCLRP0938		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProHLP-060	Caso	Patience	CCLRP0829	Transit for Livable Communities	2.3	ProHLP-006	Stops
ProHLP-061	Anderson	Peter	CCLRP0849		2.3	ProALT-025	Stations
ProHLP-062	Singerhouse	Tony	CCLRP0179		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
ProHLP-063	Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-064	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	2.3	ProHLP-025	Other Corridors
ProHLP-065	Bolson	Kent	CCLRP0199		3.2	ProHLP-012	U of M
ProHLP-066	Wietecki	Michael	CCLRP0451		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProHLP-067	Felien	Ed	CCLRP0809		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-068	Gundersen	Jane	CCLRP0825		2.3	PlaTP-013	Alignment
ProHLP-069	Denys	Jennifer and Carl	CCLRP0252		2.3	ProHLP-015	Miscellaneous
ProHLP-070	Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185	3.1	ProHLP-014	Stations	
ProHLP-071	Bernick	Herbert	CCLRP0021	1	ProPURP-002	Who Will Benefit?	
ProHLP-072	Kincaid	Michael	CCLRP0082	2.3	ProHLP-015	Miscellaneous	
ProHLP-073	Wright	Michael	CCLRP0914	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment	
ProHLP-074	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota
ProHLP-075	Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-076	Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0084	Pioneer Press Sports Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
ProHLP-077			CCLRP0443		5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
ProHLP-078	Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-079	Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0785	1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project	
ProHLP-080	Mohrbacher	Paul	CCLRP0823	Downtown District Councils	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-081	Felien	Ed	CCLRP0809		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-082			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota
ProHLP-083	Rogers	Patricia	CCLRP0092		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-084	Johnson	Craig	CCLRP0828		2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota
ProHLP-085			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProHLP-001	University of Minnesota
ProHLP-086	Anderson	Keith	CCLRP0898		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
ProHLP-087			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
ProHLP-088	Croft	Julie	CCLRP0930		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-089	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549	Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	ProHLP-003	Stations
ProHLP-090			CCLRP0443		5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
ProHLP-091	Larson	Cheryl	CCLRP0077	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProHLP-026	Other Corridors
ProHLP-092	Rossbach	Jack	CCLRP0913		1	ProHLP-019	Who Will Benefit?
ProHLP-093	Baker	Bob	CCLRP0822		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProHLP-094	Anonymous		CCLRP0933		6.3	PlaTF-006	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Distance/Paths to Stations
ProHLP-095	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProHLP-020	Stations
ProHLP-096	Feismia	Ann	CCLRP0030		2.3	PlaTP-021	Stations
ProHLP-097	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.6	ProHLP-027	Visual Quality and Aesthetics
ProHLP-098	Greene	David	CCLRP0631		2.3	ProHLP-010	Stations
ProHLP-099	Braun	Lois	CCLRP0074		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
ProHLP-100	Galles	Dan	CCLRP0863		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProHLP-101	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.1	ProHLP-014	Stations
ProHLP-102	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457		5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
ProHLP-103			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
ProHLP-104	Anderson	Kristyn	CCLRP0099		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProHLP-105	Cooper	Jeanne	CCLRP0874		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-106	Haben	Dave	CCLRP0248		2.3	ProHLP-015	Miscellaneous
ProHLP-107	Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0476		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProHLP-108			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.2	ProHLP-012	U of M
ProHLP-109			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	PlaTP-020	Stations
ProHLP-110			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProHLP-011	Stations
ProHLP-111	Kringler	Todd	CCLRP0275		2.3	ProHLP-021	Grade Separation
ProHLP-112	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0467		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-113			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProHLP-011	Stations
ProHLP-114	Dubois	Josh	CCLRP0002		2.3	ProHLP-006	Stops
ProHLP-115	Rossi	Robert	CCLRP0480		3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
ProHLP-116	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-117	Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086		1	ProPURP-002	Who Will Benefit?
ProHLP-118	Kane	Joe	CCLRP0029		2.3	ProHLP-028	Other Corridors
ProHLP-119	Swanholm	John	CCLRP0777	St. Joseph's Hospital	2.3	ProALT-010	Stations
ProHLP-120	Patterson	Oralee	CCLRP0866	Pilgrim Baptist Church	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-121	Beran	Matt	CCLRP0432		2.3	ProHLP-015	Miscellaneous
ProHLP-122	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProHLP-003	Stations
ProHLP-123	Robinson	Chris	CCLRP0939		2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProHLP-124	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProHLP-009	Alignment
ProPM-002	Vegas	John	CCLRP0235	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-004	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	8.1	ProPM-015	Capital Funding Strategy
ProPM-005	Vickers	Mavis	CCLRP0007		3.1	SocLU-003	Land Use
ProPM-006	Miels	Gayle	CCLRP0137		3.2	ProPM-010	Neighborhood Preservation
ProPM-007	Wiebold	Claudia	CCLRP0173	Securian Financial Group	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-008	Fuller	Jacque	CCLRP0303		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProPM-009	Herbison	Priscilla	CCLRP0096		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-010	Pasiuk	Joel	CCLRP0415		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-011	Grover	Tom	CCLRP0659	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-012	Bernick	Herbert	CCLRP0021		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-013	Kriel	Robert	CCLRP0078		2.3	PlaTP-011	Grade Separation
ProPM-014	Blissenbach	Paul	CCLRP0194		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-015	Doyle	Brendan	CCLRP0224		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-016	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		2.3	ProPM-007	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProPM-017	Burt	Jeffrey	CCLRP0637	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-018	Hartung	Jill	CCLRP0711	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-019	Kraus	Kim	CCLRP0400		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-020	Strelau	Tina	CCLRP0690	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-021	Nordby	Samuel	CCLRP0708	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-022	Berger	Robert D	CCLRP0230		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-023	Malloy	Chris	CCLRP0684	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-024	Dutton	Lisa	CCLRP0243		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-025	Johnson	Thomas	CCLRP0446		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-026	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-027	Swanson	Michael	CCLRP0388	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-028	Leighton	Karen	CCLRP0240	Securian Financial Group, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-029	Nakajima	Dianne	CCLRP0031		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProPM-030	Johnson	John G.	CCLRP0325		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-031	Jacobs	Randall	CCLRP0879		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-032	Hegdahl	Nancy	CCLRP0720	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-033	Mack	Andrea L	CCLRP0250		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-034	Schany	Alanna	CCLRP0704	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-035	Maccafferty	Siobhan	CCLRP0346		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-036	Hale	Carla	CCLRP0245	Securian Financial Group	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-037	Berg	Bara	CCLRP0941		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProPM-038	Pendelton	Adrian	CCLRP0189		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProPM-039	Berget	Ann	CCLRP0688	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-040	Mcbroom	Amy	CCLRP0365		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-041	Fiedler	William	CCLRP0722	Ecolab - GCS	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-042	Farrell	Chris	CCLRP0320		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-043			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
ProPM-044	O'Connell	Thomas	CCLRP0719	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-045	Ferguson	Jill	CCLRP0386		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-046	Pitera	Gino	CCLRP0277		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProPM-047	Ali	Abia	CCLRP0765		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-048	Schaff	Julie	CCLRP0410	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				Minneapolis Department of			
				Public Works	1	ProPM-016	Report Corrections Needed
ProPM-049	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-050	Pasiuk	Joan	CCLRP0901		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
ProPM-051	Lamb	Pat	CCLRP0152		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-052	Brezina	Nancy	CCLRP0679	Ecolab Inc.,			
				Minneapolis Department of			
				Public Works	1	ProPM-016	Report Corrections Needed
ProPM-053	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-054	Gilbertson	Judy	CCLRP0681	Ecolab	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-055	Myer	Dorothy Jean	CCLRP0936		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-056	Osborne	Shawne	CCLRP0289		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-057	Lafreniere	Susan	CCLRP0685		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-058	Poole	Jim	CCLRP0481		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-059	Mcdowell	Rob	CCLRP0279		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-060	Williams	Richard	CCLRP0151		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
ProPM-061			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
ProPM-062	Jaska	Susan	CCLRP0727	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-063	Mcmahon	David	CCLRP0411	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-064	Peterson	Hgeoffrey	CCLRP0487		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-065	Benson	Marie	CCLRP0473		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProPM-066	Hess	James	CCLRP0697	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-067	Anderson	Amy	CCLRP0340		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-068	Swanson	Katherine	CCLRP0718	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-069	Dyer	Reese	CCLRP0662	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-070	O'Brien	Keri	CCLRP0249		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-071	Hill	Brian	CCLRP0294		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-072	Gaston	Vince	CCLRP0051		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-073	Jindra	Diane	CCLRP0378	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-074	Bergman	Glenn A.	CCLRP0424	Peterson, Fram & Bergman	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-075	Delaney	Lisa	CCLRP0682	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-076	Rensvold	Ryan	CCLRP0420	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-077	Rebman	Ryan	CCLRP0422	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-078	Berthiaume	Michele	CCLRP0417		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-079	Hauenstein	Emily	CCLRP0729	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-080	Drasher	Daniel	CCLRP0414		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-081	Savino	Laurie	CCLRP0668	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-082	Dolphin	Elizabeth	CCLRP0721	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-083	Clinefelter	Megan	CCLRP0098		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProPM-084	Gerber	Nina	CCLRP0661	Ecolab Pest Elimination	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-085	Mitchell	Elaine	CCLRP0698	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-086	Daugherty	Elizabeth	CCLRP0696	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-087	Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0054		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-088	Pasiuk	Joel	CCLRP0415		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-089	Holzman	Lou	CCLRP0387	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-090	Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0484		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-091	Heelan	Rebecca G	CCLRP0019		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-092	Hunter	Coralie	CCLRP0258		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-093	Miner	Deb	CCLRP0449		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-094	Morelli	Carla A.	CCLRP0732	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				Minneapolis Department of			
ProPM-095	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Public Works	2	ProPM-017	Report Corrections Needed
ProPM-096	Hegge	Ellen	CCLRP0717	Ecolab inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-097	Coleman	William	CCLRP0144		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProPM-098	Moreau	Nicole	CCLRP0404	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-099	Peterson	Alan	CCLRP0423	The Realty Matrix, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-100	Rowley	Steve	CCLRP0656	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-101	Vono	Micah	CCLRP0366		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-102	Brandt	Jared	CCLRP0632		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				DSG (Dakota Supply			
ProPM-103	Herr	Ben	CCLRP0529	Group)	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-104	Lee	Susan	CCLRP0100		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-105	Bacigalupo	Roxanne	CCLRP0810		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-106	Dilling	Jane	CCLRP0710	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-107	Ruhr	Rick	CCLRP0626		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-108	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	4	ProPM-019	Report Corrections Needed
ProPM-109	Jarman	Jim	CCLRP0397		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-110	Valente	Brenda	CCLRP0658	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-111	Hietpas	Scott	CCLRP0700	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-112	Gilbreth	Jason	CCLRP0641	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-113	Ries	Jody	CCLRP0694	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-114	Lindh	Ruth	CCLRP0648		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-115	Dauner	Scott	CCLRP0649		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-116	Iverson	Kristi	CCLRP0683	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-117	Hoven	Ralph Van	CCLRP0376		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-118	Kline-Flores	Vicki	CCLRP0672	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-119	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	2.3	ProPM-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-120	Greene	Roger	CCLRP0872	HealthEast Care System	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-121			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	6	ProPM-021	Report Corrections Needed

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProPM-122	Yang	Pa Nhia	CCLRP0731	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-123	Zabel	Joseph	CCLRP0393	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-124	Maccafferty	Siobhan	CCLRP0346		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-125	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		6	ProPM-021	Report Corrections Needed
ProPM-126	Kalinowski	Mary	CCLRP0716	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-127	Anderson	Peter	CCLRP0849		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-128	Lemmons	Bruce	CCLRP0020		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
ProPM-129	Klein	Ellen	CCLRP0401	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-130	Reinhardt	Duane	CCLRP0418	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-131	Beyer	Chelsea	CCLRP0724	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-132	Nierowicz	Jeanne	CCLRP0403		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-133	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-134	Grunwald	Cheryl	CCLRP0358	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-135	Kennedy	Michele	CCLRP0712	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				Minneapolis Television			
ProPM-136	Akre	John	CCLRP0652	Network	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-137	Perez	Chris	CCLRP0017		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-138	Haugee	Eric	CCLRP0088		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-139	Ross	Cyndi	CCLRP0713	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				Minnesota Department of			
				Transportation			
ProPM-140	Pafo	Frank	CCLRP0436		2.3	ProPM-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-141	May	Charles	CCLRP0234		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-142	Vockrodt	Robert	CCLRP0027		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-143	Wensman	Charlie	CCLRP0644		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-144	Hadley	Linda	CCLRP0699	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-145	Lunde	Jackie & Jeff	CCLRP0343	Subway	3.1	SocLU-012	Impact
ProPM-146	Pasiuk	Joan	CCLRP0901		3.8	ProPM-014	Miscellaneous
ProPM-147	Lewis	Diana	CCLRP0409	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-148	Hauser	Julie	CCLRP0362	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-149	Lendway	Lisa	CCLRP0288		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				Minnesota Life Insurance			
				Company, A Securian			
				Financial Group Affiliate			
ProPM-150	Agrimson	Gerry	CCLRP0225		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProPM-151	Braun	Lois	CCLRP0074		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-152	Keple	Nick	CCLRP0359		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-153	Nestegard	Susan	CCLRP0382		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-154	Flint	Phillice Ann	CCLRP0131		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-155	Zieman	Brian	CCLRP0701	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-156	Clinefelter	Megan	CCLRP0098		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-157	Pierce	Alexandra	CCLRP0356		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProPM-158	Miser	Kevin	CCLRP0419		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-159	Fremder	George	CCLRP0191		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-160	Celt	Adam	CCLRP0338		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-161	Nelson	Ross	CCLRP0427		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-162	Gravelle	Theresa	CCLRP0408	Ecolab, Inc	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-163	Nelson	Julie	CCLRP0709		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-164	Pollak	Melisa	CCLRP0337		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-165	Busch	Jeff	CCLRP0692	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-166	Neo	Susan	CCLRP0723	PRC Consulting	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-167	Krumm	Kevin	CCLRP0611		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-168	Tjelta	Brenda	CCLRP0674	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-169	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		2.3	ProPM-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-170	Gilbreth	Stefanie	CCLRP0370		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-171	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProPM-172	Dyer	Reese	CCLRP0662	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-173	Jessup	Judy	CCLRP0377	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-174	Peterson	Alan	CCLRP0423	The Realty Matrix, Inc.	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-175	Close	Bob	CCLRP0260		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-176	Dutton	Lisa	CCLRP0243		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-177	Morrison	Eric	CCLRP0394		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-178	Toren	Shannon	CCLRP0663	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-179	Knutson	Jeff	CCLRP0391	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-180	Urman	Janina	CCLRP0421	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-181			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	2.3	ProPM-011	University of Minnesota
ProPM-182	Hannu	Donovan	CCLRP0308		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-183	Collins	Ben	CCLRP0647	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-184	Law	Kate	CCLRP0352	Gander Mountain	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-185	Wahi	Dinesh	CCLRP0728	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-186	Bergeson	Brooke	CCLRP0399		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-187	Arend	Chris	CCLRP0689	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-188	Jaeschke	Carl	CCLRP0678	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-189	Tippett	Roger	CCLRP0398		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-190	Pafo	Frank	CCLRP0436	Minnesota Department of Transportation	5	ProPM-020	Report Corrections Needed
ProPM-191	Swanson	Michael	CCLRP0726	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-192	Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0212	TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-193	Hammond	Mary J.	CCLRP0339		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-194	Becher	Jessica	CCLRP0702	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-195	Yang	Fue C	CCLRP0055		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProPM-196	Wichmann	Gerald	CCLRP0373	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-197	White	Chris	CCLRP0636		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-198	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0758		2.3	ProPM-001	Alternatives Analysis
				Minneapolis Department of Public Works			
ProPM-199	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457		3	ProPM-018	Report Corrections Needed
ProPM-200	Prien	Patricia	CCLRP0455		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-201	Mccumber	Julia John	CCLRP0395	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-202	Schmitz	Timothy	CCLRP0705	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-203	Guzman	Maximo	CCLRP0384	Ecolab inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-204	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		5.3	ProPM-002	Development Effects
ProPM-205			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	6	ProPM-021	Report Corrections Needed
ProPM-206	Long	Brett	CCLRP0094		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-207	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council	3	ProPM-018	Report Corrections Needed
ProPM-208	Hargens	Amy	CCLRP0633		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-209	Condon	Susan	CCLRP0695	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-210	Pennington	Joan	CCLRP0795		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-211	Marlow	James	CCLRP0369	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-212	Herman	Andrea	CCLRP0044		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-213	Haugee	Eric	CCLRP0088		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-214	Howe	Kirsten	CCLRP0157		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				University of Minnesota Medical Center, Fairview			
ProPM-215	Williams	Russ	CCLRP0172		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-216	Pauling	Steve	CCLRP0190		2.3	ProPM-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-217	Mitchell	Christopher	CCLRP0215		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-218	Dickinson	Jim	CCLRP0222		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-219	Paulson	Al	CCLRP0228		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-220	Alto	Beth	CCLRP0238	Securian Financial Group Securian Retirement	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				Services			
ProPM-221	Kinney	Mary C.	CCLRP0246		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-222	Levitt	Mark	CCLRP0293	Ecolab	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-223	Bollman	Alex	CCLRP0300		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-224	Goff	Jim	CCLRP0272	J.G. Goff and Associates	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-225	Murphy	Gary L.	CCLRP0307	Graphic Exhibits, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-226	Piotrowski	Jane	CCLRP0327		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-227	Kiihn	Ross G.	CCLRP0330		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProPM-228	Lickness	Georgia	CCLRP0335		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-229	Larson	Heidi	CCLRP0348	Goff & Howard, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-230	Vij	Lokesh	CCLRP0364		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-231	Bradway	Brian	CCLRP0371		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-232	Johnson	Karen	CCLRP0383	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProPM-233	Whaley	Caroline	CCLRP0390	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-234	Schmidt	Bruce	CCLRP0396		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-235	Mortice	Atom	CCLRP0405	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-236	Eggen	Sonya	CCLRP0412	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-237	Madden	Linda	CCLRP0629		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-238	Anderson	Ashley	CCLRP0646		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-239	Park	Rand	CCLRP0654		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-240	Park	Rand	CCLRP0654		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-241	Amon	Dennis	CCLRP0671	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-242	Flores	Teresa	CCLRP0680	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-243	Murray	Jerold	CCLRP0687	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-244	Harens	Thomas	CCLRP0273	Inventing Solutions	2.3	NR-013	Miscellaneous
ProPM-245			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.1	ProPM-013	Land Use and Socio-Economics
				Minneapolis Department of			
ProPM-246	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Public Works	2	ProPM-017	Report Corrections Needed
ProPM-247	Mallon	Cassandra	CCLRP0665	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-248	Ek	Jessica	CCLRP0413	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-249	Soni	Ravindra	CCLRP0640	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-250	Thompson	Jana	CCLRP0730	Ecolab Pest Elimination	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-251	Swentik	Raelynn	CCLRP0686	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				Citizens for Effective			
ProPM-252	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482	Transit	2.3	ProPM-012	Cost Effectiveness
ProPM-253	Casto	Jane	CCLRP0667	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-254	Bradley	Tareasa	CCLRP0389		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-255	Peterson	Dave	CCLRP0167		3.1	ProPM-009	Impact
ProPM-256	Quinlan	Michael	CCLRP0106		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-257	Porter	Matt	CCLRP0703	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-258	Martinson	Jonathan	CCLRP0323		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				Minneapolis Department of			
ProPM-259	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Public Works	4	ProPM-019	Report Corrections Needed
ProPM-260	Leung	Bibi	CCLRP0707	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-261	Naumann	Joshua	CCLRP0368	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-262	Arnold	Scott	CCLRP0650		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-263	Buchanan	Nick	CCLRP0360		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-264	Gilbert	Doug	CCLRP0208		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-265	Haugh	Scott	CCLRP0223	Securian Financial Group	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-266	Downing	Thomas	CCLRP0638	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-267	Nelson	Paul	CCLRP0857		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
ProPM-268	Blecha	Jennifer	CCLRP0634		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProPM-269	Peterson	Steve	CCLRP0156		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-270	Mullenbach	Carolyn	CCLRP0691	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-271	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		2.3	PlaTP-039	Grade Separation
ProPM-272	Meyers	Tamar	CCLRP0385		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-273	Cisdrich	Carol	CCLRP0119		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
				Nardini Fire Equipment Company, Inc.			
ProPM-274	Nardini	Tom	CCLRP0639		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-275	Anonymous	X	CCLRP0488		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
				Central Corridor Partnership			
ProPM-276	Grzywinski	Joan	CCLRP0894		2.3	NR-013	Miscellaneous
ProPM-277	Pokorny	Emmett	CCLRP0669	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-278	Maus	Lloyd	CCLRP0608		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-279	Moeller	Jim	CCLRP0281		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-280	Frederick	Brian	CCLRP0670	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
							Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
ProPM-281	Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0642		6.1	ProPM-003	
ProPM-282	Carlquist	Matthew	CCLRP0444		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-283	Au	Alan	CCLRP0380	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-284	Delegard	Virgil	CCLRP0706	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-285	Woelfel	Jerry	CCLRP0207		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-286	Orantes	Rob	CCLRP0657	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-287	Squillace	Laurie	CCLRP0673	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-288	Geurkink	Kerry	CCLRP0244		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-289	Trinkle	Elizabeth	CCLRP0693	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-290	Pieper	Catherine	CCLRP0660	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-291	Alva	Shilpa	CCLRP0645		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				Minneapolis Department of Public Works			
ProPM-292	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457		2	ProPM-017	Report Corrections Needed
ProPM-293	Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-294	Soroka	Robert	CCLRP0528	Marshall Field's	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-295	Pitzel	Eva	CCLRP0628		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-296	Campbell	Keith	CCLRP0206		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-297	Casto	Jane	CCLRP0667	Ecolab Inc.,	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPM-298	Gujral	Prabhjit	CCLRP0402		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPM-299	Grotheim	Kevin	CCLRP0010		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPM-300			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.1	ProPM-008	Impact
ProPM-301	Keturakat	Carol	CCLRP0050		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
				Minneapolis Department of Public Works			
ProPM-302	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457		2	ProPM-017	Report Corrections Needed
ProPM-303	Triviski	Mary	CCLRP0725	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProPOL-1	Caso	Patience	CCLRP0829	Transit for Livable Communities	3.2	EngCI-003	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
ProPOL-10	Melander	Harry	CCLRP0534	St Paul Building and Contraction Trades Council	11	ProPOL-007	Project Contracting
ProPOL-11			CCLRP0280	Lexington Hamline Community Council	3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
ProPOL-12	Muschler	Eric	CCLRP0042		3.1	SocLU-003	Land Use
ProPOL-13	Pasiuk	Joan	CCLRP0901		3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
ProPOL-14	Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180	Office of the City Council	3.2	EngCI-003	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
ProPOL-15	Harens	Thomas	CCLRP0273	Invention Solutions	2.3	ProALT-004	Alternatives Analysis
ProPOL-16	Sharp	Sonja	CCLRP0182		3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
ProPOL-17			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
ProPOL-18			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
ProPOL-19			CCLRP0531	Summit-University Planning Council	3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
ProPOL-2	Melander	Harry	CCLRP0832	St Paul Building and Contraction Trades Council	11	ProPOL-007	Project Contracting
ProPOL-20	Luhman	John	CCLRP0778		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPOL-21	Lee	Andrew	CCLRP0759		1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
ProPOL-22	Johns	Brian	CCLRP0102		1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project
ProPOL-23	Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180	Office of the City Council	11	ProPOL-002	Miscellaneous
ProPOL-24	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	Minnesota Department of Transportation	11	PlaTP-131	Public Comment Process
ProPOL-25	Willand	Lois	CCLRP0195		2.3	ProALT-021	Alignment
ProPOL-26	Melander	Harry	CCLRP0534	St Paul Building and Contraction Trades Council	11	ProPOL-007	Project Contracting
ProPOL-27	Mcgraw	Martha	CCLRP0135		3.2	ProPOL-004	Community Involvement
ProPOL-28	Miels	Gayle	CCLRP0137		3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
ProPOL-29	Hennen	David	CCLRP0047		3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
ProPOL-3	Gavanda	Michael	CCLRP0535	International Union of Painters & Allied Trades	11	ProPOL-007	Project Contracting
ProPOL-30	Luhman	John	CCLRP0778		11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
ProPOL-31	Pasiuk	Joan	CCLRP0901		3.2	ProPOL-004	Community Involvement
ProPOL-32	Rogers	Patricia	CCLRP0092		11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
ProPOL-33	Johnson	Carolynn	CCLRP0136		3.2	ProPOL-004	Community Involvement
ProPOL-34	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		11	PlaTP-131	Public Comment Process

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProPOL-35	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	11	PlaTP-131	Public Comment Process
ProPOL-36	Mcgraw	Martha	CCLRP0135	City of Minneapolis	3.3	ProPOL-001	Acquisitions and Displacements/Relocations
ProPOL-37	Sheehy	Lee	CCLRP0764		11	PlaTP-131	Public Comment Process
ProPOL-38	Massey	Gloria Y	CCLRP0001		3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
ProPOL-39	Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0642		1	ProPURP-011	In Favor of Project Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses
ProPOL-4	Rosenthal	Vic	CCLRP0788	Jewish Community Action Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.2	EngCI-003	
ProPOL-40	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	St Paul Building and Contraction Trades Council	11	PubPI-003	Public Comment Process
ProPOL-41	Melander	Harry	CCLRP0534	Hamline Midway Coalition	11	ProPOL-007	Project Contracting
ProPOL-42	White	Jim	CCLRP0123		11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
ProPOL-43	Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545		3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
ProPOL-44	Lund	Kristen	CCLRP0108		3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
ProPOL-5	Morris	David	CCLRP0836		3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
ProPOL-6	Gavanda Lamb-	Michael	CCLRP0535	International Union of Painters & Allied Trades	11	ProPOL-007	Project Contracting
ProPOL-7	Onayega	Angela	CCLRP0150		3.1	ProPOL-005	Impact
ProPOL-8	Melander	Harry	CCLRP0534	St Paul Building and Contraction Trades Council	11	ProPOL-007	Project Contracting
ProPOL-9	Gavanda	Michael	CCLRP0535	International Union of Painters & Allied Trades	11	ProPOL-007	Project Contracting
ProProjBdj-001	Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525	District Energy St. Paul	4.1	ProProjBdj-001	Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems
ProProjBdj-005	Cox	Emily	CCLRP0738		6.1	ProProjBdj-002	LRT System Design
ProProjBdj-006	Arth	David	CCLRP0800		10.1	ProProjBdj-006	Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
ProProjBdj-007	Khaliq	Nathaniel	CCLRP0899	NAACP - St. Paul Architect Environmental Group	3.1	ProProjBdj-004	Land Use and Socio-Economics
ProProjBdj-008	Davis	Leslie	CCLRP0761		8.1	ProProjBdj-005	Capital Funding Strategy
ProProjBdj-009	Anderson	Warren	CCLRP0746		10.1	ProProjBdj-006	Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
ProProjBdj-010	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		2.3	ProProjBdj-007	Grade Separation

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProProjBdj-011	Davis	Leslie	CCLRP0761	Architect Environmental Group	8.1	ProProjBdj-005	Capital Funding Strategy Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
ProProjBdj-013	Pinney	Gregory	CCLRP0741		10.1	ProProjBdj-008	
ProProjBdj-014	Schadauer	Mike	CCLRP0015	PPERRIA (Prospect park and East River Road Improvement Association)	2.3	ProProjBdj-007	Grade Separation Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
ProProjBdj-015	Arth	David	CCLRP0800		10.1	ProProjBdj-006	
ProProjBdj-016	Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0539		2.3	ProProjBdj-009	
ProProjBdj-017	Gude	Mike	CCLRP0183	Univeristy of Minnesota	10.1	ProProjBdj-010	University of Minnesota Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
ProProjBdj-020	Lambert	Clay	CCLRP0766		3.1	ProProjBdj-004	
ProProjBdj-021			CCLRP0443	Minnesota Life Insurance Company, A Securian Financial Group Affiliate	2.3	ProProjBdj-009	University of Minnesota Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
ProProjBdj-022	Payne	Ancil	CCLRP0906		10.1	ProProjBdj-006	
ProProjBdj-023	Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075		10.1	ProProjBdj-006	
ProProjBdj-024	Ring	Joseph	CCLRP0807	Citizens for Effective Transit	2.3	ProProjBdj-009	University of Minnesota Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
ProProjBdj-025	Agrimson	Gerry	CCLRP0225		10.1	ProProjBdj-006	
ProProjBdj-026	Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0085	St. Paul Chamber of Commerce	10.1	ProProjBdj-012	Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
ProProjBdj-027	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482		10.1	ProProjBdj-006	
ProProjBdj-028	Peng	Lesley	CCLRP0040	Securian Trust Company	6.1	ProProjBdj-013	Transit Effects Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives
ProProjBdj-029	Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075		10.1	ProProjBdj-006	
ProProjBdj-030	Dowell	Larry	CCLRP0892		10.1	ProProjBdj-014	
ProPURP-001	Dougherty	Bonnie	CCLRP0203	Ecolab Inc.,	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-002	Casto	Jane	CCLRP0667		1	PlaTP-129	
ProPURP-003	Downey	Keith	CCLRP0749	Minneapolis Regional Chamber of Commerce	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProPURP-004	Martinson	Jonathan	CCLRP0323		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-005	Hart	Bryan	CCLRP0328		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-006	Hokanson	Natalie	CCLRP0274		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-007	Bailey	Kevin L.	CCLRP0324		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-008	Luhman	John	CCLRP0778		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-009	Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-010	Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-011	Jaska	Susan	CCLRP0727	Ecolab Inc., City of Lakes Chamber of Commerce	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-012	Fischer	Sharon	CCLRP0748		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-013			CCLRP0287		2.3	ProALT-033	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)
ProPURP-014	Savino	Laurie	CCLRP0668	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-015	Walz	Joe	CCLRP0241	Northland Insurance Group	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-016	Johnson	Karen	CCLRP0383	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-017	Grunwald	Cheryl	CCLRP0358	Ecolab	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-018	Hauser	Julie	CCLRP0362	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-019	Mitchell	Elaine	CCLRP0698	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-020	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		6.2	ProPURP-006	Effects on Roadways
ProPURP-021	Drasher	Daniel	CCLRP0414		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-022	Dolphin	Elizabeth	CCLRP0721	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-023	Yang	Pa Nhia	CCLRP0731	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-024	Lindh	Ruth	CCLRP0648		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-025	Dzwonkowski	Ken	CCLRP0073		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-026	Mcbroom	Amy	CCLRP0365		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-027	Rensvold	Ryan	CCLRP0420	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-028	Moreau	Nicole	CCLRP0404	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-029	Eggen	Sonya	CCLRP0412	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-030	Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781	Transit for Livable Communities	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-031	Mccumber	Julia John	CCLRP0395	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-032			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	6.2	EngRW-017	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
ProPURP-033	Triviski	Mary	CCLRP0725	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-034	Swanson	Michael	CCLRP0388	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-035	Fremder	George	CCLRP0191		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-036	Knutson	Jeff	CCLRP0391	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-037	Brauer	George Ulrich	CCLRP0035		2.3	ProALT-029	Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProPURP-038	Anderson	Steve	CCLRP0347		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-039	Morrison	Eric	CCLRP0394		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-040	Bradway	Brian	CCLRP0371		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-041	Sommers	Joy	CCLRP0353		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-042	Buggy	Jon	CCLRP0750	Ellerbe Becket	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-043	Bieganek	Justin	CCLRP0305		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-044	Wichmann	Gerald	CCLRP0373	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				Architect Environmental Group			
ProPURP-045	Davis	Leslie	CCLRP0761		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProPURP-046	Haugen	Eunice	CCLRP0332		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-047	Foote	Dan	CCLRP0853		1	ProPURP-010	Who Will Benefit?
ProPURP-048	Anastasia	Tony	CCLRP0861		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-049	Sandhei	Peder	CCLRP0306		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-050	Whaley	Caroline	CCLRP0390	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-051	Bergman	Glenn A.	CCLRP0424	Peterson, Fram & Bergman	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-052	Woelfel	Jerry	CCLRP0207		1	ProPURP-010	Who Will Benefit?
ProPURP-053	Delegard	Virgil	CCLRP0706	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-054	Tippett	Roger	CCLRP0398		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-055	Leung	Bibi	CCLRP0707	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-056	Toren	Shannon	CCLRP0663	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-057	Mullenbach	Carolyn	CCLRP0691	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-058	Ross	Cyndi	CCLRP0713	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-059	Pasiuk	Joel	CCLRP0415		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-060	Nierowiecz	Jeanne	CCLRP0403		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-061	Delavega	Bob	CCLRP0780		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-062	Ferguson	Jill	CCLRP0386		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-063	Gujral	Prabhjit	CCLRP0402		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-064	Behnke	Brad	CCLRP0349		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-065	Casey	Sheryl	CCLRP0677	Ecolab Inc.,	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-066	Flores	Teresa	CCLRP0680	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-067	Schaff	Julie	CCLRP0410	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-068	Herman	Andrea	CCLRP0044		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-069	Jaeschke	Carl	CCLRP0678	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-070	Jindra	Diane	CCLRP0378	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-071	Meyers	Tamar	CCLRP0385		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-072	Klein	Ellen	CCLRP0401	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-073	Carlson	Sharon	CCLRP0329		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-074	Rowley	Steve	CCLRP0656	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-075	Squillace	Laurie	CCLRP0673	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProPURP-076	Hegge	Ellen	CCLRP0717	Ecolab inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-077	Kincaid	Michael	CCLRP0082		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProPURP-078	Inserra	Andy	CCLRP0270		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-079	Krumm	Kevin	CCLRP0611		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				Central Corridor			
ProPURP-080	Beeson	Rick	CCLRP0886	Partnership	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-081	Holzman	Lou	CCLRP0387	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-082	Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0785		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProPURP-083	Gaston	Vince	CCLRP0051		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-084	Porter	Matt	CCLRP0703	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-085	Collins	Ben	CCLRP0647	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-086	Shubatt	Pat	CCLRP0416	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-087	Schany	Alanna	CCLRP0704	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-088	Schmidt	Bruce	CCLRP0396		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-089	Mallon	Cassandra	CCLRP0665	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-090	Wahi	Dinesh	CCLRP0728	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-091	Grant	Sam	CCLRP0177		3.2	ProPURP-005	Community Involvement
ProPURP-092	Sharp	Sonja	CCLRP0182		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-093	Dyer	Reese	CCLRP0662	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-094	Berget	Ann	CCLRP0688	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-095	Zieman	Brian	CCLRP0701	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-096	Morelli	Carla A.	CCLRP0732	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-097	Arend	Chris	CCLRP0689	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-098	Kennedy	Michele	CCLRP0712	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-099	Larson	Heidi	CCLRP0348	Goff & Howard, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-100	Peterson	Steve	CCLRP0156		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-101	Thomas	David Evan	CCLRP0285		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-102	Trinkle	Elizabeth	CCLRP0693	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-103	Wilber	Susan	CCLRP0160	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-104	Dinkel	Billy	CCLRP0880		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-105	Frederick	Brian	CCLRP0670	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-106	Urman	Janina	CCLRP0421	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-107	Daugherty	Elizabeth	CCLRP0696	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-108	Buggy	Jon	CCLRP0750	Ellerbe Becket	1	ProPURP-012	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-109	Bradley	Tareasa	CCLRP0389		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-110	Jessup	Judy	CCLRP0377	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-111	Mishek	Mark	CCLRP0887	United Hospital	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-112	Nelson	Julie	CCLRP0709		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-113	O'Connell	Thomas	CCLRP0719	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-114	Schultz	Eleanor	CCLRP0165		1	ProPURP-002	Who Will Benefit?

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProPURP-115	Madden	Linda	CCLRP0629		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-116	Malloy	Chris	CCLRP0684	Ecolab Inc.,	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-117	Sandhei	Peder	CCLRP0306		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-118	Collins	Tom	CCLRP0856	St. Paul Port Authority	3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics
ProPURP-119	Brezina	Nancy	CCLRP0679	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				St. Paul Chamber of Commerce	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-120	Dowell	Larry	CCLRP0892	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-122	Pokorny	Emmett	CCLRP0669		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-123	Wensman	Charlie	CCLRP0644		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-124	Eckerly	Eunice	CCLRP0341		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-125	Binger	Craig	CCLRP0855	Amherst Wilder Foundation	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-126	Swentik	Raelynn	CCLRP0686	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-127	Mcmahon	David	CCLRP0411	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-128	Thompson	Jana	CCLRP0730	Ecolab Pest Elimination Nardini Fire Equipment Company, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-130	Nardini	Tom	CCLRP0639		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-131	Reinhardt	Duane	CCLRP0418	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-132	Grover	Tom	CCLRP0659	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-133	White	Jim	CCLRP0918		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
ProPURP-134	Nestegard	Susan	CCLRP0382		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-135	Hietpas	Scott	CCLRP0700	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				Securian Financial Group, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-136	Thompson	Karen	CCLRP0344		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-137	Busch	Jeff	CCLRP0692	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-138	Ruhr	Rick	CCLRP0626		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-139	Guzman	Maximo	CCLRP0384	Ecolab inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-140	Hoven	Ralph Van	CCLRP0376		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				Merriam Park Community Council	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-141	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0787	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-142	Schmitz	Timothy	CCLRP0705		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-144	Thooft	Travis	CCLRP0627		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-145	Jaska	Susan	CCLRP0727	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-146	Zabel	Joseph	CCLRP0393	Ecolab Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-147	Malloy	Chris	CCLRP0684	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-148	Bergeson	Brooke	CCLRP0399		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-149	Hegdahl	Nancy	CCLRP0720	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-150	Vido	Jose	CCLRP0276		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-151	Dauner	Scott	CCLRP0649		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-152	Johnson	Tamara	CCLRP0079		1	ProPURP-010	Who Will Benefit?

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProPURP-153	Buchanan	Nick	CCLRP0360		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				St. Paul Chamber of			
				Commerce	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-154	Dowell	Larry	CCLRP0892		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-155	Mortice	Atom	CCLRP0405	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-156	Dilling	Jane	CCLRP0710	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-157	Becher	Jessica	CCLRP0702	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-158	Lickness	Georgia	CCLRP0335		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-159	Law	Kate	CCLRP0352	Gander Mountain	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				St. Paul Chamber of			
				Commerce	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-160	Dowell	Larry	CCLRP0892		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-161	Valente	Brenda	CCLRP0658	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-162	Dolphin	Elizabeth	CCLRP0721	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-163	Hauenstein	Emily	CCLRP0729	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				The Automation Station,			
				Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-164	Turnipseed	Eric	CCLRP0351		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-165	Nordby	Samuel	CCLRP0708	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				City of Lakes Chamber of			
				Commerce	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-166	Fischer	Sharon	CCLRP0748		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-167	Quinlan	Michael	CCLRP0106		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-168	Lafreniere	Susan	CCLRP0685		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-169	Jarman	Jim	CCLRP0397		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
				St. Paul Area Council fo			
				Churches	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-170	Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779				
				Citizens for Effective			
				Transit	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-171	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0895		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-172	Kraus	Kim	CCLRP0400				
				TKDA Engineers/ Architects/ Planners	1	ProPURP-010	Who Will Benefit?
ProPURP-173	Morgan	Larry M.	CCLRP0754		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-174	Vij	Lokesh	CCLRP0364		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-175	Hokanson	Natalie	CCLRP0274		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-176	Marlow	James	CCLRP0369	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-177	Gilbreth	Jason	CCLRP0641	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-178	O'Brien	Kathleen	CCLRP0744	University of Minnesota	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-179	Au	Alan	CCLRP0380	Ecolab, Inc.	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-180	Gilbreth	Stefanie	CCLRP0370		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-181	Rebman	Ryan	CCLRP0422	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-182	Hegge	Ellen	CCLRP0717	Ecolab inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-183	Miser	Kevin	CCLRP0419		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-184	Casey	Sheryl	CCLRP0677	Ecolab Inc.,	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-185	Strelau	Tina	CCLRP0690	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProPURP-186	Ries	Jody	CCLRP0694	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-187	Hunter	Coralie	CCLRP0258		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-188	Neo	Susan	CCLRP0723	PRC Consulting	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-189	Mcdowell	Rob	CCLRP0279		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-190	Ek	Jessica	CCLRP0413	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-191	Alva	Shilpa	CCLRP0645		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-192	Fiedler	William	CCLRP0722	Ecolab - GCS	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-193	Dunne	Thomas M.	CCLRP0355	TKDA	1	ProHLP-019	Who Will Benefit?
ProPURP-194	Berthiaume	Michele	CCLRP0417		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-195	Schout	Christopher	CCLRP0304		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-196	Delaney	Lisa	CCLRP0682	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-197	Orantes	Rob	CCLRP0657	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-198	Fox	Stephanie	CCLRP0891		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-199	Keena	Judith	CCLRP0342		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-200	Sweeney	Laura	CCLRP0775		1	ProPURP-002	Who Will Benefit?
ProPURP-201	Grunwald	Cheryl	CCLRP0358	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-202	Casey	Sheryl	CCLRP0677	Ecolab Inc.,	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-203	Kline-Flores	Vicki	CCLRP0672	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-204	Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-205	Vickers	Mavis	CCLRP0007		1	ProHLP-019	Who Will Benefit?
ProPURP-206	Murray	Jerold	CCLRP0687	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-207	Naumann	Joshua	CCLRP0368	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-208	Koziol	Dale	CCLRP0392	Ecolab	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-209	Pieper	Catherine	CCLRP0660	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-210	Doyle	Brendan	CCLRP0224		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-211	Khaliq	Nathaniel	CCLRP0899	NAACP - St. Paul	1	ProPURP-002	Who Will Benefit?
ProPURP-212	Pena	Luis Brown	CCLRP0350		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-213	Dubois	Josh	CCLRP0002		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-214	XXXX	Harold	CCLRP0155		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-215	Murray	Joe	CCLRP0200	Counselor Realty Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-216	Gilbertson	Judy	CCLRP0681	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-217	Ruhr	Rick	CCLRP0626		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-218	Fritz	Lauri	CCLRP0469	Midway Chamber of Commerce	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-219	Murphy	Gary L.	CCLRP0307	Graphic Exhibits, Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-220	Burt	Jeffrey	CCLRP0637	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-221	Herbison	Priscilla	CCLRP0096		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-222	Aguiar- Downing	Thomas	CCLRP0638	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-223	Iverson	Kristi	CCLRP0683	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
ProPURP-224	Yost	Linda	CCLRP0354		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-225	Anderson	Ashley	CCLRP0646		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-226	Miller	Orlyn	CCLRP0848	University of Minnesota	11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
ProPURP-227	Auron	Matt	CCLRP0773		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-228	Sink	Jill	CCLRP0433		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-229	O'Brien	Kathleen	CCLRP0744	University of Minnesota	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-230	Amon	Dennis	CCLRP0671	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-231	Vono	Micah	CCLRP0366		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-232	Foote	Dan	CCLRP0853		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-233	Soni	Ravindra	CCLRP0640	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-234	Gravelle	Theresa	CCLRP0408	Ecolab, Inc	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-235	Handzija	Haris	CCLRP0334		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-236	Gelbach	Deb	CCLRP0890		6.3	ProPURP-003	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Distance/Paths to Stations
ProPURP-237	Tjelta	Brenda	CCLRP0674	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-238	Bergman	Glenn A.	CCLRP0424	Peterson, Fram & Bergman	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-239	Keple	Nick	CCLRP0359		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-240	Gerber	Nina	CCLRP0661	Ecolab Pest Elimination	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-241	Beyer	Chelsea	CCLRP0724	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-242	Rayan	Mary and Rajen	CCLRP0080		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-243	Hadley	Linda	CCLRP0699	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-244	Swanson	Katherine	CCLRP0718	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-245	Kalinowski	Mary	CCLRP0716	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-246	Triplett	Tom	CCLRP0336		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-247	Seabold	Jim	CCLRP0314		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-248	Abbey	David	CCLRP0072		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-249	Brandt	Jared	CCLRP0632		1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-250	Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086		6.2	ProPURP-004	Congestion
ProPURP-251	Abbey	David	CCLRP0072		1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-252	Hartung	Jill	CCLRP0711	Ecolab Inc.,	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
ProPURP-253	Robinson	Beatrice	CCLRP0564		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
ProPURP-254	Swanson	Michael	CCLRP0726	Ecolab	1	ProPURP-009	In Favor of Project
PubPI-002	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	3.2	PubPI-002	Neighborhood Preservation
PubPI-003	Warns	Benita	CCLRP0453		11	PubPI-003	Public Comment Process
PubPI-004	Cooper	Jeanne	CCLRP0874		11	PubPI-004	Public Involvement
PubPI-005	Jones	Seitu Kenneth	CCLRP0550		3.8	PubPI-005	Inclusive Community Involvement
PubPI-006	Presley	Dennis	CCLRP0884		3.8	PubPI-006	Inclusive Community Involvement
PubPI-007	W	R M	CCLRP0447		11	PubPI-004	Public Involvement
PubPI-008	Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180	Office of the City Council	11	PubPI-004	Public Involvement

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title	
PubPI-009	Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0904	Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation	3.8	PubPI-007	Inclusive Community Involvement	
PubPI-010	Cobb	Martha	CCLRP0910		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process	
PubPI-011	White	Anne	CCLRP0171		3.8	PubPI-009	Inclusive Community Involvement	
PubPI-012	White	Anne	CCLRP0171		11	PubPI-010	Public Involvement	
PubPI-013	Harriet	Harriet	CCLRP0148		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process	
PubPI-014	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549		Merriam Park Community Council	3.8	PubPI-007	Inclusive Community Involvement
PubPI-015	Leach	Betsy	CCLRP0460		Hamline Midway Coalition, District 11	3.2	PubPI-011	Community Involvement
PubPI-016	Klingel	Todd	CCLRP0760		Minneapolis Regional Chamber of Commerce	11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
PubPI-017			CCLRP0532		District 7 Planning Council	3.2	PubPI-046	Community Involvement
PubPI-018	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271			11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
PubPI-019	Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086			11	PubPI-012	Information Availability
PubPI-020	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407		City of St. Paul District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	3.2	PubPI-011	Community Involvement
PubPI-021	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178			3.2	PubPI-013	Community Involvement
PubPI-022	Heelan	Rebecca G	CCLRP0019		11	PubPI-004	Public Involvement	
PubPI-023	Thao	Pen	CCLRP0935		3.2	PubPI-014	Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses	
PubPI-024	Gude	Mike	CCLRP0183		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process	
PubPI-025	White	Anne	CCLRP0171		3.8	PubPI-007	Inclusive Community Involvement	
PubPI-026	Scott	Patricia	CCLRP0938		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process	
PubPI-027	Robinson	Chris	CCLRP0939		11	PubPI-015	Public Comment Process	
PubPI-028	Lorence	Rebekah	CCLRP0090		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process	
PubPI-029	Goff	Phyllis	CCLRP0782		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process	
PubPI-030	White	Anne	CCLRP0171		3.8	PubPI-009	Inclusive Community Involvement	
PubPI-031	White	Anne	CCLRP0171		3.2	PubPI-016	Community Involvement	
PubPI-032	Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470		11	PubPI-017	Public Involvement	
PubPI-033	Khaliq	Nathaniel	CCLRP0899	NAACP - St. Paul	2.3	PubPI-018	Alignment	
PubPI-034	Warns	Michael D.	CCLRP0471		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process	
PubPI-035			CCLRP0531	Summit-University Planning Council	3.2	PubPI-002	Neighborhood Preservation	
PubPI-036	Nakajima	Dianne	CCLRP0031		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process	
PubPI-037	Pasiuk	Dave	CCLRP0897		3.2	PubPI-011	Community Involvement	

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
PubPI-038	Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	3.2	PubPI-019	Community Involvement
PubPI-039	Senkler	Charles	CCLRP0278		3.2	PubPI-020	Community Involvement
PubPI-040	Crain	Zach	CCLRP0877		11	PubPI-004	Public Involvement
PubPI-041	Simonson	Kari	CCLRP0075		11	PubPI-015	Public Comment Process
PubPI-042	Lamberton	Abigail	CCLRP0039		3.2	PubPI-020	Community Involvement
				District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls			
PubPI-043	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0458		3.8	PubPI-007	Inclusive Community Involvement
PubPI-044	Grant	Sam	CCLRP0177		11	PubPI-022	Public Comment Process
PubPI-045	Banks	Roger	CCLRP0801		11	PubPI-023	Information Availability
PubPI-046	Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	Hamline Midway Coalition Merriam Park Community Council	3.2	PubPI-024	Community Involvement
PubPI-047	Heiland	Theresa	CCLRP0462		3.2	PubPI-011	Community Involvement
PubPI-048	Owens	Gerry	CCLRP0142		3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
PubPI-049	Alexander	Anita	CCLRP0086		3.2	PubPI-026	Community Involvement
				Central Corridor Partnership Merriam Park Community Council			
PubPI-050	Grzywinski	Joan	CCLRP0894		11	PubPI-027	Public Involvement
PubPI-051	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0787		3.2	PubPI-028	Community Involvement
PubPI-052	White	Anne	CCLRP0171		3.8	PubPI-009	Inclusive Community Involvement
PubPI-053	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	11	PubPI-027	Public Involvement
PubPI-054	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	3.2	PubPI-029	Community Involvement
PubPI-055	Harens	Thomas	CCLRP0273	Inventiong Solutions	11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
PubPI-056	Goldstein	Janice	CCLRP0043		3.2	PubPI-030	Community Involvement
PubPI-057	Strom	Vernon	CCLRP0774		11	PubPI-031	Information Availability
PubPI-058	Jones	Carl	CCLRP0452		11	PubPI-015	Public Comment Process
PubPI-059	White	Anne	CCLRP0459		3.2	PubPI-032	Community Involvement
PubPI-060	Skreves	Jeff	CCLRP0915		3.2	PubPI-011	Community Involvement
PubPI-061	Yang	Teng	CCLRP0058		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
PubPI-062	Kue	Saeng	CCLRP0794		3.8	PubPI-033	Inclusive Community Involvement Coordinate with Other Community Plans
PubPI-063	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council MICAH (Metropolitan Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	3.1	PubPI-034	
PubPI-064	Ruzza	John R.	CCLRP0523		3.2	PubPI-035	Community Involvement
PubPI-065	Lee	Choua	CCLRP0934		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
PubPI-067	White	Anne	CCLRP0171		3.2	PubPI-011	Community Involvement

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
PubPI-068	Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	MICAH (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	3.2	PubPI-036	Community Involvement
PubPI-069			CCLRP0532	District 7 Planning Council	11	PubPI-037	Information Availability
PubPI-070	Hruby	Maryanne	CCLRP0063		2.3	PubPI-018	Alignment
PubPI-071	Fuller	Jeffrey S.	CCLRP0105		11	PubPI-015	Public Comment Process
PubPI-072	Warns	Benita	CCLRP0453		11	PubPI-015	Public Comment Process
PubPI-073	Goldstein	Janice	CCLRP0043		11	PubPI-039	Public Involvement
PubPI-074	Strom	Vernon	CCLRP0774		11	PubPI-031	Information Availability
PubPI-075	Banks	Roger	CCLRP0801		11	PubPI-041	Information Availability
PubPI-076	Paulson	Al	CCLRP0228		3.2	PubPI-042	Community Involvement
PubPI-077	Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
PubPI-078	Lee	Choua	CCLRP0934		3.2	PubPI-020	Community Involvement
PubPI-079	Hennen	David	CCLRP0133		11	PubPI-043	Public Comment Process
PubPI-080			CCLRP0280	Lexington Hamline Community Council	3.2	PubPI-036	Community Involvement
PubPI-081	Caso	Patience	CCLRP0829	Transit for Livable Communities	3.2	PubPI-011	Community Involvement
PubPI-082	Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	MICAH (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	11	PubPI-044	Public Comment Process
PubPI-083	Lee	Boa	CCLRP0463	District 7 Planning Council	11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
PubPI-084			CCLRP0298		11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
PubPI-085	White	Anne	CCLRP0171		3.1	PubPI-045	Coordinate with Other Community Plans
PubPI-086	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0907	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	3.8	PubPI-007	Inclusive Community Involvement
PubPI-087	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	11	PubPI-008	Public Comment Process
SocCR-001	Jones	Seitu Kenneth	CCLRP0550		3.8	SocEJ-019	Contracting
SocCR-003	Felien	Ed	CCLRP0809		3.8	SocEJ-005	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
SocCR-007	Caso	Patience	CCLRP0829	Transit for Livable Communities	3.8	SocEJ-005	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
SocCR-2	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.4	SocCR-001	Cultural Resources
SocCR-5	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.4	SocCR-001	Cultural Resources

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
SocCR-6			CCLRP0531	Summit-University Planning Council	3.4	SocCR-002	Cultural Resources
SocEE-1	Leighton	Karen	CCLRP0240	Securian Financial Group, Inc.	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
SocEE-10	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		2.3	ProALT-004	Alternatives Analysis
SocEE-11	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council	4.2	SocEE-006	Water Resources
SocEE-12	Larson	Cheryl	CCLRP0077	Metropolitan Council	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
SocEE-13	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435		4.2	SocEE-006	Water Resources
SocEE-14	Everett	Leslie	CCLRP0193	St. Paul Port Authority	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
SocEE-15	Collins	Tom	CCLRP0856		4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
SocEE-16	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475	The Realty Matrix, Inc.	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
SocEE-17	Fritz	Bev	CCLRP0028		4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
SocEE-18	Peterson	Alan	CCLRP0423	Metropolitan Council	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
SocEE-19	Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166		4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
SocEE-2	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council	4.2	SocEE-002	Water Resources
SocEE-20	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council	4.2	EngUT-004	Water Resources
SocEE-21	Dzwonkowski	Ken	CCLRP0073	Living Portraits	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
SocEE-22	Luepker	Ellen	CCLRP0071		4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
SocEE-23	Sheehan	Gregory M.	CCLRP0345	Ellerbe Becket	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
SocEE-24	Buggy	Jon	CCLRP0750		4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
SocEE-3	Montgomery	Vince	CCLRP0847	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	1	EngTI-003	In Favor of Project
SocEE-4	Keturakat	Carol	CCLRP0050		4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
SocEE-5	Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	Central Corridor Partnership	4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
SocEE-6	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
SocEE-7	Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166	Building Owners Management Association	6.2	SocEE-004	Congestion
SocEE-8	Grzywinski	Joan	CCLRP0894		4	SocEE-001	Environmental Effects
SocEE-9	Robinson	Chris	CCLRP0940	Central Corridor Partnership	4	SocEE-003	Environmental Effects
SocEJ-002	Garvey	Dyane	CCLRP0789	Building Owners Management Association	3.8	SocEJ-001	Businesses
SocEJ-003	Burt	Veronica	CCLRP0902	Central Corridor Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-001	Businesses
SocEJ-004			CCLRP0280	Lexington Hamline Community Council	3.8	SocEJ-001	Businesses
SocEJ-005	Kue	Saeng	CCLRP0794	MICAH (Metropolitan Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	3.8	SocEJ-001	Businesses
SocEJ-006	Ruzza	John R.	CCLRP0523		3.8	SocEJ-001	Businesses

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
SocEJ-007	Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470		3.8	SocEJ-027	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
SocEJ-008	Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003		3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
SocEJ-009	Poole	Jim	CCLRP0481		3.8	SocEJ-001	Businesses
SocEJ-010			CCLRP0532	District 7 Planning Council Building Owners	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocEJ-011	Garvey	Dyane	CCLRP0789	Management Association	3.8	SocEJ-005	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
SocEJ-012	Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0642	Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood	3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
SocEJ-013	Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0522	Development Corporation	3.8	SocEJ-004	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
SocEJ-014	Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470	Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood	3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
SocEJ-015	Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0522	Development Corporation Minnesota Department of Transportation	3.8	SocEJ-004	Impacts and Mitigation Measures Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocEJ-016	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436		6.3	EngBP-001	
SocEJ-017	Warns	Michael D.	CCLRP0471	Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood	3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
SocEJ-018	Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0522	Development Corporation Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood	3.8	SocEJ-004	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
SocEJ-019	Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0522	Development Corporation	3.8	SocEJ-004	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
SocEJ-020	Massey	Gloria Y	CCLRP0001	Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood	3.8	SocEJ-000	Inclusive Community Involvement
SocEJ-021	Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0522	Development Corporation	3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-022	Smith	Alphonsine	CCLRP0005		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-023			CCLRP0532	District 7 Planning Council	3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-024	Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	Hamline Midway Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-025	Schultz	Eleanor	CCLRP0165		3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
SocEJ-026	Booker-Butler	Glenice	CCLRP0922		3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-027			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-009	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-028	Kingston	Tom	CCLRP0771	Wilder Foundation Twin Cities Habitat for Humanity	3.8	SocEJ-000	Inclusive Community Involvement
SocEJ-029	Haigh	Sue	CCLRP0909		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-030	Presley	Dennis	CCLRP0884		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-031	Goldstein	Janice	CCLRP0043		3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
SocEJ-032	Reynolds	Betty	CCLRP0116		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocEJ-033			CCLRP0298		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocEJ-034	Colvin	Gloria	CCLRP0129		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocEJ-035			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-036	Smith	Barb	CCLRP0747		3.8	SocEJ-000	Inclusive Community Involvement Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
SocEJ-037	Presley	Dennis	CCLRP0884		3.8	SocEJ-013	
SocEJ-038	Ruzza	John R.	CCLRP0523	MICAH (Metropolitan Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing) District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-039	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0458		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
SocEJ-040	Grant	Sam	CCLRP0177		3.8	SocEJ-013	Corrections
SocEJ-041	Lund	Kristen	CCLRP0108		3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
SocEJ-042			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-043	Anderson-Howze	Rossie	CCLRP0882	Pilgrim Baptist Church	3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-044	Inman	Karen	CCLRP0004		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-045	Grant	Sam	CCLRP0177		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-046	Cooper	Jeanne	CCLRP0874		3.8	SocEJ-024	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
SocEJ-047	Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	MICAH (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-048	Matthews	Delores	CCLRP0867	Pilgrim Baptist Church	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocEJ-049	Williams	Richard	CCLRP0151		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocEJ-050	Mattila	Laurie	CCLRP0033		3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
SocEJ-051	Matthews	Delores	CCLRP0867	Pilgrim Baptist Church	3.8	SocEJ-024	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
SocEJ-052	Burt	Veronica	CCLRP0468	Central Corridor Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-012	Inclusive Community Involvement
SocEJ-053	Rosenthal	Vic	CCLRP0788	Jewish Community Action	3.8	SocEJ-008	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-054	Levin	Margaret	CCLRP0816	Jewish Community Action	3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
SocEJ-055	Rosenthal	Vic	CCLRP0788	Jewish Community Action Hamline Midway Coalition,	3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-056	Leach	Betsy	CCLRP0460	District 11	3.8	SocEJ-023	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-057	Rice	Rebecca	CCLRP0140		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-058			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-022	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
SocEJ-059	Kingston	Tom	CCLRP0771	Wilder Foundation MICAH (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	3.8	SocEJ-000	Inclusive Community Involvement
SocEJ-060	Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524		3.8	SocEJ-028	Environmental Justice
SocEJ-061	Inman	Karen	CCLRP0004		3.8	SocEJ-011	Inclusive Community Involvement
SocEJ-062	Burt	Veronica	CCLRP0902	Central Corridor Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-063	Levin	Margaret	CCLRP0816	Jewish Community Action	3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-064			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-065			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-066	Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-067	Presley	Dennis	CCLRP0884		3.8	SocEJ-000	Inclusive Community Involvement
SocEJ-068	Wallace	Julia	CCLRP0751		3.8	SocEJ-000	Inclusive Community Involvement
SocEJ-069	Patterson	Oralee	CCLRP0866	Pilgrim Baptist Church	3.8	SocEJ-027	Impacts and Mitigation Measures Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
SocEJ-070	Presley	Dennis	CCLRP0884		3.8	SocEJ-021	Corrections
SocEJ-071	Miels	Gayle	CCLRP0137		3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-072	Bruin	Marilyn	CCLRP0134		3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-073	Owens	Gerry	CCLRP0142		3.8	SocEJ-000	Inclusive Community Involvement
SocEJ-074	Pry	Arthur	CCLRP0138		3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-075	Vickers	Mavis	CCLRP0007		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-076	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocEJ-077	Alger	Stuart	CCLRP0923		3.8	ProHLP-030	Impacts and Mitigation Measures Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
SocEJ-078			CCLRP0280	Lexington Hamline Community Council	3.8	SocEJ-013	Corrections
SocEJ-079	Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-080	Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-081	Scott	Patricia	CCLRP0938		3.8	SocEJ-027	Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
SocEJ-082	Mattlin	Rev. Margaret	CCLRP0109		3.8	SocEJ-017	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-083	Mattession	Paul	CCLRP0850		3.8	SocEJ-008	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-084	Anonymous	X	CCLRP0489		3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-085	Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185		3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-086	Bowron	Alice	CCLRP0095		3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
SocEJ-087	Sear	Esther	CCLRP0114		3.8	SocEJ-006	Miscellaneous
				Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation			
SocEJ-088	Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0904		3.8	SocEJ-012	Inclusive Community Involvement Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
SocEJ-089	Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470		3.8	SocEJ-015	
SocEJ-090			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-091			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-011	Inclusive Community Involvement
SocEJ-092	Bexell	Luther	CCLRP0798		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-093	Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-094	Greene	David	CCLRP0032		3.8	SocEJ-010	Affordable Housing
				Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation			
SocEJ-095	Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0522		3.8	SocEJ-001	Businesses
SocEJ-096	Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166		3.8	SocEJ-000	Inclusive Community Involvement
SocEJ-097	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	3.8	SocEJ-002	Affordable Housing
SocEJ-098			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-000	Inclusive Community Involvement
SocEU-1	Shallcross	Gary	CCLRP0916		4.11	SocEU-002	Energy
				Minneapolis Department of Public Works			
SocEU-10	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
				Minneapolis Television Network			
SocEU-11	Akre	John	CCLRP0652		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
SocEU-12	Dutton	Lisa	CCLRP0243		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
SocEU-13	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		4.11	SocEU-003	Energy
SocEU-14	Gitis	Sheldon	CCLRP0271		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
SocEU-15	Hart	Sean	CCLRP0204		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
SocEU-16	Rydaker	Anders	CCLRP0525		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
				District Energy St. Paul City of Lakes Chamber of Commerce			
SocEU-17	Fischer	Sharon	CCLRP0748		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
				Northland Insurance Group			
SocEU-3	Walz	Joe	CCLRP0241		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
SocEU-4	Morrison	Eric	CCLRP0394		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
SocEU-5	Nelson	Paul	CCLRP0857		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
SocEU-6	Crain	Zach	CCLRP0877		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
SocEU-7	Cowles	Page Knudsen	CCLRP0006		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
SocEU-8	Prien	Patricia	CCLRP0455		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
SocEU-9	Lee	Susan	CCLRP0100		4.11	SocEU-001	Energy
SocHI-1	McNally	Leslie	CCLRP0878		3.4	SocHI-001	Cultural Resources
SocHI-2	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.4	SocHI-002	Cultural Resources
SocHI-3	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	3.4	SocHI-001	Cultural Resources
SocHI-4	Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	City of St. Paul	3.4	SocHI-003	Cultural Resources
SocHI-5	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	3.4	SocHI-004	Cultural Resources
SocHI-6	Nigoff	Mindy	CCLRP0442	National Geodetic Survey US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	3.4	SocHI-001	Cultural Resources
SocHM-1	Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	City of St. Paul	4.9	SocHM-001	Hazardous or Regulated Materials
SocHM-2	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	4.2	SocHM-002	Water Resources
SocHM-3			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	4.9	SocHM-003	Hazardous or Regulated Materials
SocHM-4	Khaliq	Nathaniel	CCLRP0899	NAACP - St. Paul	4.6	SocHM-004	Air Quality
SocHM-5	Hilleman	Monte	CCLRP0868	St. Paul Port Authority	4.9	SocHM-005	Hazardous or Regulated Materials
SocHM-6	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	4.9	SocHM-003	Hazardous or Regulated Materials
SocLU-001	Mattlin	Rev. Margaret	CCLRP0109		3.3	ProPOL-001	Acquisitions and Displacements/Relocations
SocLU-002	Cowles	Jay	CCLRP0756		3.1	SocLU-003	Land Use
SocLU-003	Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	Hamline Midway Coalition	3.1	SocLU-001	Land Use and Socio-Economics
SocLU-004	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		1	SocLU-002	In Favor of Project
SocLU-005	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	3.1	SocLU-003	Land Use
SocLU-006	Lowder	Lorrie	CCLRP0845	St. Paul Port Authority	1	SocLU-004	In Favor of Project
SocLU-007	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	3.1	SocLU-005	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
SocLU-008	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178		3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics
SocLU-009	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	3.1	SocLU-007	Land Use
SocLU-010			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota St. Anthony Park Community Council	3.1	SocLU-007	Land Use
SocLU-011	Axelson	Nina	CCLRP0786		3.1	SocLU-001	Land Use and Socio-Economics
SocLU-012	Reiling	David	CCLRP0871		3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics
SocLU-013	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council	3.1	SocLU-008	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
SocLU-014			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.1	SocLU-009	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
SocLU-015			CCLRP0280	Lexington Hamline Community Council	3.1	SocLU-010	Zoning
SocLU-016			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.1	SocLU-016	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
SocLU-017	Lund	Kristen	CCLRP0108	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics
SocLU-018	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics
SocLU-019	Booker-Butler	Glenice	CCLRP0922		3.1	SocLU-012	Impact
SocLU-020	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	3.2	SocLU-013	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
SocLU-022	Watry	Mike	CCLRP0185		3.1	SocLU-003	Land Use
SocLU-023	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.1	SocLU-014	Land Use
SocLU-024	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.1	SocLU-005	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
SocLU-025	Pflaum	Donald	CCLRP0457	Minneapolis Department of Public Works	3.1	SocLU-008	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
SocLU-027			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.1	SocLU-017	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
SocLU-028	Thorkelsen	David	CCLRP0862		3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics
SocLU-029	Ireland	Mark	CCLRP0284		3.1	SocLU-001	Land Use and Socio-Economics
SocLU-030	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		3.1	SocLU-001	Land Use and Socio-Economics
SocLU-031	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	3.1	SocLU-015	Land Use and Socio-Economics
SocLU-032	Thera	Shawn	CCLRP0869	City of St. Paul District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics
SocLU-033	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0458		3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
SocLU-034			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.1	SocLU-017	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
SocLU-035			CCLRP0443	Univeristy of Minnesota	3.1	SocLU-016	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
SocLU-036			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-017	Affordable Housing
SocLU-037	Deluca	Tim	CCLRP0842	Braun Intertec	3.1	SocLU-001	Land Use and Socio-Economics
SocLU-26	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul MICAHA (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing)	6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
SocNC-001	Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524		3.8	SocEJ-012	Inclusive Community Involvement
SocNC-002	Anonymous	X	CCLRP0489		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
SocNC-003	Rothrock	Kathleen	CCLRP0003		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title	
SocNC-004	Reuther	Terry	CCLRP0524	MICAH (Metro Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing) Equity Coalition	3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation	
SocNC-005			CCLRP0485		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion	
SocNC-006	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		3.2	SocNC-009	Neighborhood Preservation	
SocNC-007	Close	Bob	CCLRP0260		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion	
SocNC-008	Scott	Patricia	CCLRP0938		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation	
SocNC-009	Thur	Lois	CCLRP0192		3.2	SocNC-002	Community Cohesion	
SocNC-010	Presley	Nieeta	CCLRP0904		Aurora/St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation	3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
SocNC-011	Rosenthal	Vic	CCLRP0788		Jewish Community Action	3.2	SocNC-003	Community Involvement
SocNC-012	Rowley	Steve	CCLRP0656		Ecolab	1	PlaTP-129	In Favor of Project
SocNC-013	Steitz	Martin	CCLRP0166		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections	
SocNC-014			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-013		
SocNC-015	Johnson	Carolynn	CCLRP0136		3.8	SocEJ-012	Inclusive Community Involvement	
SocNC-016	Pearl	Shirley White	CCLRP0283		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation	
SocNC-017	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	3.2	SocNC-002	Community Cohesion	
SocNC-018			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition Transit for Livable Communities	3.2	SocNC-006	Neighborhood Preservation	
SocNC-019	Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion	
SocNC-020	Dubois	Josh	CCLRP0002		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion	
SocNC-021	Peng	Lesley	CCLRP0040		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion	
SocNC-022	Mattlin	Rev. Margaret	CCLRP0109		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation	
SocNC-023	Thao	Pen	CCLRP0935		3.2	SocNC-007	Community Involvement	
SocNC-024	Bruin	Marilyn	CCLRP0134		3.2	SocNC-008	Neighborhood Preservation	
SocNC-025	Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation	
SocNC-026	Matthews	Delores	CCLRP0867	Pilgrim Baptist Church	3.8	SocEJ-001	Businesses	
SocNC-027	Bruin	Marilyn	CCLRP0134		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation	
SocNC-028	W	R M	CCLRP0447		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion	
SocNC-029	Anonymous	X	CCLRP0489		3.2	SocNC-012	Neighborhood Preservation	
SocNC-030	Greene	David	CCLRP0893		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation	
SocNC-031	Bexell	Luther	CCLRP0798		3.2	SocNC-008	Neighborhood Preservation	
SocNC-032	Anderson	Amy	CCLRP0340		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion	
SocNC-033	Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation	
SocNC-034	Nelson	Helen	CCLRP0604		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
SocNC-035	Harrigan	Sandy	CCLRP0920		1	ProHLP-019	Who Will Benefit?	

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
SocNC-036	Adams	Tottiana	CCLRP0059		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-037	Wells	Mary	CCLRP0516		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-038	Gatto	Pat	CCLRP0514		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-039	Eckerly	Eunice	CCLRP0341		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-040	Moldenhauer	Stanley	CCLRP0269		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-041	Pratt	Richard	CCLRP0612		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-042	Neimeyer	Charles	CCLRP0559		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-043	Gaston	Vince	CCLRP0051		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-044	Tabrizi	Mat	CCLRP0614		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-045	Duckwall	Adam	CCLRP0585		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-046	Herman	Randy	CCLRP0254		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-047	Buchen	Daniel	CCLRP0583		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-048	Mockovak	Paul	CCLRP0257		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-049	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
SocNC-050	Lam	Leisbel	CCLRP0501		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-051	Zuehlke	Joshua	CCLRP0312		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-052	Herbison	Priscilla	CCLRP0096		3.3	SocNC-014	Displacements/Relocations
SocNC-053	Thur	Lois	CCLRP0192		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-054	Yang	Mary	CCLRP0512		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-055	Pry	Arthur	CCLRP0138		3.8	SocEJ-012	Inclusive Community Involvement
SocNC-056	German	Judy	CCLRP0497		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-057	Dennie	Janice	CCLRP0578		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-058	Toia	Richard	CCLRP0581		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-059	Graham	Teresa	CCLRP0500		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-060	Moua	Josie	CCLRP0321		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-061	Croft	Julie	CCLRP0930		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
SocNC-062	Vadnais	Kathy	CCLRP0508		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-063	Russell	Margaret	CCLRP0319		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-064	Jurgens	Andrew	CCLRP0268		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-065	Johnson	Grant	CCLRP0586		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-066	Cowles	Page Knudsen	CCLRP0006		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-067	Dixon	Caroline	CCLRP0590		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-068	Bauman	Gregory	CCLRP0255		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-069	Danielzuk	Steven	CCLRP0226		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-070	Thompson	Joan	CCLRP0769		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-071	Roach	Tammi	CCLRP0568		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-072	Honeywell	Cedar	CCLRP0266		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-073	Firebaugh	Todd	CCLRP0852	Piper Jaffray	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-074	Sabby	Dean	CCLRP0574		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
SocNC-075	Buggy	Jon	CCLRP0750	Ellerbe Becket	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-076	Diffley	Kathleen	CCLRP0214		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-077	Utecht	Ryan	CCLRP0570		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-078	Barraclough	Scott	CCLRP0617		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-079	Lincowski	Vi	CCLRP0622		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-080	Mattlin	Rev. Margaret	CCLRP0109		3.2	SocNC-021	Community Involvement
SocNC-081	Fedor	Dennis	CCLRP0219		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-082	Pinney	Gregory	CCLRP0741		2.3	SocNC-015	Grade Separation
SocNC-083	Matthews	Jeffery	CCLRP0573		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-084	Anderson-Howze	Rossie	CCLRP0882	Pilgrim Baptist Church	11	PlaTP-138	Miscellaneous
SocNC-085	Johnson	Carolynn	CCLRP0136		3.8	SocEJ-012	Inclusive Community Involvement
SocNC-086	Bush	Gale	CCLRP0601		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-087	Ireland	Mark	CCLRP0284		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-088	Popplewell	Frank	CCLRP0605		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-089	Fang	Pang	CCLRP0566		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-090	Dubois	Josh	CCLRP0002		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-091	Blustein	Maureen	CCLRP0297		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-092	Yacoub	James	CCLRP0624		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-093	Pierce	Alexandra	CCLRP0356		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-094	Saldivar	Israel	CCLRP0618		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-095	Jungwirth	David	CCLRP0620		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-096	Ewing	Dixie	CCLRP0509		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-097	Holm	Keith	CCLRP0505		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-098	Neimeyer	Jane	CCLRP0291		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-099	Crain	Zach	CCLRP0877		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-100	Malone	Raejean	CCLRP0580		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-101	Szulim	David	CCLRP0315		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-102	Hollencamp	Stephen	CCLRP0227		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-103	W	R M	CCLRP0447		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
SocNC-104			CCLRP0532	District 7 Planning Council	3.2	SocNC-008	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-105	West	Michael	CCLRP0567		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-106	O'Hara	Laura	CCLRP0602		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-107	Kueppers	Kathy	CCLRP0593		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-108	Carson	Marcia	CCLRP0518		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-109	Presley	Dennis	CCLRP0884		3.8	SocEJ-013	Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections
SocNC-110	Overbye	John	CCLRP0196		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-111	Schadegg	Mark	CCLRP0556		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
SocNC-112	Jefferson	Carla	CCLRP0491		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-113	Vanheuklom	Norene	CCLRP0596		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-114	Goldstein	Janice	CCLRP0043		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-115	Anderson	Kristyn	CCLRP0099		3.1	ProPOL-006	Land Use and Socio-Economics
SocNC-116	May	Charles	CCLRP0234		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-117	Hanson	Ryan	CCLRP0262		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-118	Mead	Shannon	CCLRP0233		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-119	Tilsen	Janie	CCLRP0576		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-120	Pedersen	Millisa	CCLRP0520		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-121	Pry	Arthur	CCLRP0138		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-122	Hermes	James	CCLRP0261		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-123	Tufford	Marie	CCLRP0267		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-124	Werner	Cindy	CCLRP0572		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-125	Bramlett	Derald	CCLRP0607		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-126	Breining	Dennis	CCLRP0322		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-127	Fellman	Lance	CCLRP0623		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-128	Goldstein	Janice	CCLRP0043		3.8	SocEJ-012	Inclusive Community Involvement
SocNC-129	Lindstrom	Jonathan	CCLRP0571		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-130	Mattesson	Paul	CCLRP0850		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-131	Huebsch	Victoria	CCLRP0579		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-132	Singh	Shakunla	CCLRP0609		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-133	Oberg	Eric	CCLRP0515		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-134	Woelfel	Jerry	CCLRP0207		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-135	Mccarty	Jack	CCLRP0625		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-136	Harvey	Gary	CCLRP0299		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-137	Schwiderski	Marijo	CCLRP0202		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-138	Geiger	Tera	CCLRP0569		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-139	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	3.2	NR-024	Community Involvement
SocNC-140	Hein	Brigitte	CCLRP0309		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-141	Moening	Mary Jo	CCLRP0621		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-142	Rastegari	Holly	CCLRP0577		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-143	Hadley	Linda	CCLRP0699	Ecolab Inc.,	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-144	Beckstrom	John	CCLRP0600		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-145	Christopherso n	Philip	CCLRP0496		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-146	Bexell	Luther	CCLRP0798		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-147	Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-148	Mule	Daniel	CCLRP0595		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-149	Chapeau	Julie	CCLRP0229		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
SocNC-150	Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-151	Piper	Cameron	CCLRP0201		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
				Midway Used and Rare Books			
SocNC-152	Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-153	Warns	Benita	CCLRP0470		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
SocNC-154	Peterson	Alan	CCLRP0423	The Realty Matrix, Inc.	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-155	Bushard	Barbara	CCLRP0211		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-156	Hennen	David	CCLRP0047		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
SocNC-157	Reiter	James	CCLRP0598		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-158	Belmonte	Joseph	CCLRP0558		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-159	Sparr	Peter	CCLRP0594		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-160	D'Entremont	Elise	CCLRP0502		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-161	Goldman	Rich	CCLRP0651		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-162	Carpenter	Kim	CCLRP0231		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-163	Hagen	David	CCLRP0591		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-164	Huynh	Nghi	CCLRP0793		3.2	SocNC-005	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-165	Schack	Sherry	CCLRP0221		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-166	Dubois	Josh	CCLRP0002		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
SocNC-167	Hanf	Benjamin	CCLRP0181		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-168	Maus	Lloyd	CCLRP0608		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-169	Ruble	Patrick	CCLRP0511		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-170	Beck	Paula	CCLRP0506		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-171	Harder	Terri	CCLRP0599		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-172	Vickers	Mavis	CCLRP0007		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
SocNC-173	Rewald	Betsy	CCLRP0557		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-174	Cobb	Martha	CCLRP0910		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
SocNC-175	Hames	Dan	CCLRP0495		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-176	Keljik	Karen	CCLRP0292		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-177	Bryski	Joseph	CCLRP0603		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-178	Lowder	Lorrie	CCLRP0845	St. Paul Port Authority	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-179			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-012	Inclusive Community Involvement
SocNC-180	Newcomb	Curtis	CCLRP0295		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-181	Johnson	Kathleen	CCLRP0503		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
							Acquisitions and
SocNC-182	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		3.3	SocNC-014	Displacements/Relocations
SocNC-183	Tivyan	Elena	CCLRP0575		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-184	Doucette	Kathleen	CCLRP0584		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-185	Frey	Brian	CCLRP0616		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-186	Hurlbut	Robert	CCLRP0242		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-187	Scheller	David	CCLRP0318		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
SocNC-188	Urman	Trevor	CCLRP0197		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-189	Maccafferty	Siobhan	CCLRP0346		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-190	Kuczaboski	Tony	CCLRP0588		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-191	Collins	Tom	CCLRP0856	St. Paul Port Authority	3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
SocNC-192	Yang	Davone	CCLRP0493		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-193	Hart	Sean	CCLRP0204		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-194	Binger	Craig	CCLRP0855	Amherst Wilder Foundation	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-195	Flood	Patrick	CCLRP0521		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-196	Nedich	Biljana	CCLRP0563		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-197	Reiling	David	CCLRP0871		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-198	Scott	Patricia	CCLRP0938		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
SocNC-199	Mensch	Mary	CCLRP0610		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-200	Walsh	Agnes	CCLRP0265		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-201	Buggy	Jon	CCLRP0750	Ellerbe Becket	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-202	Thatcher	Jennifer	CCLRP0606		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-203	Harvey	Robert	CCLRP0510		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-204	Feismia	Ann	CCLRP0030		2.3	SocNC-016	Grade Separation Impact and Mitigation for
SocNC-205	Inman	Karen	CCLRP0004		3.2	SocNC-010	Community Businesses
SocNC-206	Crockett	Carol	CCLRP0253		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-207	Sperling	Amy	CCLRP0218		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-208	Lynn	Sheri	CCLRP0103		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-209	Easton	John	CCLRP0519		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-210	Nordenstrom	Dorothy	CCLRP0592		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-211	Vanasek	Rob	CCLRP0900		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
SocNC-212	Gallivan	Timothy	CCLRP0597		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-213	White	Anne	CCLRP0171		3.2	PubPI-024	Community Involvement
SocNC-214	Horneck	Ryan	CCLRP0615		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-215	Beeson	Rick	CCLRP0886	Central Corridor Partnership	1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
SocNC-216	Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	Midway Used and Rare Books	3.8	SocEJ-007	Affordable Housing
SocNC-217	Krueger	Vicki	CCLRP0296	Minnesota Youth Symphonies	3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
SocNC-218	Remmers	Michael	CCLRP0864	North End Business Association	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-219	Smith	Alphonsine	CCLRP0005		1	PlaTP-130	Not in Favor of Project
SocNC-220	Wentzel	David	CCLRP0498		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-221	Marshall	Scott	CCLRP0587		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
SocNC-222	Murlowski	Mariss	CCLRP0175		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-223	Rasmussen	David	CCLRP0565		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-224	Jarvenpa	Alan	CCLRP0141		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
SocNC-225	Vopatek	Caroline	CCLRP0220		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-226	Jones	Preston	CCLRP0507		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-227	Barnett	Bill	CCLRP0560		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-228	Johnson	Lisa	CCLRP0210		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-229	Leicht	Lisa	CCLRP0494		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-230	Murray	Joe	CCLRP0200	Counselor Realty Inc.	2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-231	Jiruska	Jennifer	CCLRP0290		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-232	Abbott	Grant	CCLRP0779	St. Paul Area Council fo Churches	3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-233	Sheahan	Stephen	CCLRP0317		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-234	Smith	Timothy	CCLRP0619		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-235	Meyer	Tara	CCLRP0504		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-236	Gilbert	Doug	CCLRP0208		3.2	SocNC-004	Neighborhood Preservation
SocNC-237	Merrill	Michael	CCLRP0311		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-238	Wesley	Thomas	CCLRP0613		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-239	Shamrokh	Shereen	CCLRP0513		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-240	Rockstad	Karen	CCLRP0217		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-241	Losey	Daryl	CCLRP0555		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-242	Platte	Georgia	CCLRP0316		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-243	Gale	Chris	CCLRP0213		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-244	Larson	Randy	CCLRP0499		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocNC-245	Pham	Thu	CCLRP0562		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocP4-1	Vanhattum	Dave	CCLRP0781	Transit for Livable Communities	3.5	SocP4-001	Parklands and Recreation Areas
SocP4-2	Hanson	Phyllis	CCLRP0435	Metropolitan Council	3.5	SocP4-002	Parklands and Recreation Areas
SocP4-3	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	3.5	SocP4-003	Parklands and Recreation Areas
SocP4-4	Vento	Andrea	CCLRP0527	Friends of the Parks and Trails	3.5	SocP4-004	Parklands and Recreation Areas
SocP4-5	Mcgraw	Martha	CCLRP0135		3.5	SocP4-001	Parklands and Recreation Areas
SocP4-6	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0407	City of St. Paul	3.5	SocP4-005	Parklands and Recreation Areas
SocP4-7	Sheehy	Patrick	CCLRP0545	Hamline Midway Coalition	3.5	SocP4-006	Parklands and Recreation Areas
SocSC-001	Risko	Georgi	CCLRP0310		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocSC-002	Hanson	Chad	CCLRP0582		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocSC-004	Wills	Lorance	CCLRP0517		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis
SocSC-3	Benson	Marie	CCLRP0473		9	SocSC-001	Secondary and Cumulative Impacts

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title	
SocSC-5	Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	9	SocSC-002	Secondary and Cumulative Impacts	
SocSoc-001	Skreves	Jeff	CCLRP0915		3.2	SocNC-019	Neighborhood Preservation	
SocSoc-002	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406		City of St. Paul	3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion
SocSoc-003	Richter	Wayne	CCLRP0478		3.2	SocNC-001	Community Cohesion	
SocSoc-004			CCLRP0485		Equity Coalition	3.8	SocEJ-027	Impacts and Mitigation Measures
				Minneapolis Television Network				
SocSS-003	Akre	John	CCLRP0652		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
SocSS-007	Anderson	Marilyn	CCLRP0113		3.7	SocSS-002	Safety and Security	
SocSS-009	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	3.7	SocSS-003	Safety and Security	
SocSS-017	Mcgraw	Martha	CCLRP0135		3.7	SocSS-004	Safety and Security	
SocSS-018	Lamb	Pat	CCLRP0152		3.7	SocSS-003	Safety and Security	
SocSS-020	Wilson-Opaac	Cheryl	CCLRP0139		3.7	SocSS-004	Safety and Security	
SocSS-029	Geurkink	Kerry	CCLRP0244		2.3	ProALT-001	Alternatives Analysis	
SocSS-030	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	3.7	SocSS-005	Safety and Security	
SocSS-032	Bolar	Barb	CCLRP0797		3.7	SocSS-004	Safety and Security	
SocSS-034	Pendelton	Adrian	CCLRP0189		3.7	SocSS-002	Safety and Security	
				Merriam Park Community Council				
SocSS-037	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549		6.2	SocSS-006	Effects on Roadways	
SocSS-042	Alstead	Stephanie	CCLRP0484		3.7	SocSS-002	Safety and Security	
SocSS-043	Johnson	Jennifer Johnson	CCLRP0714	Minnesota Public Radio	3.7	SocSS-005	Safety and Security	
SocSS-044	Hickman	Joan	CCLRP0127		3.7	SocSS-002	Safety and Security	
SocSS-045			CCLRP0485	Equity Coalition	6.3	SocEJ-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation	
SocSS-047	Tabaka	Judy	CCLRP0122		3.7	SocSS-004	Safety and Security	
SocSS-049	Richardson	Ray	CCLRP0084	Pioneer Press Sports	3.7	SocSS-003	Safety and Security	
SocSS-054	Ward	Gilbert E	CCLRP0755		3.7	SocSS-002	Safety and Security	
							Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation	
SocSS-1	Everett	Leslie	CCLRP0068		6.3	EngBP-001	Grade Separation	
SocSS-10	Singerhouse	Tony	CCLRP0179		2.3	PlaTP-011	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation	
				Merriam Park Community Council				
SocSS-11	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549		6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation	
SocSS-12	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation	
SocSS-13	Rounds	Shawn	CCLRP0037		6.3	EngBP-011	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation	

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
SocSS-14	Lamb-Onayega	Angela	CCLRP0150		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-15	Singerhouse	Tony	CCLRP0179		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-16	Gaarder	Bruce L.	CCLRP0482	Citizens for Effective Transit	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-19	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul Merriam Park Community Council	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-2	Banas	Scott	CCLRP0549		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-21	Legi	Rickie	CCLRP0149		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-22	Markle	David	CCLRP0472		6.2	EngRW-003	Effects on Roadways
SocSS-23	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.2	EngRW-003	Effects on Roadways
SocSS-24	Hruby	Maryanne	CCLRP0063		6.3	EngBP-013	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-25	Vickers	Mavis	CCLRP0007		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-26	Schweigert	Frank	CCLRP0178	District Councils Collaborative of St Paul and Mpls	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-27	Inman	Karen	CCLRP0004		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-28	Massey	Gloria Y	CCLRP0001		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-31	Braun	Lois	CCLRP0074		6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-33	Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	6.2	EngRW-003	Effects on Roadways
SocSS-36	Frelix	Tanya	CCLRP0145		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-38	Westlake	Kenneth	CCLRP0428	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, NEPA	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-39	Clark	Eric	CCLRP0143		6.2	EngRW-011	Congestion
SocSS-4	Caso	Patience	CCLRP0829	Transit for Livable Communities	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-40	Engle	Dolores	CCLRP0263		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation

Comment Code	Last Name	First Name	Commenter Id	Representing	EIS Category	Response	Title
SocSS-41	Lee	Lisa	CCLRP0475		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-46	Khaliq	Nathaniel	CCLRP0899	NAACP - St. Paul	6.2	EngRW-011	Congestion
SocSS-48	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.2	EngRW-015	Effects on Roadways
SocSS-5	Anderson	Peter	CCLRP0849		6.2	EngRW-003	Effects on Roadways
SocSS-50	Boyle	Marge	CCLRP0132		6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-51	Pafko	Frank	CCLRP0436	Minnesota Department of Transportation	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-52	Stransky	Tom & Kathy	CCLRP0038	Midway Used and Rare Books	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-53	Anderson	Janet	CCLRP0067		6.2	EngRW-014	Congestion
SocSS-55	Montgomery	Debbie	CCLRP0180	Office of the City Council	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-56	Sear	Esther	CCLRP0114		3.7	EngBP-015	Safety and Security
SocSS-57			CCLRP0532	District 7 Planning Council	6.3	EngBP-001	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-58	Lambert	Clay	CCLRP0766		6.2	EngRW-003	Effects on Roadways
SocSS-59	Bolar	Barb	CCLRP0797		6.3	EngPG-001	Parking
SocSS-6	Rasmussen	David	CCLRP0492		6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation
SocSS-60	Madden	Mike	CCLRP0154		3.2	EngRW-016	Community Cohesion
SocSS-8	Coleman	Christopher	CCLRP0406	City of St. Paul	6.3	EngBP-018	Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation

Comments-Responses Report for the AA/DEIS

Section: 1.0 - In Favor of Project

Issue Summary EngTI-003. Project will have positive impact (89)

Comments:

(CCLRP0880) EngTI-3

St. Paul needs light rail because Minnesota and the metropolitan area has made the decision that light rail is going to be one of their options in reducing congestion and moving people.

(CCLRP0355) EngTI-4

I will not personally use the light rail for commuting to work unless the arterial transports are extensive. I'm sure it would shorten the travel time it takes for those who now take the bus from downtown Mpls. to work in St. Paul and visa versa. Also it would relieve congestion if more people consider taking advantage of the light rail system.

(CCLRP0083) EngTI-5

Light rail is essential to help address growing highway congestion and reduce air pollution.

(CCLRP0338) EngEng-6

Having a Major Universities downtown (MCTC, U of M, and St. Thomas) puts a strain on the entire freeway system surrounding downtown. The proposed central corridor would also help to alleviate the swelling traffic issue of the past 5-10 years.

(CCLRP0773) EngTI-36

It will reduce traffic.

(CCLRP0760) EngTI-42

A couple of things that have not been mentioned are the Met Council's anticipation of between 2000 and 2030 a million more people in our community or 500,000 households. If you think of the congestion we have now, what is it like when we have all those other households on the line.

(CCLRP0212) PlaTE-8

4.) Construction of an improved transit system throughout the Metro Area will increase my use of mass transit. This project needs to be viewed in the broader context of a metro-wide transportation system. Not only will it serve the transit patrons living along the alignment, but it serves as a critical rail link to the future Red Rock Commuter Rail Line to the southeast, the existing Hiawatha Light Rail Line to Minneapolis and Bloomington and the future Northstar Corridor Line to the northwest. As a southwest Woodbury resident I will use the Central Corridor and the Red Rock Corridor to link with the Metro Area. The completion of the Central Corridor together and the Red Rock Corridor will greatly improve

the transit options available to me. As I look toward senior citizen status and eventually a transit dependent lifestyle, I envision boarding the Red Rock Corridor Commuter Line near my home in Woodbury, traveling to Downtown St. Paul, transferring to the Central Corridor Light Rail Line and continuing on to either downtown Minneapolis or the Airport without the need for a car.

(CCLRP0855) PlaTE-22

Light rail will provide those we serve and our employees with an effective travel option to and from our new site and do so efficiently in a way that's consistent with good transportation and development principles.

(CCLRP0285) PlaTE-31

With the exception of three years 2002-2005, I have lived without a car in the Twin Cities. In recent years I have felt the cut-backs in bus service. The Central Corridor project would enrich my life, and I believe save the community money, not to mention being an environmentally sound choice.

(CCLRP0667) PlaTE-40

Let's get this moving! Now is the time to get light rail on track to supplement and enhance the efficiency of the automobile and bus transit currently available.

(CCLRP0409) PlaTE-45

Additionally, this extension of another leg to the greater evolving rail transit system will serve the transportation needs of many of our current employees, help us continue to attract highly talented employees in the future, as well as benefit the overall traffic situation for all of us who live and work in St. Paul and Minneapolis. Now is the time to get light rail on track to supplement and enhance the efficiency of the automobile and bus transit currently available.

Thank you for your attention to this project.

(CCLRP0909) PlaTE-51

Our offices are located in the Central Corridor. We're one block north of University Avenue. And each day families visit our office to apply to be homeowners, come and attend classes to be prepared to be successful homeowners, and they would be easily enhanced by being able to ride Light Rail Transit in the Central Corridor. I watch them juggle strollers and little kids as they come in and out of the office to classes and I think about how much easier it is to ride a light rail train with that open floor when you're navigating a stroller.

(CCLRP0088) PlaTE-53

With University Ave continuing to expand and develop, light rail makes the most sense for accommodating the projected growth and the new jobs, retail and housing that will come with it. LRT will provide a faster, more reliable connection between the two downtowns, and will allow residents along the route more transit opportunities. Also, as an avid cyclist, it will allow easier boarding for bicycles than the current bus system.

(CCLRP0323) PlaTE-54

I believe that it will be good for both our St. Paul neighborhoods and the metro area. I am not particularly concerned about its overall transportation time between the two downtowns, but am more concerned that it serve the neighborhoods that it runs through.

(CCLRP0258) PlaTE-56

LRT will function as a connector to many other neighborhoods and other transportation methods: Northstar Commuter Line, Airport to name two.

(CCLRP0274) PlaTE-57

The Twin Cities is one of the last major metro areas to implement an LRT line, but our model is proving to be one of the most efficient. It is expected the Central Corridor depends on mobility and access.

(CCLRP0847) PlaTE-75

In 1998 we were actually the first St. Paul firm to participate in the Metropass program and to date nearly 20 percent of our employees actually take advantage of this program. Transit availability is an important factor in our long-term decision to stay put in downtown.

(CCLRP0873) PlaTE-69

One is it's a great transit option for employees. We've got over 220 employees working on Rice Street right now.

(CCLRP0185) PlaTE-72

To that end, since the Hiawatha Line opened ostensibly as the beginnings of a system--indeed, one line of any transit mode doth not a system make—the Central Corridor serves as a natural extension to the rail-based trunk lines that will form the backbone of the Twin Cities Metro Transit system at large, i.e. mixed with bus, dial-a-ride, streetcar, and other multi-modal services. And therefore the line, based on the selection of technology, must adequately serve its function and resist the implication that it must be all things to all riders.

(CCLRP0278) PlaTE-73

Transportation will become in the near future the critical issue in the economic base of our city. The citizens of St. Paul will need affordable, convenient and safe transportation to function in the urban environment.

(CCLRP0643) PlaTE-80

I will ride the rail instead of driving my own car, I will save on gas and there will be less traffic.

(CCLRP0748) PlaTE-81

And as an employee of the University of St. Thomas, which has campuses in both St. Paul and Minneapolis, it means that I can easily travel between the two campuses since my boss is in St. Paul.

(CCLRP0630) PlaTE-83

W7th St has great to potential for ridership from the employments centers and events at the many entertainment centers nearby.

(CCLRP0260) PlaTE-88

Light rail on University will transform the corridor into a vital, engaging environment, less dependent on the car. Light rail will bring stability and sense of permanence to the street, and encourage a more compact, walkable development pattern. The recent debate over the suburban design of the new SuperTarget might have ended differently if light rail had been in place.

(CCLRP0668) PlaTE-91

A link between the cities will further bond them and allow for access during work hours as well as rush hour.

(CCLRP0777) PlaTE-92

So the Central Corridor Light Rail Transit will secure transit for our patients and for infrastructure which is fundamental for access to quality health care, but it will also provide options to help alleviate auto congestion, pollution, and noise on Interstate 94 and the surrounding communities.

(CCLRP0913) PlaTE-93

My great-grandfather came here around 1870. That's the time that the first electric train was put into service in this country. That technology is known for being the transportation for the first half of the 20th Century. So when I hear people say transportation for the 21st Century, I realize it's really spin for the 21st Century because it is really old technology that has been brought up so that they can get this massive transfer of money from the taxpayers to rich corporations who benefit tremendously from this.

(CCLRP0876) PlaTE-98

Having a good transportation option improves the quality of life for all residents of the Twin Cities. Having personally lived in St Louis and San Francisco, both of which have good transit systems, I found that if you build a good transit system people will use it. I'd like to give my support and the support of my family to the Central Corridor Project.

(CCLRP0891) PlaTE-104

I didn't own a car until eight years ago when I moved back to the Twin Cities and the existing mass transit in the metro area couldn't meet my needs. I look forward to a day when I'm able to ride a rail to my office, visit my clients, and go back home. I urge you to approve the Central Corridor Light Rail Transit as the preferred transit for the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0249) PlaTE-111

I live in Falcon Heights, and it would be easy for me to take a bus to the light rail line and then take the train to work in downtown St. Paul. I would be much more likely to do this than to take the bus the whole way because the trains are faster, cleaner, and much more pleasant than buses.

(CCLRP0251) PlaTE-116

It will contribute to the prosperity of the Twin Cities and improve the quality of life for those who live and/or work near the line.

(CCLRP0166) PlaTE-119

LRT service will be faster, more reliable and more convenient.

(CCLRP0240) PlaTE-122

I am in support for many reasons. I have a sister who lives in St. Paul and does not own a car. She and many others are significantly and positively impacted by effective and efficient public transportation. She has used the light rail in Minneapolis significantly however her current employment opportunities are limited to only areas she can easily reach by bus (basically downtown St. Paul).

(CCLRP0228) PlaTE-123

I believe, once past the disruption of traffic and business for some, it will benefit all the folks in the area... especially St. Paul.

(CCLRP0849) PlaTE-124

There's a benefit to Episcopal Homes, a rather large senior housing group in the area. Having a Light Rail Transit means that they could get around a whole lot better.

(CCLRP0270) PlaTE-125

Also, making Central Corridor a LRT line would begin to expand the network of rail lines, Hiawatha has shown people in the metro want to ride rail but without a comprehensive network the line will only be able to grow so much. As one who worked on that line, I can say that light rail has already shown tremendous potential and continues to do so both in the Twin Cities and in cities worldwide. To not make this corridor a rail line would be a mistake.

(CCLRP0011) PlaTE-129

The more lines become available, the more popular and effective light rail will be.

(CCLRP0194) PlaTE-130

I am excited about the prospect of being able to board the light rail line only half a mile from my home.

(CCLRP0325) PlaTE-133

I also take in a lot of sporting events at the U of M and using a light rail line for transportation would make this much easier as well. What I like most about the light rail idea is that you can always add links on as needed. I've spent some time in the Chicago area and they have a train system that connects downtown out to all the suburbs, I often refer to it as the spokes of a bicycle. The system in Chicago is an absolute treat (in my humbled opinion) compared to the system we have in the Twin Cities. Please make the dream of increased light rail a reality.

(CCLRP0063) PlaTE-139

I look forward to the day when I will not need a detailed schedule to make my way around the Twin Cities on public transit, when I can reasonably rely on dependable and frequent service to get me where I need and want to go without long transfer times.

(CCLRP0742) PlaTE-142

The success of the Hiawatha Light Rail indicates that it would decrease congestion and that many people that do not ride buses will most likely ride the light rail.

(CCLRP0664) PlaTE-145

Many of our employees use mass transit for daily commutes and this is a system that would benefit them as well. I think this would also have a positive impact on reducing traffic congestion.

Traffic congestion will only worsen with time and building a transit system will only be more expensive in later years. So, now is the time to implement this system.

(CCLRP0216) PlaTE-146

This project makes long term sense for Minnesota and Saint Paul. The light rail eases congestion and parking woes, supplements and enhances the efficiency of public and private transportation and benefits the environment.

I hope you consider my view when weighing your decision. Thank you for your time.

(CCLRP0244) PlaTE-151

I have had the opportunity to visit cities where light rail is the norm. San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington DC all make it fast and easy for people to get from point A to point B using light rail. As a visitor, I always feel that the city encourages me to move about and not be stuck in my hotel room.

(CCLRP0235) PlaTE-154

This is a very important project for the city of St. Paul and for residents of the Twin Cities. It would offer a commuting alternative to many, while reducing gas consumption, traffic and wear and tear on the roads.

(CCLRP0338) PlaTE-158

Dependable Mass transit that doesn't rely on gasoline and is not as easily impeded by heavy snow will not only help those who are dependent on mass transit to get to work each day, but ensure that tourists have a easily understandable mode of transportation.

(CCLRP0896) PlaTE-166

On a more personal level, I spent time growing up on Sherburne Avenue in the '50s at the end of the streetcar era and although I was a youngster I recall a very robust University Avenue during this period.

(CCLRP0473) PlaTE-173

I believe the benefits of rapid train transit are outweighed by the damage that the light-rail system would likely inflict on these neighborhood communities. Those who depend on public transportation to get around would either stop going anywhere (which would be sad and doesn't do the economy any good) or rely on other means like taxis (which may be too expensive an option for the poor) or friends and relatives (a possible inconvenience) to get them places.

(CCLRP0915) PlaTE-180

We need to see transportation and mobility number one or number two and we need to see communities and the environment being number one or number two

(CCLRP0339) PlaTE-185

My hope is that all of the 5 county area might someday be endowed with the light rail, but liking Minneapolis and St. Paul seems of primary importance. Not only will it allow access to businesses in both cities, but it will reduce our dependence on gas and result in better environment.

(CCLRP0868) PlaTE-187

Our goal is always to provide clean business sites that are easily accessible to St. Paul workers by public transportation. In order to ensure these sites are attractive to business, we always consider how they are or are not served by public transportation. The market dictates that successful redevelopment sites have a nearby work force that can easily get to and from work.

(CCLRP0207) PlaTE-188

I live in the city of St. Paul and believe it helps keep urban areas vital, growing and safe. LRT will help our aging population, our economic vitality, and the environment in general.

(CCLRP0270) PlaTE-192

And most importantly - we can't afford to wait any longer to get started. The metro area is decades behind already when it comes to transit and with most other major metro areas building large expansions to their rail transit systems it is time to start building this line. I hope that in just a few years I'll be able to ride the train to work in downtown St Paul.

(CCLRP0345) PlaTE-193

Ultimately, the Central Corridor LRT would become part of a fully integrated transit system in the metro area, reducing the risk of isolation from major commercial areas and allowing for freer movement of employees, citizens and customers. Also, the proposed line would likely be one of the most used LRT lines in the country - 43,000 passengers are expected to ride it on a daily basis. To that effect, LRT represents a significant step forward in improving the urban environment and assuring the long-term vitality of our community.

(CCLRP0231) PlaTE-197

Transit is no longer just about moving people from place to place. It is now about strategically transporting people to fill business needs for employees, and to foster new economic development around jobs, housing and infrastructure.

(CCLRP0648) PlaTE-199

I love using the Hiawatha line out to the airport or the Mall of America. Making this kind of convenience available between Minneapolis and St Paul would greatly enhance our appeal for tourism, conventions, educational venues, and sports events. The weather here in winter, even without the congestion on the freeways, often makes driving a car stressful and unpleasant. Once we have it, people won't know how we got along without it.

(CCLRP0383) PlaTE-113

(CCLRP0157) PlaTE-20

(CCLRP0160) PlaTE-41

(CCLRP0235) ProALT-065

(CCLRP0224) ProALT-524

Now is the time to get light rail on track to supplement and enhance the efficiency of the automobile and bus transit currently available.

(CCLRP0639) PlaTE-110

(CCLRP0335) PlaTE-126

(CCLRP0342) PlaTE-143

(CCLRP0306) PlaTE-152

(CCLRP0279) PlaTE-161

(CCLRP0205) PlaTE-165

(CCLRP0349) PlaTE-174

(CCLRP0332) PlaTE-18

(CCLRP0305) PlaTE-182

(CCLRP0352) PlaTE-190

(CCLRP0350) PlaTE-23

(CCLRP0307) PlaTE-28

(CCLRP0627) PlaTE-34

(CCLRP0334) PlaTE-43

(CCLRP0276) PlaTE-52

(CCLRP0314) PlaTE-58

(CCLRP0336) PlaTE-59

(CCLRP0351) PlaTE-71

(CCLRP0304) PlaTE-77

(CCLRP0353) PlaTE-90

(CCLRP0348) PlaTE-95

(CCLRP0347) PlaTF-12

The Twin Cities is one of the last major metro areas to implement an LRT line, but our model is proving to be one of the most efficient. It is expected the Central Corridor line will be one of the most used in the country, with 43,000 riders per day.

(CCLRP0246) PlaTE-17

(CCLRP0247) PlaTE-70

(CCLRP0083) ProALT-104

(CCLRP0231) ProALT-412

The Twin Cities is the last major metro area to implement an LRT line. Now with the developing Northstar Commuter line and potential Central Corridor, we have the makings of a fully integrated transit system for the next century.

(CCLRP0050) ProFSt-006

It would help with rising gas prices

(CCLRP0847) SocEE-3

All of the environmental impacts as identified in the Draft EIS are reasonable that you can expect with this type of project. We see that these impacts are adjacent to our building. We are prepared to accept those inconveniences as long as we can eventually benefit from this long overdue project.

Response EngTI-003. The Preferred Alternative selected is consistent with and supports the transportation goals and objectives of the Central Corridor LRT project. The Preferred Alternative will improve the transportation system by providing the Central Corridor with more travel choices and faster travel times between residential areas, major destinations, and employment centers.

Issue Summary PlaTF-003. Ridership (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0859) PlaTF-3

LRT is projected to have a higher ridership with 43,000 riders per day which is nearly twice what Hiawatha has currently for their ridership per day. BRT will require dedicated lanes and construction that is nearly as disruptive as LRT without the benefit of the economic development that we would expect from the LRT. The demand predicted for Bus Rapid Transit would make it nearly obsolete when it would be built needing buses to run every two minutes through the corridor which is physically impossible with streets like Snelling and Lexington going through University Avenue.

(CCLRP0652) PlaTF-4

I also know that the ridership of that train is much higher than the ridership of the buses that used to run on the street.

(CCLRP0756) PlaTF-8

One: Light rail provides the capacity to match the corridor's growth and transit usage. Building dedicated transit is a difficult, expensive proposition and we need to match the technology to our long-term projections for ridership. Let's build just once.

(CCLRP0787) PlaTF-9

Finally, light rail is the only alternative that can accommodate anticipated future Central Corridor ridership in 2025 and beyond.

(CCLRP0754) PlaTF-11

Also, because of the great success of Hiawatha. That had initially started out with a lot of naysayers and now it carries more people than was ever projected to carry.

Response PlaTF-003. Comment noted.

Issue Summary PlaTP-129. In Favor of Project (196)

Comments:

(CCLRP0243) PlaTE-11

As a St. Paul Midway native, I care that the vitality of this area be maintained and improved. There exist not only daily transportation needs for those living in the area, but also parking challenges for businesses. Light rail encourages people to come to the area who are not familiar with driving in the area.

(CCLRP0336) PlaTE-14

As our city develops, it is critical to have in place viable options to the personal automobile for traveling within our metro area. A comprehensive transportation plan that includes light rail is a must. Connecting our two downtowns via the University of Minnesota makes sense economically, environmentally and socially.

(CCLRP0337) PlaTE-25

I live in Minneapolis, and there are jobs that interest me in St. Paul, but I don't want to drive in traffic every day. The LRT would open up new possibilities for me.

(CCLRP0324) PlaTE-26

I live in St. Paul and currently work in downtown Minneapolis. I see the addition of light rail to the Central Corridor as the next natural expansion to the Hiawatha Line and the evolution of light rail in general in the metro. I have been riding the Hiawatha Line to meet my commuting needs in to Minneapolis and feel it is the most efficient and quickest way for me to get into and out of downtown Minneapolis when compared to riding a bus. By having a light rail option that connects St. Paul and Minneapolis, my commute will become even more efficient.

(CCLRP0771) PlaTE-27

It efficiently transports individuals from lower-income communities to the five major employment centers both downtowns, U of M, the airport, Mall of America -- and it creates an opportunity for the community to ensure that viable housing is maintained. It can be maintained along the corridor.

(CCLRP0875) PlaTE-33

Transportation is not available for many of the organizations that we support, and then in turn their clients that they represent, to get to and from where they need to be both throughout the St. Paul communities as well as getting from St. Paul to the Minneapolis area. The Central Corridor would connect the two cities, connect the downtown with University Avenue, make it much more easier for those individuals to get around.

(CCLRP0887) PlaTE-47

The proximity of the line to the University of Minnesota will provide transportation options for the numerous students, physicians, and medical research staff members who travel between the University and our hospitals and medical facilities including the University Enterprise Laboratories located near Highway 280 and University.

(CCLRP0172) PlaTE-50

Our patients, other guests, providers, employees, students and other staff face many of the same difficult transportation, parking, and access issues as others at the University. We also have particular challenges due to the nature of our multiple campuses. Our clinical services are spread out in numerous buildings on both sides of the river, and many of our patients, other guests, providers, employees, students and other staff have to travel between these sites. Easy, efficient transportation across the campuses and the Twin Cities is essential for anyone affiliated with the hospital, and I feel strongly that the LRT Central Corridor is key to improving the current challenge. My personal passion is with the experience that each of our patient's has when they come to us to receive medical care. Access to our hospital and clinics is a major frustration and problem for our patients and visitors. It is a major barrier, seriously affecting patient satisfaction and undercutting the long-term viability of our hospital and clinics. The LRT Central Corridor would provide direct access to the hospital and clinics for patients, other guests, providers, employees, students and other staff, and would help alleviate the acute access problem we face.

(CCLRP0174) PlaTE-62

I read the bizarrely short-sighted article in the Star Tribune regarding travel time between the two downtowns, and even if it is longer than the existing express buses, I suspect that the population that travels from one downtown to the other everyday is not vast. Where the Central Corridor will be the greatest asset is for the people who want to stop between the downtowns, in Midway shopping center or at the University of Minnesota. And even if I were traveling between the two downtowns, I wouldn't necessarily choose the faster mode of transportation, since I have come to rely on the Hiawatha line as more dependable, more frequent, and more comfortable than most city busses.

(CCLRP0860) PlaTE-79

I would also say on a personal level I've lived in south Minneapolis for 30 years and commuted to St. Paul back and forth and Light Rail Transit on the Central Corridor would be an excellent option that I would consider as well as meetings that I have in Minneapolis or the University area that would allow me to hop on Light Rail Transit and move back and

forth between the corporate headquarters.

(CCLRP0245) PlaTE-85

Furthermore, connecting both metro areas to the airport will benefit business travelers who usually drive their own cars or rely on shuttle-vans to transport them to/from the airport. It will also provide safe, reliable transportation for travelers visiting Minnesota to get to and from St. Paul or Minneapolis with ease and comfort.

(CCLRP0872) PlaTE-102

We have 3500 employees. We see more than 100,000 patients combined in those various sites. Those patients have family and friends that visit them as well. Clearly this is an important dimension of providing easy access to our services for what are essentially urban health care facilities.

(CCLRP0096) PlaTE-109

It will serve as a vital connection between the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

(CCLRP0748) PlaTE-141

Our faculty, staff, and students who now depend upon the University shuttle buses or their own personal transportation vehicle when traveling between the two campuses could so easily use light rail to save time and eliminate the number of vehicles on the road and in Downtown Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0891) PlaTE-144

I currently work on the Hiawatha Line and do business in Minneapolis and St. Paul. If the light rail transit were built I could visit my clients in both communities without contributing to the congestion on our highways.

(CCLRP0921) PlaTE-148

I have fibromyalgia so it's hard for me to do things like driving so I take the bus a lot. I like the bus, but I think light rail would give more opportunities to go. I take light rail, the Hiawatha Line. I'd go to the West Bank more. I'd go to Lake and 27th when I get off the 21 and shop. I go to Seward and I think I would go - I work downtown - so I would take it downtown and I would go to University and Dale and shop more if I had the opportunity for light rail because the 16's not very close to my work.

(CCLRP0185) PlaTE-149

The decision for transit enhancement between Minneapolis and St. Paul is a significant one. If done correctly, this second line of the system will likely shift public opinion even more towards an expanded multi-modal system, thereby accomplishing the greater goal of urban infill with enhanced mobility and congestion mitigation. Other "trunk lines" wait with anticipation: connecting the airport with St. Paul along the Riverview Corridor, connecting the southwest suburbs with Uptown/Downtown via the Southwest and Crosstown Corridors, etc. Bus service can then be shifted and optimized to feed these trunk lines for true intermodality, further enhancing system effectiveness and regionalized economic growth. And isn't this what it's all about?

(CCLRP0245) PlaTE-150

Currently, the majority of people drive their own cars to travel between the metropolitan areas and to/from the airport. The development of LRT will decrease congestion and create a more pleasant commute between these integral areas of the community. People will be more prone to travel to the Mpls. theater district from St. Paul knowing that they will not have to fight traffic or search for parking. In addition, St. Paul restaurants, the Ordway, RiverCentre, Science Museum and Xcel Center will benefit from travelers from Minneapolis who do not usually frequent the St. Paul area due to the lack of proper parking and general unfamiliarity with the area.

(CCLRP0346) PlaTE-153

I have always shopped in the Midway area and have seen it struggle to balance function and volume. There is a large amount of traffic in the area and it needs to function more as a place where both cars, pedestrians, and mass transit can coexist. I believe Light Rail is the way to place mass transit at the forefront and improve the midway area. Once Light Rail is added development will be spurred. People will be able to take light rail to do their grocery shopping, shop for household supplies, go to work, go out in Downtown St. Paul or Minneapolis, go to a sporting event, and many more limitless opportunities. I personally love the idea of a direct connection between the downtowns.

I love the Light Rail Line on the Hiawatha Corridor and it has definitely been a success. I ride it anytime I go to a Twins or Vikings Game it has definitely improved the experience.

(CCLRP0179) PlaTE-163

I recently have found an apartment in downtown Saint Paul, and having a rail system from the Downtown Saint Paul through the U of M into Downtown Minneapolis is a wonderful idea. It would ease my commute tremendously. Also, I do occasionally attend some night clubs in the downtown Minneapolis area, and having access to the central rail would make the trip much more easier.

(CCLRP0271) PlaTE-164

The rail corridor provides opportunities for stops at Hamline University, the U of M St. Paul Campus, and could also serve events at Midway Stadium, Como Park, and the Fairgrounds. The rail corridor also provides opportunities for river crossings at 10th Ave., the Stone Arch Bridge trolley, and Hennepin Ave.

(CCLRP0250) PlaTE-167

I grew up in St. Paul. I work in St. Paul. I am in college and occasionally take classes in Mpls. and would like to take more classes there. I also travel to Mpls for leisure activities. Sometimes I choose not to go to Mpls because of traffic concerns. I do not consider jobs in Mpls due to the traffic concerns. I would be more likely to travel to Mpls for leisure or work with my preferred mode of transportation for the Central Corridor, light rail.

(CCLRP0166) PlaTE-168

6. LRT on Central Corridor will be a convenient connection to other neighborhoods, businesses and commercial centers and will increase accessibility to jobs, services, and recreational opportunities in Minneapolis and the Northstar Corridor, connecting St. Paul directly to downtown Minneapolis, the airport, the Veteran's Center, the Mall of America, and communities through the growing northwest suburbs.

7. Central Corridor LRT will be a key link in the transit system that connects St. Paul and Minneapolis to jobs, housing and services in communities as far as St. Cloud, Eden Prairie, Hastings, and Rush City.

(CCLRP0173) PlaTE-170

LRT along University would improve transportation between our two downtowns and provide better access to the State Capitol and the Univ. of MN. And connection to the existing light rail in Mpls is most efficient. I believe LRT is the way to go.

(CCLRP0107) PlaTE-171

I have a 15 month old son and one thing I am looking forward to the most is hopping on the Light Rail and taking him to Gopher football games and Twins games - both played at an outdoor stadium the way football and baseball should be played. During the off season we will jump on the Light Rail and head down to the Science Museum or the Children's Museum.

(CCLRP0206) PlaTE-172

I work in St. Paul and have to travel to Mpls. about twice a week and have done so for over 25 years. The traffic on 94 has become almost unbearable during the 5:00 hour. If light rail was in place, I could take that and it should be faster and cheaper than driving to Mpls. Trying to find parking and paying for it has also been a jolt to anyone visiting Mpls. Without light rail to ease congestion on 94 will surely bring cries for widening 94--that will cost a chunk as well.

(CCLRP0231) PlaTE-175

LRT will connect these neighborhoods with the places we need and want to go.

(CCLRP0879) PlaTE-178

As a bus rider in Downtown St. Paul I only have a few routes to get to Minneapolis and this will help, as congestion comes along, to ease that trip going to Minneapolis to open up things like the Convention Center.

(CCLRP0024) PlaTE-189

The Twin Cities has a unique logical problem in having two city centers. Having a light rail connecting them only makes sense in improving the use of both.

(CCLRP0636) PlaTE-194

In addition to helping relieve auto congestion, pollution and noise on Interstate-94, light rail will provide much needed transit between the downtowns and the University of MN - where many students do not have cars.

(CCLRP0737) PlaTE-198

Let me give you a quick three examples of how this would make it much easier for me recently. One month ago in this very room I held a conference that had 700 people that has increased people from a national audience coming here. One week later we were in the process of raising hopefully four to \$500,000 from the medical industry and we brought in two members of the National Science Foundation, one from the FDA, and about ten companies coming in to campus. In both cases it would have been really nice to give them simple instructions to get here.

Every March we bring in 30 of the brightest students from around the country to be potential graduate students where we've offered them fellowships. It sure would have been nice not to spend \$1400 bringing them to campus, and we sure didn't show them how easy it was to get in and out of campus. My research brings me to the VA, to HCMC. It also brings me to Children's Hospital in St. Paul. These are places that are difficult to get to and just a hassle to go to that light rail could get me there.

(CCLRP0651) PlaTP-073

I am writing to you as an Anoka resident who plans on using the Northstar line and the Midway rapid transit to get to work (Snelling and University) when they are up and running.

(CCLRP0327) PlaTP-079

The Central Corridor LRT will be a key link in the transit system that connects St. Paul and Minneapolis to jobs, housing and services in communities as far away as St. Cloud, Eden Prairie, Hastings, and Rush City.

(CCLRP0484) PlaTP-100

The cost of the light rail ride is low enough that it makes financial sense to ride, particularly given the cost of parking downtown and gas. Right now a short bus ride from the Midway to Downtown St. Paul is \$2 one way during rush hour. It is almost cheaper to have a monthly parking spot in some of the lots downtown than to take the bus. It is also important so that LRT is usable to those on a tight budget. Frequency and reliability of the LRT is important. One needs to be able to get where they want to go and to be able to return home later.

(CCLRP0107) PlaTP-156

I choose to live in St. Paul because I want to live in a place that has sidewalks and front porches. Part of living in a city should be the access to a great mass transit system and Light Rail is an integral part of that system.

(CCLRP0856) PlaTP-189

We encourage businesses in our centers to hire St. Paul residents, yet nearly a third of the people living in the Central Corridor where we have three business centers do not own a car and, therefore, rely on public transportation or their own two feet to get to work. Their transportation needs will only increase. Within 10 years there will be more people relying on public transportation along the corridor than our bus system can handle.

(CCLRP0862) PlaTP-209

But with that stipulation, we should get on with it. We should build this, the second leg, in what should become a metro-wide transit system.

(CCLRP0081) PlaTP-255

I hope it will be in the center of University Avenue and will be built as quickly as possible.

(CCLRP0454) PlaTP-257

Then get the Northstar Commuter Rail, Red Rock Line, Riverview Line, etc. RUNNING for a complete transit system that Minnesotans (taxpayers) and visitors will utilize !!!!!

(CCLRP0110) ProALT-004

I would like to respectfully voice my preference for light rail in the Central Corridor. As a resident at 825 Berry Street, St. Paul, I believe light rail promises a boom in economic development in the neighborhood and a reliable, preferred method of mass transit. As your committee is aware, there are many Hiawatha light rail riders who would not ride the bus if bus transportation was the only option. I am one of these people in the Central Corridor. Several years ago, I took the bus to my job in downtown Minneapolis. I found it to be unreliable, inconvenient and dirty. I currently work just a few blocks north of the Metrodome. If a light rail line connected the Central Corridor to Downtown, I would ride the light rail rather than driving to work. I also believe the light rail line will bring economic development to the neighborhood. Just looking at the boom of new housing and retail along the Hiawatha line is a glimpse at development our neighborhood can look forward to. Already condos are popping up. If the light rail development is crushed, additional development will also be crushed. Developers will not want to invest additional resources in a neighborhood that is not transit oriented and does not have a light rail line. Some opponents argue that light rail development will force out small business. I believe mass transit will bring a flood of new consumers to the neighborhood who might never shop in the Central Corridor if light rail is not available. Who can argue against a greater number of customers? Light rail won't crush small business, it will allow small businesses to expand and grow their customer base by bringing customers to their door (and a passive audience viewing their stores as they sit on the train each day - free advertising for those businesses). Please continue to invest in this important neighborhood. Please invest in future economic development in our neighborhood. Please invest in St. Paul and connect our city to the light rail line so that we are not left out of the economic expansion this transportation line will provide. I strongly urge you to support the Central Corridor light rail line.

(CCLRP0652) ProALT-005

I also have family members who live in Portland, Oregon, and I know how easy it is for them to get around without cars in that city, which has emphasized rail transit. I also have ridden the Yellow Line train in Portland. This train runs down a street similar to St. Paul's University Ave. I have seen what a positive effect that train line has had on that street, on the businesses, and the residents of the nearby neighborhoods.

(CCLRP0320) ProALT-006

I work in Saint Paul and go to graduate school at the University of Minnesota. I would be taking the light rail as often as possible in order to get away from use of my car and Interstate 94. The LRT will be good for not only the community of Frogtown and others, but also for the City of Saint Paul and the east metro region. This metro needs some serious work in terms of public transportation, and only adding to the Hiawatha Line will be a good thing.

(CCLRP0194) ProALT-008

We, as a region, need to take a long-term look at transportation issues. We need to give people in the region a fast, clean transportation option that gives them the opportunity to keep the car in the garage, off the road. I believe that light rail along University Avenue is a giant step toward building the transportation system of the future in the Twin Cities.

(CCLRP0783) ProALT-011

I believe light rail is -- it's a great mode of transportation because of its convenience, its reliability, that it's clean and quiet, and that it also allows us to experience the area differently. That's certainly something that I've been noticing with riding the bus. I'm able to see the stores that are along my route instead of concentrating, as I individually ride in my car, on just, you know, not hitting the next car or making that next light; and as I'm a pedestrian in between bus stops I notice so many other things and there's certainly more opportunities to stop at the small businesses, and I certainly welcome more small businesses as I live near Lexington where there's certainly plenty of opportunity and not so much development right there. It certainly connects the neighborhoods and the neighbors as I begin to meet some of my neighbors that are also riding mass transit.

(CCLRP0860) ProALT-018

Now, when I say "our employees" I have not surveyed our employees, but we do communicate with them about public policy issues that we consider to be important not only for the company but to them as individuals; and in doing so on this issue we received a very enthusiastic response back from them, much more than I have seen in any particular issue in many years and we believe because this strikes home so closely to the direct interest that they have as commuters and people who ordinarily only have the option of being able to drive or take buses to work.

(CCLRP0438) ProALT-053

Light rail transit will significantly knit together various neighborhoods in Saint Paul and the Saint Paul community with other communities. It will enhance our already strong urban environment, and will provide an amenity in a very highly trafficked area.

(CCLRP0737) ProALT-056

So in conclusion I'd like to say that light rail right outside campus here would make life easy and also a lot more efficient for thousands of faculty like myself, not to mention all the students and staff that have to come in to campus every day. Thank you very much.

(CCLRP0742) ProALT-059

The status quo is simply not acceptable, and I support the LRT.

(CCLRP0009) ProALT-067

This is the 'sine' of the Twin Cities and an important connection between Mpls and St. Paul. Light Rail is needed!!

(CCLRP0748) ProALT-069

I-94 is landlocked and will exceed capacity in 2020. Over one-third of the residents in the Central Corridor do not own a car.

(CCLRP0076) ProALT-089

We live in Prospect Park, one block south of University Ave SE, and we would welcome Light Rail on the University Ave Corridor itself.

(CCLRP0174) ProALT-115

I am overwhelmingly in favor of the Central Corridor, despite the fact that I will have long since graduated from the U of M by the time it is built. The fact is that the route makes sense and that people from St. Paul need a convenient way to get to the University and downtown. I have only a few recommendations based on my experience with the Hiawatha line.

(CCLRP0009) ProALT-125

Don't let us be left behind other cities with modern transportation systems.

(CCLRP0885) ProALT-128

We see it as an economic engine. Xcel Energy, it's where the utility company we've got a lot of infrastructure within the city; substations, transmission lines, distribution lines. As people move out of the city and move to the suburbs, our capacities aren't there. So when we see an opportunity that can improve the core of the city with a project like this and get that rejuvenation back into the community, we're excited about the project.

(CCLRP0782) ProALT-134

I have personal experience in using this type of transit in other cities as does my family. They use it for a mode of going to work, to go to entertainment, and to visit other friends and relatives; and so I support that.

(CCLRP0862) ProALT-151

I think when gasoline prices reach the \$5-a-gallon in today's dollars and they surely will -- we will then be glad that however belatedly we committed to a transit system and resulting community development that will truly enable much less dependency on automobiles.

(CCLRP0017) ProALT-187

I rode "street cars" when we had that system - but when we changed to buses, I didn't like them.

(CCLRP0737) ProALT-208

I fully support the Light Rail Transit that will be right outside these walls here. I think this is vital to the research, teaching, and the mission of outreach of the University of Minnesota to connect our East Bank and West Bank Campuses to Downtown Minneapolis, St. Paul, and to the airport.

(CCLRP0868) ProALT-233

I'm the vice president of redevelopment for the St. Paul Port Authority. I'm testifying in support of efforts to bring Light Rail Transit to University Avenue.

(CCLRP0546) ProALT-249

The Central Corridor line is also the right thing to do and the smart thing to do...

(CCLRP0892) ProALT-261

I'll be honest. I'm a convert. Didn't originally support LRT in the marketplace and all the hype surrounding it. However, I guess you can teach an old dog new tricks. I learned that it's a powerful transit alternative and a powerful economic development tool and a job creation tool.

(CCLRP0739) ProALT-262

I'm Fredda Scobey, executive director of Riverside Plaza Tenants Association and I'm here to tell you that Riverside Plaza residents represent the greatest population density in the state -- approximately 4,000 people live there -- and connecting our population to the University Corridor and St. Paul with light rail will greatly increase access to employment and educational opportunities.

(CCLRP0053) ProALT-279

I strongly support the plan to construct an LRT line between downtown Minneapolis and downtown St. Paul on the Washington Avenue/University Avenue alignment.

(CCLRP0467) ProALT-300

...he supports LRT with a few modifications

(CCLRP0174) ProALT-315

Thank you for hearing my concerns. I can't wait to see the Central Corridor get underway, and I hope to see the rail lines expand even further in the near future!

(CCLRP0846) ProALT-333

Transit no longer is just about moving people quickly between place to place. It's about strategically and reliably moving them to their jobs, their homes, and opportunities to go to school. The infrastructure improvements are key to economic growth. The Twin Cities has

become the last major metro area to implement an LRT line. With the developing Northstar Commuter Line and the potential Central Corridor, we have a chance now to finally develop a fully-integrated transit system for the first time.

(CCLRP0081) ProALT-338

The sooner we extend the light rail system, the better.

(CCLRP0766) ProALT-350

I own a business on University Avenue, in particular a gas station. We are in support of the Light Rail Transit. We believe it's good for business along the University Corridor.

(CCLRP0763) ProALT-351

I strongly support the construction of the Light Rail Transit on University Avenue. The Central Corridor Light Rail would be the major connector of our two Twin Cities which would stimulate growth and economic development. This has become very obvious with the Hiawatha line.

(CCLRP0084) ProALT-352

As a veteran rider of Chicago's rapid transit, and in other cities, it is wonderful feeling to be on a train and look out the window to see traffic snarls as the train whizzes by. I rode a CTA train in Chicago for many years to school and work that ran down the median of an expressway (Day Ryan). I know the benefits of a smooth and efficient train ride.

(CCLRP0750) ProALT-368

And, lastly, it works. We've seen with the Hiawatha line great success. I spent my first five years as a professional in Downtown Chicago living just north of Downtown Chicago, used transit all the time, and I've seen how wonderful transit can be. Thank you very much for your hard work

(CCLRP0166) ProALT-370

Improving transit in the Central Corridor will provide current and new transit riders with faster more reliable, more frequent and more cost-effective service.

(CCLRP0244) ProALT-375

Please continue to move in the direction of the establishment of light rail for the central corridor. This is the right move if we are to make any attempts at conserving energy resources and building a vibrant city.

(CCLRP0260) ProALT-379

The Central Corridor should have been the first light rail line in the Twin Cities. Now, with the huge success of the Hiawatha line, it should be funded and developed as quickly as possible. University Avenue, with its broad right-of-way and its importance as a connecting link between the two cities, is a logical choice for on-street light rail. The clear link between private investment and state-of-the-art light rail is undisputed, as evidenced in the success stories of numerous cities across the country (the Europeans had this figured out long before).

(CCLRP0027) ProALT-384

The Central Corridor is past due. It should have been constructed decades ago.

(CCLRP0864) ProALT-387

The North End Business Association supports the Light Rail Transit. We believe that a light rail system in the Central Corridor connecting our two cities is vital to the existence and continued improvement of our local neighborhood communities. We believe that an integrated and coordinated Light Rail Transit system between and within our cities will demonstrate the commitment of our government and of our cities to support the continued growth and redevelopment of our smaller business communities. We believe that the people traveling between the two largest cities in this state and to our campuses deserve a convenient and efficient transportation system.

(CCLRP0102) ProALT-388

Of course this should happen. MSP is so far behind on public transport. The light rail is great!

(CCLRP0901) ProALT-398

I am very supportive of the light rail project. The benefits would be long-term and widespread.

(CCLRP0824) ProALT-417

... I look forward to light rail on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0041) ProALT-452

I am writing to voice my support for the development of the LRT between Minneapolis and Saint Paul, specifically the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0026) ProALT-462

To continue this in-migration to the urban core, we need to invest in the transit infrastructure!

(CCLRP0182) ProALT-482

I am wholeheartedly in favor of a light rail line extending through the central corridor.

(CCLRP0185) ProALT-484

First and foremost, thank you for the opportunity to solicit feedback as part of the EIS development. To that end, I fervently support expanded mass transit infrastructure for the Twin Cities to continue to flourish as a metropolitan area, but it must do so in an intelligent, sensible, and responsible manner.

(CCLRP0537) ProALT-508

Please know of Bethesda Hospital's strong support for the development of the Central Corridor transit project linking downtown St. Paul and Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0845) ProALT-509

We at the St. Paul Port Authority are in favor of Light Rail Transit on University Avenue. We believe that the Central Corridor LRT will be a much needed and long needed component to the all important transportation system in the Twin Cities.

(CCLRP0858) ProALT-510

I'm a small business owner and have had a business mortgage company for the last year and I'm here to solely support Light Rail Transit because it's going to do -- it will open up a lot of opportunities for not just myself and a lot of other people that work in and around St. Paul, but it's going to make the city itself energized I feel. So I'm here to support the light rail and all of the things that it's going to bring to St. Paul.

(CCLRP0812) ProALT-512

We are in support of light rail.

(CCLRP0830) ProALT-519

I strongly support the proposal to build LRT in the Central Corridor...

(CCLRP0783) ProALT-525

I am just very excited that we are actually looking like we're going to go forward with something here, and I'm really hoping to see light rail. I think it's an exciting opportunity and a long time coming.

(CCLRP0890) ProALT-527

I really support this. I think we need to provide this for people who are unable to provide things for themselves and I do hope this goes through.

(CCLRP0345) ProALT-599

While there are no doubt local concerns that need to be addressed, LRT represents a huge transit and quality-of-life advancement for the vast majority of individuals in the Central Corridor and Twin Cities Metro Area. I fully support this plan and look forward to the continued redevelopment of this important part of our urban community.

(CCLRP0160) ProHLP-055

I am writing you today to voice my support of the Central Corridor project. Increased and improved mass transit options between the twin cities it critical to continued commercial and residential growth of both St. Paul and Minneapolis downtown areas. An employee of Ecolab, with our corporate headquarters based in downtown St. Paul, I am writing to support the Central Corridor project to link downtown Minneapolis with downtown St. Paul by light rail transit.

(CCLRP0451) ProHLP-066

Build the Central Corridor LRT, and then build another LRT corridor.

(CCLRP0863) ProHLP-100

Right now it's time to stand up and provide that leadership. If we don't take the opportunity to do this now I promise you that Hennepin County will tee up the next line and the east metro will be looking back instead of forward.

(CCLRP0099) ProHLP-104

To be a legitimate "big city," we need a reliable and accessible public transportation system. Linking the downtowns via light rail makes sense, both from an urban planning and an economic perspective.

(CCLRP0303) ProPM-008

I work in Saint Paul and live in Minneapolis. I've often remarked that as soon as a light rail is established linking Minneapolis and Saint Paul, I'll happily sell my car.

(CCLRP0096) ProPM-009

I support the Central Corridor project

(CCLRP0021) ProPM-012

(2) What people on the study team are against the light rail?

(CCLRP0325) ProPM-030

I currently drive to work everyday and would absolutely love the option of using the light rail along the Central Corridor. I could drive, or take an express bus to downtown St. Paul and hop on without any worries.

(CCLRP0879) ProPM-031

It's about time for rapid transit on that route as it would open up the University to people in St. Paul where classes are not often in the evening but only during the day. My time is too late for that trip to the University, but there are other opportunities for me.

(CCLRP0250) ProPM-033

I fully support the Central Corridor Project.

(CCLRP0245) ProPM-036

I support the development of LRT on University Avenue and other St. Paul locations.

(CCLRP0320) ProPM-042

Please build a light rail transit system for the University Avenue corridor.

(CCLRP0277) ProPM-046

I would like to voice my support for the light rail central corridor project being proposed for University Avenue.

(CCLRP0765) ProPM-047

So this was the first line been established is really great and I look forward the other one goes

to Ramsey County. Might be other area in the city can grab it or whatever, those other which I never been there. So I really support this as a resident in Cedar Riverside and I'm looking forward that there will be bus just stop near the Cedar Riverside.

(CCLRP0901) ProPM-050

I'm a St. Paul resident, transit rider, and transit advocate. My employer and my place of worship are located in the area served by the proposed Central Corridor. I would use the LRT often for these destinations as well as to shop, patronize restaurants, attend community meetings, and enjoy this city that I love.

(CCLRP0936) ProPM-055

I certainly believe in the Central Corridor transit project, linking downtown St. Paul and Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0289) ProPM-056

I am writing to encourage you to push ahead with plans to build a light rail line through the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0481) ProPM-058

I'm all for light rail. I was raised in Philadelphia where we had elevated trains, subways, street cars, electric buses, and diesel buses. I used to work in Manhattan and had no car. I frequently visit Toronto which has a great transit system. St. Paul and Minneapolis would be a great place for light rail.

(CCLRP0487) ProPM-064

My purpose in writing is to inform you of my total support for light rail for the Central Corridor. I think light rail is vitally important for our cities and I ask that you aggressively move this issue forward. Thank you.

(CCLRP0340) ProPM-067

I live on Aurora Avenue, one block south of where the light rail line is planned to run. I've lived in Europe for 15 years and can testify to the great advantage that public transportation brings to a community. I am entirely in favor of putting light rail down University Ave.

(CCLRP0294) ProPM-071

I would like to say via this format since I will not be able to attend a meeting, that I am in full support of Light Rail running from downtown St. Paul to downtown Minneapolis. I will look forward to the day I can walk with my wife the five blocks to University Avenue in the morning, kiss her goodbye as she heads toward downtown St. Paul and make my own journey to work in downtown Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0051) ProPM-072

I fully support this project!

(CCLRP0424) ProPM-074

A fast, safe, convenient and pleasant connection between Minneapolis and St. Paul is long overdue. The people mover should have been built 25 years ago. It is time to address the question.

(CCLRP0098) ProPM-083

I would LOVE to see the Central Corridor completed...I live very close to the proposed route and am not concerned about any negative implications.

(CCLRP0054) ProPM-087

Our family has used Hiawatha LRT to go to work, the airport, and downtown events, and will definitely use Central Corridor if it is built.

(CCLRP0415) ProPM-088

As a long-time resident of St. Paul, and a continuing resident of the East Metro area, I strongly urge the continuation of the Central Corridor project.

(CCLRP0019) ProPM-091

So far everything looks great. As a downtown resident, I am looking forward to bringing more activity to St. Paul.

(CCLRP0100) ProPM-104

As a person who commutes solely by bicycle, I have found the light rail very convenient. A train system going to St. Paul would be wonderful.

(CCLRP0810) ProPM-105

...I'd be very excited to have light rail going down University Avenue...

(CCLRP0648) ProPM-114

As a long time resident of Minneapolis, I want to see the light rail system expanded. We need to catch up with other first class cities in regard to our public transit system.

(CCLRP0849) ProPM-127

Finally, at 1919 University Avenue is Ramsey County Mental Health. People could make it to their appointments on time.

(CCLRP0017) ProPM-137

I would very much (unreadable) see an LRT connection between the cities for starters (unreadable) extend both east and west.

(CCLRP0088) ProPM-138

I am excited about the prospect of light rail on University Avenue. As an area resident, transit user, cyclist and father, it is a needed amenity and one that will adequately address the population growth and increased development, on each block and in the entire region.

(CCLRP0074) ProPM-151

Yes! This project is long overdue!

(CCLRP0131) ProPM-154

Go for it... When will we have more lines? I say the more the better.

(CCLRP0098) ProPM-156

I would be willing to help get this project accomplished. Most people I know are equally excited about the project.

(CCLRP0338) ProPM-160

Connecting St. Paul to Minneapolis and the airport via light rail, is a crucial and responsible step for the health of the growing Twin City metro area.

(CCLRP0427) ProPM-161

I support expanding the light rail transit system in the Twin Cities and surrounding areas. I currently work in downtown Minneapolis and take the light rail from the Franklin Ave station. I do own a car, but due to the light rail I'm able to significantly cut down on my transportation costs. Next year, I'm planning on living in Prospect Park. While there are buses to get to the Hiawatha line and downtown, a University Ave line would make the commute to downtown Minneapolis or St. Paul much more convenient.

(CCLRP0423) ProPM-174

I wish to have light rail down University Avenue as soon as possible.

(CCLRP0308) ProPM-182

I am very excited about the Central Corridor Light Rail Project. I think it will provide a boost to both communities, especially St. Paul. The public transit system in the MSP area is FAR behind that of most cities. Minnesotans are supposed to be progressive; this is embarrassing. I hope you are supporting this project. Thanks

(CCLRP0212) ProPM-192

I fully support this project and encourage the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority to press forward to its earliest completion.

(CCLRP0339) ProPM-193

It just makes sense to do it.

(CCLRP0094) ProPM-206

I fully support the Central Corridor. I am not concerned about any negative impact from the project.

(CCLRP0088) ProPM-213

As a resident of St. Paul and frequent rider of the 16 and 50 routes along University Ave, I wholeheartedly support construction of a light rail line on University Avenue. My wife and I bought our house at 1009 Edmund Ave in 2001 in part because of its proximity to a major transit line, with the hope that it would include light rail in the near future. Now with two small children to grow up with a multitude of transit options.

(CCLRP0300) ProPM-223

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the Central Corridor transit project being considered. My overall message is this: Get this light rail done as soon as possible. The taxpayers will thank you for it.

(CCLRP0106) ProPM-256

The Hiawatha Line was clean and relaxing and I'm sure St. Paul could benefit from such a line.

(CCLRP0156) ProPM-269

This is a great opportunity to link Minneapolis, St. Paul, and the University of Minnesota! Let's make it happen!

(CCLRP0488) ProPM-275

It is a positive project to have more opportunities for transit.

(CCLRP0628) ProPM-295

I would like to give my complete SUPPORT for any and all mass transit projects in the Twin Cities, especially those that involve light rail. We need this service in the Twin Cities and I'm especially pleased to see the central line between St. Paul and Minneapolis is on the drawing block. I am a St. Paul resident and live in Lowertown. (Right next to the proposed Union Depot station). Rail travel is an American institution that NEEDS to be preserved.

(CCLRP0010) ProPM-299

Without the LRT line we will fall far behind other major economic regions in the U.S.

(CCLRP0050) ProPM-301

I think the Central Corridor would be a good thing...I am in favor of this venture.

(CCLRP0778) ProPOL-20

For the same amount of money that the state and federal and local people have to put in, about \$450 million, that's the same amount of money that is being put in publicly for a single stadium that was just passed. Instead of servicing a million fans a year, this system will service six and a half to seven million people, passengers of all classes, workers, and not to mention the University of Minnesota benefiting. Essentially three major cities -- Minneapolis, St. Paul, and the University of Minnesota -- an all-connecting bus line whereas the stadium essentially affects just the businesses downtown that are lucky enough to park or feed the people that go down there.

(CCLRP0203) ProPURP-001

The Central Corridor is the key link to the two downtowns. It connects major job centers, such as the Midway, State Capitol and the University of Minnesota. The Central Corridor LRT would stimulate growth and economic development.

(CCLRP0667) ProPURP-002

I believe that the proposed central corridor addition will help to position the Twin Cities to compete (for industry, employees and major events) with other progressive American cities, and makes a positive step forward environmentally.

(CCLRP0749) ProPURP-003

Transit is not just about moving people from place to place any longer. It is now about strategically transporting people to fill business needs for employees and to foster new economic development around jobs, housing, and infrastructure. We are the last major metro area to implement an LRT line. We now have Hiawatha, Northstar coming on-line, and potentially the Central Corridor. We have the makings of a fully-integrated transit system in the next century. Let's capitalize on that.

(CCLRP0328) ProPURP-005

Higher densities create greater potential for vibrant communities of high economic value. Autocentric development has limits because of the pavement required to use and store personal vehicles. In areas of existing high economic potential transit should be strongly considered. Systems with multiple layers are able to use the same energy and area for several purposes. Highways speeds and volumes demands single-use areas for safety, thus eliminating all other potential for the area. (except perhaps as housing, but the DOT seems to be eliminating that as well.)

CCLRP0274) ProPURP-006

As a Saint Paul resident and business member, I recognize infrastructure improvements are fundamental to economic growth. Transit is no longer just about moving people from place to place -- it is about strategically transporting people to places of business and recreation. The proposed Central Corridor line would better connect the Twin Cities and stimulate growth and economic development. It would also contribute to the future prosperity of the two downtowns, the Midway areas and other communities and businesses along the corridor.

(CCLRP0778) ProPURP-008

Also, there are 11 miles of commercial distance that would be serviced by the light rail versus essentially one mile at a stadium and instead of about 65 days a year that the stadium will be used -- I'm guessing there -- 365 days a year for light rail.

(CCLRP0231) ProPURP-009

LRT will ultimately become part of a fully integrated transit system in the metro area, reducing the risk of isolation from major commercial areas and allowing for freer movement for employees, citizens and customers. As a result of connecting the two downtowns, the business customer mix will diversify, providing new opportunities for serving the needs of a larger number of people.

(CCLRP0231) ProPURP-010

The Central Corridor LRT is a major connector of the Twins Cities and will stimulate growth and economic development. Improved transit along the Central Corridor will contribute to the future prosperity of the two downtowns, the Midway area and other communities and businesses along the corridor, the Greater Twin Cities region and overall economic growth of the state.

(CCLRP0727) ProPURP-011

Light rail transit is so very important to our future, especially with fuel costs rising each day. And providing a rail link between St. Paul and Minneapolis would greatly benefit both cities

(CCLRP0748) ProPURP-012

I am the chair of the City of Lakes Chamber of Commerce. As an affiliate of the Minnesota Regional Chamber of Commerce, the City of Lakes Chamber is committed to addressing the needs and concerns of businesses in the City of Minneapolis and leading a focused effort to attract and retain talented, qualified workers and an advocate for upgrading workers' skills. Now, that last statement may seem a bit out of context, but let me explain the other hat I wear. I am an employee at the University of St. Thomas in Downtown Minneapolis and transportation second only to education is the greatest impact to upward mobility of this state. I would venture to say that getting to and from work is more difficult right now than it is to get a college education. Failure to invest in a comprehensive metro-wide transit system undercuts the state's ability to assert leadership against national competition. We strongly support the Light Rail Alternative for the Central Corridor. I-94 is landlocked and will exceed capacity in 2020. Over one-third of the residents in the Central Corridor do not own a car. The electric-powered LRT cars are more environmentally friendly than any Bus Rapid Transit. One railcar can transport 130 passengers. It takes 100 automobiles to move those same 130 passengers, and also LRT will reduce air pollution in heavily trafficked areas and will serve as an environmental benefit to area businesses and residents. And as an employee of the University of St. Thomas, which has campuses in both St. Paul and Minneapolis, it means that I can easily travel between the two campuses since my boss is in St. Paul. Our faculty, staff, and students who now depend upon the University shuttle buses or their own personal transportation vehicle when traveling between the two campuses could so easily use light rail to save time and eliminate the number of vehicles on the road and in Downtown Minneapolis. I fully support the construction of Light Rail Transit on University Avenue both as a representative of the City of Lakes Chamber and as a member of the St. Paul and Minneapolis communities. Thank you.

(CCLRP0241) ProPURP-015

However, when it comes to mass transit the subways and light rails are wonderful not only for the city of Baltimore and DC but also for the suburbs where people rely on this transportation to live in those outer rung suburbs.

(CCLRP0358) ProPURP-017

I currently take an express bus to work every day and would love to see light rail giving us the option to reach many destinations without the use of a car. The Twin Cities needs to take some serious steps to enhancing our options for transportation. There is no reason why the Twin Cities cannot take the steps for light rail like many other big cities. The rising cost and supply of gasoline should only incent us more.

(CCLRP0648) ProPURP-024

Please, let's build it now before it becomes even more expensive.

(CCLRP0073) ProPURP-025

Following the success of the Hiawatha Line, it is imperative to continue developing the Twin Cities Mass Transit network.

(CCLRP0781) ProPURP-030

Light Rail Transit is the most cost-effective way to move large numbers of transit riders. In its first full year of operation, Hiawatha Light Rail carried 11 percent of Metro Transit's riders at 8 percent of the cost. That efficiency occurs because a two-car train can carry up to 250 riders while an articulated or accordion bus can carry about 80 riders.

(CCLRP0191) ProPURP-035

It is important to link both downtowns with the State Capitol complex, MSP airport and the Mall of America with one integrated transit system.

(CCLRP0750) ProPURP-042

My business depends upon workers being able to get to our offices in Downtown Minneapolis. Our employees use transit and light rail quite often. Even the Hiawatha line many of my employees use and they found it's wonderful.

(CCLRP0861) ProPURP-048

We encourage our employees to explore alternatives to driving such as taking the bus, carpooling, or even riding a bike, but our efforts have had little success. Many of our patients who live in the Midway area do not own vehicles. Any additional means of transportation that might help them get to a doctor or a hospital is a good thing.

(CCLRP0306) ProPURP-049

The success of the light rail line connecting Minneapolis and the Mall of America has been more successful than anyone anticipated and it is important to continue to expand the rail system in the Twin Cities area so that more residents can take advantage of this convenient mode of transportation and decrease the pressure on our existing highways.

(CCLRP0424) ProPURP-051

It can also serve to tie in the Hiawatha Line and the North Star Corridor and comprise an essential next step in a transit system which is desperately needed. One needs only to look at the oil production/ discovery and use projections to understand that the Twin Cities are dangerously exposed to dislocations and enormously increased costs within the next ten to twenty years. An electric rail line serving the most densely populated portions of the cities is an obvious place to start and to make an investment and it has been for many years.

(CCLRP0677) ProPURP-065

It just makes sense with the expanding population to provide transit between the two metropolitan areas. Please move forward on expanding the light rail as quickly as possible. I think the Hiawatha Line has proven its value in the Twin Cities area.

(CCLRP0329) ProPURP-073

My reasoning stems from LRT will aid in: reducing dangerous emissions/noise pollution, improving air quality along the corridor and creating a comfortable, reliable transportation option for people. Although we have benefited by waiting to construct a LRT and learning from the mistakes other cities made, the time to act is now. We no longer can afford to continue the status quo and we have outgrown the road/single car system. I urge you to continue with the plans for LRT along University Avenue.

(CCLRP0886) ProPURP-080

We have something unique about the Central Corridor and we have dozens of not-for-profit organizations who employ literally thousands of people with disabilities. Now, not only do those not-for-profit organizations provide services to our local residents and people throughout St. Paul and the area, but they provide employment for folks with special needs and almost all of those employees are mass transit users.

(CCLRP0051) ProPURP-083

Hiawatha LRT has shown this to be true and the linking of our capital city to our largest city (and airport and MOA) will serve residents, travelers and businesses for generations.

(CCLRP0182) ProPURP-092

We need public transportation that is permanent, convenient, safe, clean and appealing to riders. The Hiawatha line has proved that light rail can be extremely successful in this regard. People are ready for Minneapolis to make serious strides in public transportation. They are tired of sitting in traffic. They are worried about the effects of individual car usage on global climate change. We need to move ahead with a permanent public transportation system now, so that the Twin Cities will continue to be a livable clean, progressive place to live.

(CCLRP0156) ProPURP-100

It would also be appropriate for large events at the U including football games in their new stadium-so less traffic would occur during these times with the existence of LRT.

(CCLRP0285) ProPURP-101

I still have reason to go to St. Paul regularly: the Minnesota Opera, St. Paul Chamber Orchestra, many events at Hamline University, and other cultural offerings.

(CCLRP0887) ProPURP-111

One important factor in health care is providing access to health care. This is an important reason that the Allina Hospitals & Clinics fully support the development of the Central Corridor Light Rail Line. It's not a building that makes a hospital. It's the people that make the hospital. Thousands of Allina hospital employees, physicians, and volunteers who live in our community travel to United and Abbott-Northwestern every day to provide care for patients and their families who also travel to the hospital to receive care. The Central Corridor Light Rail Line is imperative to ensure long-term transportation access for our community to our outstanding medical facilities.

(CCLRP0684) ProPURP-116

The Central Corridor light rail project would benefit all of us due to the high volume of daily traffic on highways into and out of Minneapolis/St. Paul and suburbs particularly early AM and PM. It is safer, more efficient, moves more personnel quicker and is environmentally friendly. We are spoiled by the roadways we do have and ability to drive everywhere. Conserving our resources including gas is a step in the right direction. With gas prices escalating, roadways in disrepair and traffic volume increasing this effort would benefit everyone.

(CCLRP0855) ProPURP-125

Light rail will provide an affordable, convenient, environmentally-friendly means of travel between St. Paul and Minneapolis. It will ultimately be integrated into a metro-wide transit system.

(CCLRP0892) ProPURP-154

The Twin Cities and especially the east metro is at a pivotal point. We're growing by leaps and bounds. Met Council reports that over the next 24 years we'll add one million additional people that will call these Twin Cities their home and the current transportation system cannot accommodate that many additional folks.

(CCLRP0748) ProPURP-166

One railcar can transport 130 passengers. It takes 100 automobiles to move those same 130 passengers, and also LRT will reduce air pollution in heavily trafficked areas and will serve as an environmental benefit to area businesses and residents.

(CCLRP0106) ProPURP-167

I took the light rail for two wonderful months to Downtown Minneapolis and now that I am in St. Paul, I'm spending too much money on travel expenses.

(CCLRP0779) ProPURP-170

People will not only ride it to avoid the hassle and cost of driving between the two downtowns. They will also ride it to visit businesses along the corridor.

(CCLRP0744) ProPURP-178

Washington Avenue is a hub for University Residence Halls, Coffman Memorial Union, the graduate and professional schools, the Institute of Technology, University libraries, and scores of heavily used classrooms. It is a 24/7 environment. The University's Academic Health Center, hospital, and major new biomedical research facilities are on the corridor. Over 400,000 people each year visit the outpatient health clinics alone.

(CCLRP0677) ProPURP-184

If we want to remain economically competitive and be a highly desired place to live and work, then we need to invest in transit, education, etc. for this area. Thank you for considering my viewpoint.

(CCLRP0891) ProPURP-198

I believe the Central Corridor Light Rail Transit is a crucial next step towards creating a fully-integrated mass transit system that is long overdue and greatly needed to support the growing population and geographic area that is the greater Twin Cities.

(CCLRP0677) ProPURP-202

I am a strong supporter of mass transit, light rail in particular. It just makes sense with the expanding population to provide transit between the two metropolitan areas. Please move forward on expanding the light rail as quickly as possible. I think the Hiawatha Line has proven its value in the Twin Cities area. If we want to remain economically competitive and be a highly desired place to live and work, then we need to invest in transit, education, etc. for this area. Thank you for considering my viewpoint.

(CCLRP0231) ProPURP-204

In most metro areas around the country, business has been the leader in efforts to secure transit for its citizens. Infrastructure improvements are fundamental to economic growth.

(CCLRP0392) ProPURP-208

As a resident of the East Metro Area and an employee of a Downtown St. Paul company, I can see the importance of the Central Corridor rail system as a critical link to the existing LRT system and the evolving Northstar line. Without the Central Corridor, these other modes of public transit are of little value to me and my neighbors. With it, we will be tied in to a extensive and useful system.

(CCLRP0224) ProPURP-210

If light rail connected with Saint Paul I would not have to transfer to a bus to get to work.

(CCLRP0002) ProPURP-213

The Twin Cities and the entire State of Minnesota need more light rail. Transit is a major livability concern for our largest metropolitan area. We need light rail to attract new businesses to our state and keep our largest cities competitive with other states.

(CCLRP0155) ProPURP-214

I say with the current gas prices that are rising on the daily/ weekly order. Build it as soon as you can, as much as you can afford, and don't worry about the opposition, they would adjust once its build. The cost of living is going up to fast to delay any project of transportation issues to improve our current economy.

(CCLRP0626) ProPURP-217

I commute 120 miles to and from work each day. Any option to reduce traffic time and volumes will help all commuters.

(CCLRP0469) ProPURP-218

Without Central Corridor, the East Metro will be left behind,...

(CCLRP0096) ProPURP-221

3. It will provide a needed alternative to auto traffic and by extension, relive congestion on Hwy 94 and promote fuel economy.

(CCLRP0744) ProPURP-229

A highly effective transit system is essential to our campus. The University has invested heavily to enhance service and accessibility. Already 66 percent of the trips to and from our campus are made via something other than a single-occupancy vehicle. Over 18,000 students and employees use transit as their primary means of commuting daily.

(CCLRP0853) ProPURP-232

We do a great majority of our business, however, in Downtown Minneapolis. Hence the reason that the Central Corridor would be an absolutely wonderful addition for me being in business in Downtown St. Paul.

(CCLRP0424) ProPURP-238

It is time to stop dithering and move forward. Los Angeles and the Twin Cities are the prime examples of cities victimized by the corruption and criminal behavior of General Motors and the tire and petroleum companies forcing buses as the sole or primary transit option. Years later they remain prime examples of sprawl and inadequate transit infrastructure. Perhaps it is time to look back to the future.

(CCLRP0080) ProPURP-242

A faster, safer, cleaner route connecting the two cities is long overdue.

(CCLRP0072) ProPURP-248

With the heavy ridership between the downtowns on I-94 and University, this is a very good area for high volume mass transit.

(CCLRP0072) ProPURP-251

The Hiawatha line shows how successful LRT can be in the Twin Cities, and the Central Corridor is even better suited for frequent trains.

(CCLRP0656) SocNC-012

As I am sure you are aware, more light rail lines are a necessity for light rail to be considered a success. As someone who grew up in Minneapolis I can attest to two things: one is that downtown St. Paul has such a great variety of destinations and two that it is so very confusing to navigate the street of St. Paul for the first time, which is why I avoided St. Paul most of my youth. Having a light rail line connecting the two cities will allow others in Minneapolis (and surrounding areas) to visit St. Paul as see what a great city it is, without having to worry about driving and parking.

Response PlaTP-129. After publication of the AA/DEIS and completion of the public hearings, the Metropolitan Council adopted the AA/DEIS LPA for the Central Corridor (June 28, 2006, Metropolitan Council Resolution No. 2006-15). As shown on Figure 2-1 of the FEIS, after analysis in the SDEIS, the Preferred Alternative is an at-grade light rail transit line that is 11 miles in length, of which 9.8 miles consists of new alignment and 1.2 miles use the existing Hiawatha LRT alignment in downtown Minneapolis. The design of the LRT is discussed in Chapter 2 of the FEIS. In addition, the Central Corridor Partnership has been established as a voice for and an entity to interface with local area businesses along the Central Corridor.

Issue Summary ProPURP-009. Project will benefit commute for Ecolab employees
(293)

Comments:

(CCLRP0699) PlaTE-105

I am a firm believer in doing what we can to lighten the environmental load in any way in any city. When the lightening of that load is also a system that makes a city more accessible, user-friendly and vital - what's not to love? I have just returned from Portland, OR, and feel that part of that city's charm is it's great transit system which includes light rail. As an employee of Ecolab, with our corporate headquarters based in downtown St. Paul, I am writing to support the Central Corridor project to link downtown Minneapolis with downtown St. Paul by light rail transit. This addition of another leg to the greater evolving rail transit system will serve the transportation needs of many of our employees as well as benefit the overall traffic situation in St. Paul. Now is the time to get light rail on track to supplement and enhance the efficiency of the automobile and bus transit currently available.

(CCLRP0667) PlaTE-157

Please count me among the growing number of strong supporters of light rail expansion in the Twin Cities. I believe that the proposed central corridor addition will help to position the Twin Cities to compete (for industry, employees and major events) with other progressive American cities, and makes a positive step forward environmentally. As an employee of Ecolab, with our corporate headquarters based in downtown St. Paul, I have even greater reason to support the additional leg to St. Paul. The new rail will serve the transportation needs of many of our employees as well as improve the overall traffic situation in St. Paul. Let's get this moving! Now is the time to get light rail on track to supplement and enhance the efficiency of the automobile and bus transit currently available.

(CCLRP0216) ProALT-324

As a resident of Saint Paul and an employee of Ecolab, a Saint Paul based company, I am writing to you in great support for the expansion of the light rail system via the Central Corridor project which will link downtown Minneapolis with downtown Saint Paul. This addition of another leg to the greater evolving rail transit system will serve the transportation needs of Saint Paul citizens and of numerous Ecolab employees as well.

(CCLRP0411) ProPM-063

I am writing the following letter to you on behalf of supporting the initiative to expand light rail transit down the Central Corridor to downtown St. Paul. As an employee of Ecolab, with our corporate headquarters based in downtown St. Paul, I am writing to support the Central Corridor project to link downtown Minneapolis with downtown St. Paul by light rail transit.

(CCLRP0721) ProPM-082

As a citizen of Minneapolis, I wholeheartedly support the continuation of the light rail link. The link from Minneapolis to St. Paul is the next critical step to continue to build momentum for Light Rail. As gas prices continue to rise, we need to be pro-active in providing alternatives for the residents of Minneapolis and St. Paul. As an employee of Ecolab, with our corporate headquarters based in downtown, St. Paul, I am writing to support the Central Corridor project to link downtown Minneapolis with downtown St. Paul by light rail transit.

(CCLRP0409) ProPM-147

As the Ecolab executive responsible for Ecolab's people, including those at our corporate headquarters based in downtown St. Paul, I am writing to support the Central Corridor project to link downtown Minneapolis with downtown St. Paul by light rail transit. Your leadership and support for this exciting project is so important.

(CCLRP0382) ProPM-153

I am a strong supporter of light rail. Although I work in St. Paul and Eagan, I have used the rail to commute to Mpls for sporting, entertainment and dining events. Public transportation is a key component in the fight against our disproportionate dependence on oil. Our light rail has proved to be efficient and effective in meeting our transportation needs. As an employee of Ecolab, with our corporate headquarters based in downtown St. Paul, I am writing to support the Central Corridor project to link downtown Minneapolis with downtown St. Paul by light rail transit.

(CCLRP0723) ProPM-166

As a contract resource for Ecolab and St. Paul resident, I am writing to support the Central Corridor project to link downtown Minneapolis with downtown St. Paul by light rail transit.

(CCLRP0370) ProPM-170

After having worked in a large metropolis on the East Coast, I felt the impact firsthand that a rail system can have on a city. I used the rail frequently and would be extremely happy to see any expansion of the rail system here in the Twin Cities. Especially with gas prices on the raise, public transit is an important issue. As an employee of Ecolab, with our corporate headquarters based in downtown St. Paul, I am writing to support the Central Corridor project to link downtown Minneapolis with downtown St. Paul by light rail transit.

(CCLRP0647) ProPM-183

As a new resident of St. Paul, and even newer employee of Ecolab I strongly urge you to support the light rail project to St. Paul. I have lived in Minnesota my entire life and St. Paul is far and away my favorite city. I have no doubt that the addition of this light rail system will help others see how great our city is. As an employee of Ecolab, with our corporate headquarters based in downtown St. Paul, I am writing to support the Central Corridor project to link downtown Minneapolis with downtown St. Paul by light rail transit.

(CCLRP0678) ProPM-188

As a resident of St. Paul, and an employee of Ecolab (with our corporate headquarters based in downtown St. Paul), I am writing to support the Central Corridor project to link the downtowns of Minneapolis and St. Paul by light rail transit.

(CCLRP0222) ProPM-218

As an employee of Ecolab, with our corporate headquarters based in downtown Saint Paul, and as an enthusiastic supporter of light rail transportation, I am writing to support the Central Corridor project to link downtown Minneapolis with downtown Saint Paul by light rail transit. This addition of another leg to the greater evolving rail transit system will serve the transportation needs of many of our employees as well as benefit the overall traffic situation in Saint Paul.

(CCLRP0667) ProPM-253

As an employee of Ecolab, with our corporate headquarters based in downtown St. Paul, I have even greater reason to support the additional leg to St. Paul. The new rail will serve the transportation needs of many of our employees as well as improve the overall traffic situation in St. Paul.

(CCLRP0360) ProPM-263

I'd like to see rail transit across the metro area. This is the next logical step. As an employee of Ecolab, with our corporate headquarters based in downtown St. Paul, I am writing to support the Central Corridor project to link downtown Minneapolis with downtown St. Paul by light rail transit.

(CCLRP0721) ProPURP-022

As a citizen of Minneapolis, I wholeheartedly support the continuation of the light rail link. The link from Minneapolis to St. Paul is the next critical step to continue to build momentum for Light Rail. As gas prices continue to rise, we need to be pro-active in providing alternatives for the residents of Minneapolis and St. Paul. As an employee of Ecolab, with

our corporate headquarters based in downtown, St. Paul, I am writing to support the Central Corridor project to link downtown Minneapolis with downtown St. Paul by light rail transit. This addition of another leg to the greater evolving rail transit system will serve the transportation needs of many of our employees as well as benefit the overall traffic situation in St. Paul. Now is the time to get light rail on track to supplement and enhance the efficiency of the automobile and bus transit currently available.

(CCLRP0678) ProPURP-069

This additional leg of our evolving rail transit system will serve the transportation needs of many in my community, as well Ecolab employees as it will improve the overall traffic situation in St. Paul, as well as provide additional resources to continue economic development.

(CCLRP0717) ProPURP-076

I fully support the light rail initiative. I am a training manager and organize the travel for hundreds of associates to Ecolab every year. The light rail would provide us with a low cost option for travel to other parts of the city to enhance the participant's experience while they are in the Twin Cities area.

(CCLRP0411) ProPURP-127

This addition of another leg to the greater evolving rail transit system will serve the transportation needs of many of our employees as well as benefit the overall traffic situation in St. Paul. Now is the time to get light rail on track to supplement and enhance the efficiency of the automobile and bus transit currently available. St. Paul deserves light rail...not another slow, smelly bus. It's time our metro decides to take action...not just study and study and study.

(CCLRP0684) ProPURP-147

This addition of another leg to the greater evolving rail transit system will serve the transportation needs of many of our employees as well as benefit the overall traffic situation in St. Paul and Minneapolis, promote safety and conserve gas, which are current needs for everyone. Now is the time to get light rail on track to supplement and enhance the efficiency of the automobile and bus transit currently available.

(CCLRP0687) ProPURP-206

Furthermore I would like to see a link from the outer suburbs like Cottage Grove MN into downtown St. Paul. This addition of another leg to the greater evolving rail transit system will serve the transportation needs of many of our employees as well as benefit the overall traffic situation in St. Paul. Now is the time to get light rail on track to supplement and enhance the efficiency of the automobile and bus transit currently available.

(CCLRP0720) PlaTE-106

(CCLRP0711) PlaTE-112

(CCLRP0697) PlaTE-118

(CCLRP0712) PlaTE-121

(CCLRP0293) PlaTE-138

(CCLRP0659) PlaTE-191
(CCLRP0665) ProALT-298
(CCLRP0662) ProPM-172

As an employee of Ecolab, with our corporate headquarters based in downtown St. Paul, I am writing to support the Central Corridor project to link downtown Minneapolis with downtown St. Paul by light rail transit. This addition of another leg to the greater evolving rail transit system will serve the transportation needs of many of our employees as well as benefit the overall traffic situation in St. Paul. Now is the time to get light rail on track to supplement and enhance the efficiency of the automobile and bus transit currently available.

(CCLRP0235) ProPM-002
(CCLRP0224) ProPM-015

As an employee of Ecolab, with our corporate headquarters based in downtown Saint Paul, I am writing to support the Central Corridor project to link downtown Minneapolis with downtown Saint Paul by light rail transit. This addition of another leg to the greater evolving rail transit system will serve the transportation needs of many of our employees as well as benefit the overall traffic situation in Saint Paul.

(CCLRP0416) ProALT-621
(CCLRP0415) ProPM-010
(CCLRP0659) ProPM-011
(CCLRP0637) ProPM-017
(CCLRP0711) ProPM-018
(CCLRP0400) ProPM-019
(CCLRP0690) ProPM-020
(CCLRP0708) ProPM-021
(CCLRP0684) ProPM-023
(CCLRP0388) ProPM-027
(CCLRP0720) ProPM-032
(CCLRP0704) ProPM-034
(CCLRP0688) ProPM-039
(CCLRP0365) ProPM-040
(CCLRP0722) ProPM-041
(CCLRP0719) ProPM-044
(CCLRP0386) ProPM-045
(CCLRP0410) ProPM-048
(CCLRP0679) ProPM-052
(CCLRP0681) ProPM-054
(CCLRP0685) ProPM-057
(CCLRP0727) ProPM-062
(CCLRP0697) ProPM-066
(CCLRP0718) ProPM-068
(CCLRP0662) ProPM-069
(CCLRP0378) ProPM-073
(CCLRP0682) ProPM-075
(CCLRP0420) ProPM-076

(CCLRP0422) ProPM-077
(CCLRP0417) ProPM-078
(CCLRP0729) ProPM-079
(CCLRP0414) ProPM-080
(CCLRP0668) ProPM-081
(CCLRP0661) ProPM-084
(CCLRP0698) ProPM-085
(CCLRP0696) ProPM-086
(CCLRP0387) ProPM-089
(CCLRP0732) ProPM-094
(CCLRP0717) ProPM-096
(CCLRP0404) ProPM-098
(CCLRP0656) ProPM-100
(CCLRP0366) ProPM-101
(CCLRP0632) ProPM-102
(CCLRP0710) ProPM-106
(CCLRP0626) ProPM-107
(CCLRP0397) ProPM-109
(CCLRP0658) ProPM-110
(CCLRP0700) ProPM-111
(CCLRP0641) ProPM-112
(CCLRP0694) ProPM-113
(CCLRP0649) ProPM-115
(CCLRP0683) ProPM-116
(CCLRP0376) ProPM-117
(CCLRP0672) ProPM-118
(CCLRP0731) ProPM-122
(CCLRP0393) ProPM-123
(CCLRP0716) ProPM-126
(CCLRP0401) ProPM-129
(CCLRP0418) ProPM-130
(CCLRP0724) ProPM-131
(CCLRP0403) ProPM-132
(CCLRP0358) ProPM-134
(CCLRP0712) ProPM-135
(CCLRP0713) ProPM-139
(CCLRP0644) ProPM-143
(CCLRP0699) ProPM-144
(CCLRP0362) ProPM-148
(CCLRP0359) ProPM-152
(CCLRP0701) ProPM-155
(CCLRP0419) ProPM-158
(CCLRP0408) ProPM-162
(CCLRP0709) ProPM-163
(CCLRP0692) ProPM-165
(CCLRP0611) ProPM-167

(CCLRP0674) ProPM-168
(CCLRP0377) ProPM-173
(CCLRP0394) ProPM-177
(CCLRP0663) ProPM-178
(CCLRP0391) ProPM-179
(CCLRP0421) ProPM-180
(CCLRP0728) ProPM-185
(CCLRP0399) ProPM-186
(CCLRP0689) ProPM-187
(CCLRP0398) ProPM-189
(CCLRP0726) ProPM-191
(CCLRP0702) ProPM-194
(CCLRP0373) ProPM-196
(CCLRP0395) ProPM-201
(CCLRP0705) ProPM-202
(CCLRP0384) ProPM-203
(CCLRP0695) ProPM-209
(CCLRP0369) ProPM-211
(CCLRP0157) ProPM-214
(CCLRP0364) ProPM-230
(CCLRP0371) ProPM-231
(CCLRP0383) ProPM-232
(CCLRP0390) ProPM-233
(CCLRP0396) ProPM-234
(CCLRP0405) ProPM-235
(CCLRP0412) ProPM-236
(CCLRP0629) ProPM-237
(CCLRP0646) ProPM-238
(CCLRP0671) ProPM-241
(CCLRP0680) ProPM-242
(CCLRP0687) ProPM-243
(CCLRP0665) ProPM-247
(CCLRP0413) ProPM-248
(CCLRP0640) ProPM-249
(CCLRP0730) ProPM-250
(CCLRP0686) ProPM-251
(CCLRP0389) ProPM-254
(CCLRP0703) ProPM-257
(CCLRP0707) ProPM-260
(CCLRP0368) ProPM-261
(CCLRP0638) ProPM-266
(CCLRP0691) ProPM-270
(CCLRP0385) ProPM-272
(CCLRP0669) ProPM-277
(CCLRP0281) ProPM-279
(CCLRP0670) ProPM-280

(CCLRP0380) ProPM-283
(CCLRP0706) ProPM-284
(CCLRP0657) ProPM-286
(CCLRP0673) ProPM-287
(CCLRP0693) ProPM-289
(CCLRP0660) ProPM-290
(CCLRP0645) ProPM-291
(CCLRP0402) ProPM-298
(CCLRP0725) ProPM-303

As an employee of Ecolab, with our corporate headquarters based in downtown St. Paul, I am writing to support the Central Corridor project to link downtown Minneapolis with downtown St. Paul by light rail transit.

(CCLRP0697) PlaTE-37
(CCLRP0281) PlaTE-66
(CCLRP0695) PlaTE-96
(CCLRP0668) ProPURP-014
(CCLRP0362) ProPURP-018
(CCLRP0698) ProPURP-019
(CCLRP0414) ProPURP-021
(CCLRP0731) ProPURP-023
(CCLRP0365) ProPURP-026
(CCLRP0420) ProPURP-027
(CCLRP0404) ProPURP-028
(CCLRP0412) ProPURP-029
(CCLRP0395) ProPURP-031
(CCLRP0725) ProPURP-033
(CCLRP0388) ProPURP-034
(CCLRP0391) ProPURP-036
(CCLRP0394) ProPURP-039
(CCLRP0371) ProPURP-040
(CCLRP0373) ProPURP-044
(CCLRP0390) ProPURP-050
(CCLRP0706) ProPURP-053
(CCLRP0398) ProPURP-054
(CCLRP0707) ProPURP-055
(CCLRP0663) ProPURP-056
(CCLRP0691) ProPURP-057
(CCLRP0713) ProPURP-058
(CCLRP0415) ProPURP-059
(CCLRP0403) ProPURP-060
(CCLRP0386) ProPURP-062
(CCLRP0402) ProPURP-063
(CCLRP0680) ProPURP-066
(CCLRP0410) ProPURP-067
(CCLRP0378) ProPURP-070

(CCLRP0385) ProPURP-071
(CCLRP0401) ProPURP-072
(CCLRP0656) ProPURP-074
(CCLRP0673) ProPURP-075
(CCLRP0611) ProPURP-079
(CCLRP0387) ProPURP-081
(CCLRP0703) ProPURP-084
(CCLRP0647) ProPURP-085
(CCLRP0416) ProPURP-086
(CCLRP0704) ProPURP-087
(CCLRP0396) ProPURP-088
(CCLRP0665) ProPURP-089
(CCLRP0728) ProPURP-090
(CCLRP0662) ProPURP-093
(CCLRP0688) ProPURP-094
(CCLRP0701) ProPURP-095
(CCLRP0732) ProPURP-096
(CCLRP0689) ProPURP-097
(CCLRP0712) ProPURP-098
(CCLRP0693) ProPURP-102
(CCLRP0670) ProPURP-105
(CCLRP0421) ProPURP-106
(CCLRP0696) ProPURP-107
(CCLRP0389) ProPURP-109
(CCLRP0377) ProPURP-110
(CCLRP0709) ProPURP-112
(CCLRP0719) ProPURP-113
(CCLRP0629) ProPURP-115
(CCLRP0679) ProPURP-119
(CCLRP0669) ProPURP-122
(CCLRP0644) ProPURP-123
(CCLRP0686) ProPURP-126
(CCLRP0730) ProPURP-128
(CCLRP0418) ProPURP-131
(CCLRP0659) ProPURP-132
(CCLRP0382) ProPURP-134
(CCLRP0700) ProPURP-135
(CCLRP0692) ProPURP-137
(CCLRP0626) ProPURP-138
(CCLRP0384) ProPURP-139
(CCLRP0376) ProPURP-140
(CCLRP0705) ProPURP-142
(CCLRP0727) ProPURP-145
(CCLRP0393) ProPURP-146
(CCLRP0399) ProPURP-148
(CCLRP0720) ProPURP-149

(CCLRP0649) ProPURP-151
(CCLRP0360) ProPURP-153
(CCLRP0405) ProPURP-155
(CCLRP0710) ProPURP-156
(CCLRP0702) ProPURP-157
(CCLRP0658) ProPURP-161
(CCLRP0721) ProPURP-162
(CCLRP0729) ProPURP-163
(CCLRP0708) ProPURP-165
(CCLRP0685) ProPURP-168
(CCLRP0397) ProPURP-169
(CCLRP0400) ProPURP-172
(CCLRP0364) ProPURP-174
(CCLRP0369) ProPURP-176
(CCLRP0641) ProPURP-177
(CCLRP0380) ProPURP-179
(CCLRP0370) ProPURP-180
(CCLRP0422) ProPURP-181
(CCLRP0717) ProPURP-182
(CCLRP0419) ProPURP-183
(CCLRP0690) ProPURP-185
(CCLRP0694) ProPURP-186
(CCLRP0723) ProPURP-188
(CCLRP0413) ProPURP-190
(CCLRP0645) ProPURP-191
(CCLRP0722) ProPURP-192
(CCLRP0417) ProPURP-194
(CCLRP0682) ProPURP-196
(CCLRP0657) ProPURP-197
(CCLRP0358) ProPURP-201
(CCLRP0672) ProPURP-203
(CCLRP0368) ProPURP-207
(CCLRP0660) ProPURP-209
(CCLRP0681) ProPURP-216
(CCLRP0637) ProPURP-220
(CCLRP0638) ProPURP-222
(CCLRP0683) ProPURP-223
(CCLRP0646) ProPURP-225
(CCLRP0671) ProPURP-230
(CCLRP0366) ProPURP-231
(CCLRP0640) ProPURP-233
(CCLRP0408) ProPURP-234
(CCLRP0674) ProPURP-237
(CCLRP0359) ProPURP-239
(CCLRP0661) ProPURP-240
(CCLRP0724) ProPURP-241

(CCLRP0699) ProPURP-243
(CCLRP0718) ProPURP-244
(CCLRP0716) ProPURP-245
(CCLRP0632) ProPURP-249
(CCLRP0711) ProPURP-252
(CCLRP0726) ProPURP-254

This addition of another leg to the greater evolving rail transit system will serve the transportation needs of many of our employees as well as benefit the overall traffic situation in St. Paul. Now is the time to get light rail on track to supplement and enhance the efficiency of the automobile and bus transit currently available.

(CCLRP0157) PlaTE-49
(CCLRP0383) ProPURP-016
(CCLRP0160) ProPURP-103

This addition of another leg to the greater evolving rail transit system will serve the transportation needs of many of our employees as well as benefit the overall traffic situation in St. Paul.

Response ProPURP-009. Comment noted.

Issue Summary ProPURP-011. [Miscellaneous Comment](#) (11)

Comments:

(CCLRP0271) PlaTE-147

Ramsey County has already acquired and partially developed the LRT corridor that runs from the eastern end of Phalen Blvd. to the Maplewood Mall area and intersects with the Gateway Trail. The University of Minnesota has already acquired and developed an anti-transit, parking lot bus shuttle service on a portion of the corridor that connects the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses.

(CCLRP0913) PlaTF-10

Interestingly enough, if you look at the data that was given recently by the Metropolitan Council having to do with Hiawatha, they said that 19,000 that first year -- 19,500 people are riding per day and they said that was 70 percent over their predicted value. Well, their predicted value was 19,300 and I don't know how 200 people a day could be over their predicted value.

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-172

Section/page/table is 1.2.3, page 1-5, Specific Transportation Problems and Needs in the Study Area. The University of Minnesota shuttle system carries 15,378 passengers in the study area per day. This number should be included as a reason for LRT.

(CCLRP0740) PlaTP-198

Our faculty, staff, and students face the same difficult transportation, parking, and access issues as others at the University, but we have some particular challenges and they come because we're so spread out and because we have so many vital connections with the

community. While the four-block area south of Washington Avenue between Church and Harvard Streets houses our principal facilities, we also have major education, research, and clinical facilities on the Fairview Riverside Campus, the West Bank, the Research Park near the new stadium, and the St. Paul Campus; and we have faculty, staff, and students who have to travel between these sites often several times a day for education, research, and patient care. Furthermore, our faculty, staff, and students have to travel to the Hennepin County Medical Center, Regions and other St. Paul hospitals, the Veterans Medical Center and scores of other clinical sites throughout the Twin Cities daily. Corridor is central and key to our operation. And what really makes us unique at the University is that we see over 400,000 patients in our clinics annually. We are a major health care provider not only in the Twin Cities but in the state and providing health care is critical to our mission and access to our clinics is a major frustration and problem for our patients and visitors.

(CCLRP0738) PlaTP-205

Because it is so important to students, many, many students use public transportation every day as the U-Pass numbers exemplify. So I urge you to continue to keep the interests of students in mind as you move forward in these proceedings. Public transportation really is our lifeblood and I'm kind of scared of what I'm going to do when my U-Pass goes away when I graduate.

(CCLRP0408) PlaTP-208

The need for improved, more accessible & cost efficient, and most importantly, more expandable public transportation is greater than ever. I witness this growing need every day when I sit in traffic on Highway 94 heading between Minneapolis and St. Paul and when I avoid going to either downtown just because of parking. While I appreciate the freedom and mobility driving myself to work in my own car each day provides, I value sound, sustainable, and efficient public transportation far more.

(CCLRP0033) PlaTP-213

Riders who reside within the city of St. Paul need to be able to access both buses and light rail.

(CCLRP0785) ProHLP-079

The pursuit of a new light rail line in the Central Corridor by the Ramsey and Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authorities is a remarkable parallel to the pursuit of war with Iraq by the Bush administration about four years ago. Both adventures have been championed by ideologues and self-interested contractors. Both have witnessed the selective use of intelligence that ignored obvious warnings in the past. Both have been supported by politicians more interested in political posturing than in sound policies. Both have been cheered by a media establishment looking for feel-good stories more than the truth. Both have had the support of a public too busy to pay close attention to the facts.

(CCLRP0759) ProPOL-21

Unfortunately, the Met Council has seen its job or Metro Transit's job as welfare until very recently and Hiawatha was a Hennepin County and City of Minneapolis project. Perhaps the Met Council should be elected to be better accountable to people, but that's politics.

(CCLRP0102) ProPOL-22

Why do we have new stadiums instead of better transportation? Lawmakers cave to special interest groups. Public did NOT want stadiums. Let us vote!

(CCLRP0642) ProPOL-39

The pursuit of a new LRT line in the Central Corridor by the Ramsey and Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authorities is a remarkable parallel to the pursuit of war with Iraq by the Bush Administration about 4 years ago. Both adventures have been championed by ideologues and self-interested contractors. Both have witnessed a selective use of intelligence that ignored obvious warning signals. Both have been supported by politicians more interested in political posturing than in sound policy. In both cases, the decision to proceed has been made for reasons other than those shared with the public. Both have been cheered by a media establishment looking for feel good stories more than the truth. Both have had the support of a public too busy to dig into the facts. And like the Iraq war, I suspect the cost of the Central Corridor LRT will vastly exceed its benefits and actually make life worse for most of its intended beneficiaries. As many have said of the case for the Iraq war, so it can be said of the case for LRT in the Central Corridor: it amounts to a fraud.

To substantiate this conclusion, one need look no further than the draft EIS submitted ostensibly to support approval of the project. In Chapter 7, Evaluation of Alternatives, the case is stated for LRT, rather than BRT or some variation of existing bus service, as strongly supporting three key goals - economic opportunity and investment, community and environmental quality, and (not to be completely forgotten in the rush to benefit land developers) transportation and mobility. Fulfillment of these goals is measured according to a list of criteria, for which the LRT option is routinely awarded the highest grade while extension of existing service (the baseline option) is given the lowest. However, these conclusions are contradicted by the information contained within the DEIS itself.

Response ProPURP-011. Comment noted

Issue Summary ProPURP-012. [Good for the business community](#) (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0655) ProALT-072

I have been a business owner and a member of the Midway Chamber of Commerce since 1990, as well as a property owner in the Midway area. I am in support of the Central Corridor project, but have some concerns.

(CCLRP0750) ProPURP-108

Another reason is the connections that it will make from Downtown Minneapolis to the University that's been already commented about to the neighborhoods and then down to Downtown St. Paul we believe will be terrific for our business community.

Response ProPURP-012. Goals and objectives were developed to serve as the framework for the decision making for the future of the Central Corridor. Goal 1: Economic Opportunity and Investment has as its first objective, "Support investments in infrastructure, business, and community that sustain the heart of the region." To meet this objective, the Metropolitan Council adopted the AA/DEIS LPA for the Central Corridor (June 28, 2006, Metropolitan Council Resolution No. 2006-15). As shown on Figure 2-1 of the FEIS, after further analysis in the SDEIS, the Preferred Alternative is an at-grade light rail transit line that is 11 miles in length, of which 9.8 miles consists of new alignment and 1.2 miles use the existing Hiawatha LRT alignment in downtown Minneapolis.

Issue Summary SocLU-002. Project will reduce urban sprawl (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0154) SocLU-004

It should be added that a mature transit system with LRT in appropriate corridors, and compatible transit oriented development will reduce urban sprawl, conserving habitat and farmland.

Response SocLU-002. Goal 2: Communities and Environment, Objective: Facilitate the preservation and enhancement of neighborhoods in the Central Corridor (page 1-10) describes how transit is a crucial part of implementing the principles of smart growth, and "would promote infill growth in designated transit-oriented development areas, and de-emphasize less dense growth, or 'sprawl,' on the fringe of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.

Issue Summary SocLU-004. Concerns about urban sprawl in Twin Cities (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0845) SocLU-006

As you may know, the Twin Cities region has been known for, the past ten years or so to be one of the highest percentage areas for loss of green fields to urban sprawl development in the nation.

Response SocLU-004. The Central Corridor is entirely within the urbanized area of St. Paul and Minneapolis. Both cities have or are developing plans to accommodate much of the projected population growth of the Twin Cities in the Central Corridor, thus reducing pressure for new development on the fringe.

Section: 1.0 - Not in Favor of Project

Issue Summary PlaPla-007. **Project will have negative impacts** (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0470) PlaPla-3

Several factors will negatively impact our quality of life: • Increased commuter traffic by LRT users

- Traffic backups on north-south streets because LRT will reduce the level of service at key intersections (such as along Hiawatha)
- Reduced number of locations for crossing University Avenue because crossings will be limited to only signalized intersections (see page 3-28, paragraph 2 of DEIS)
- Increase in "cut-through" traffic due to limited turn movements into and out of local businesses
- Removal of one signalized intersection at Albert St. and University Avenue
- Increased noise seven days a week between 5 AM and 12:30 AM due to the sounding of horns or bells on the LRT vehicles as the train approaches each station
- Reduced bus service for those whose origin and/or destination isn't near an LRT station (reduced from every 10 minutes to every 30 minutes)
- Reduced ability for pedestrians/bicyclists/wheelchair users to safely cross University Avenue to access the shopping centers
- Higher taxes due to increased land prices caused by speculative investors
- Higher taxes to pay for LRT with all its intrusions
- Costs to homeowners to purchase parking permits

Response PlaPla-007. The adopted Preferred Alternative includes an alignment and routes that meet the purpose and need most efficiently and minimize project impacts. The current configuration of University Avenue poses a barrier to pedestrian movements. Adding LRT would not degrade conditions further. Incorporating desired system elements such as non-signalized pedestrian crossings and secondary station platform access would provide clearly defined crossing areas and connections along the corridor, enhancing the overall pedestrian environment and promoting community cohesion. Additionally, various safety treatments and/or landscaping may be installed to hinder pedestrian movement outside of legal crossing areas. Each of these design elements would improve pedestrian safety. Access to the stations and bus stops will be ADA compliant for pedestrians. The effects of the Central Corridor LRT project on community cohesion and Safety and Security are discussed in Section 3.2 & 3.7 of the FEIS. Noise effects are discussed in section 4.6 of the FEIS. Traffic impacts and transit access are discussed in section 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTF-011. **Ridership concerns based on history** (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0895) PlaTF-2

The people are reminiscing about streetcars. They should remember that they peaked in ridership in 1922 and declined thereafter except for a little bump during World War II.

Response PlaTF-011. Comment noted.

Issue Summary PlaTP-130. Not in Favor of Project (40)

Comments:

(CCLRP0476) PlaTE-65

Now, Met Council proposes constructing a line between St. Paul and Minneapolis at great cost as a solution. Again, it is likely that the Central Corridor will not relieve congestion during rush hours except possibly between Minneapolis and St. Paul, however, busy, productive people will be forced to choose to use their own personal car most of the time for many reasons, all very good.

(CCLRP0755) PlaTE-84

It has very little flexibility and it will serve very few of the passengers who need to go places around the Twin Cities.

(CCLRP0035) PlaTP-062

Please please do not run LRT along University.

(CCLRP0271) PlaTP-244

The University Ave. route does not well-serve Hamline University, the St. Paul U of M Campus, Midway Stadium, Como Park or the Fairgrounds, and the Washington Ave. river crossing is a continuation of the construction and traffic mess that the University, MNDOT, the Met. Council and other road construction business interests have been engineering for far too long.

(CCLRP0642) ProALT-013

For the time being, rail transit between downtown Minneapolis and downtown St. Paul can better be provided by a commuter rail line along the BN right-of-way for which travel time between the two downtowns is projected at 23 minutes. Later, perhaps, a high speed rail line within the I-94 right-of-way with stops at the University, Cretin Ave., Snelling Ave., and the Capitol would offer a much more competitive and cost-effective alternative to driving the freeway. University Avenue is a community corridor, not a highway. It should be beautified and existing bus service upgraded with more frequent fuel cell, low floor buses, and better shelters. But, the proposed LRT will do very little for those who live, work, and travel along it. Instead, it will create dangerous traffic conflicts, more pollution, and an unequal distribution of costs and benefits that favor the rich over the average resident. It is the wrong idea in the wrong place at the wrong time for the wrong reasons. I urge you to reject the findings of the DEIS and completely re-examine the mode and alignment of mass transit in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0130) ProALT-050

Fourth, cost is a major issue for this project that doesn't seem to be getting enough attention. The differences in ridership between the three options are slight, and would be even less if the TSM alternative were optimally designed. It is hard to imagine a scenario under which either the BRT or LRT alternatives would prove cost-effective. Major capital investments

are not called for, since it is extremely difficult to substantially lower transit travel times in the corridor without providing service above or below-grade. According to the DEIS, the light rail alternative exceeds the BRT alternative in capital cost by \$600 million (and the baseline alternative by more than \$800 million), yet only provides an additional 3,700 trips per day. This is not a cost-effective option.

(CCLRP0075) ProALT-091

Light rail is inflexible, and does not allow for future changes to transit that may be necessary due to changes in population density.

(CCLRP0445) ProALT-116

The Central Corridor project using LRT is a bad idea.

(CCLRP0031) ProALT-156

All the neighbor's I've spoken to in a 6-block grid are as opposed to LR as I am.

(CCLRP0758) ProALT-184

I brought along two of my documents that I'd like to present as testimony and I have extras available if anyone would like them. The first document is called "A \$740 Million Hood Ornament for a \$100,000 Road Construction Project" and the other document is called "No Transit Money for Another bulldozer of a Business Deal."

(CCLRP0128) ProALT-275

We don't need no light rail.

(CCLRP0271) ProALT-281

Why do the Met. Council, MNDOT, the University of Minnesota and other business interests prefer the most costly and least beneficial alternative? Could it be that the folks that brought us all the freeway-oriented development on University Ave. really do not want to see a successful transit-oriented alternative?

(CCLRP0456) ProALT-304

I am opposed the construction of the central corridor light rail.

(CCLRP0001) ProALT-307

I understand there are two other options to this Central Corridor project...(2) DO "NOTHING." I agree one hundred percent (100%) with this option.

(CCLRP0915) ProALT-355

I oppose light rail at this point. I want to see some sort of improvement to the transit on University Avenue and the Central Corridor, but I oppose light rail because this pamphlet here has the priorities upside down.

(CCLRP0784) ProALT-371

I don't want the inconvenience of this down by me.

(CCLRP0895) ProALT-410

What can we say about the Central Corridor LRT? Costs too much, does too little.

(CCLRP0275) ProALT-464

I read the Star Tribune article yesterday and was disappointed to learn how slow the Central Corridor light rail train was projected to be. It will be traveling about 35 mph compared to the Hiawatha Line which travels about 50 mph. We are going to be stuck with this line for 50 years.

(CCLRP0075) ProALT-476

Of the 3 possibilities offered, the Light Rail Alternative makes the least amount of sense.

(CCLRP0589) ProALT-499

I do not support light rail.

(CCLRP0878) ProALT-511

I am strongly against light rail going down University Avenue.

(CCLRP0589) ProALT-565

I am a REALTOR and surprised our association has taken a stance for it. I am against it.

(CCLRP0916) ProALT-611

LRT may be romantic, but it works against the need to provide transit to more locations. LRT, as others have said, is basically a form of corporate welfare which benefits contractors and real estate investors, not the transit dependent which is a population which may grow as energy prices rise.

(CCLRP0445) ProHLP-049

If you want a preliminary measure of how (in) effective an inter-downtown route would be, simply offer FREE express bus service between the two cities for 6 months. The results are likely to demonstrate to you that very few people would use the LRT, either. Such a test will save billions of wasted monies in the future.

(CCLRP0476) ProHLP-107

So, what is the Met Council to do? They are stuck between a rock and a hard place. People hope that rail or bus lines solutions from long ago will somehow rescue them. This is wishful thinking. More and more rail lines are proposed, without the recognition that we are on the threshold of new technology that will indeed solve all these problems.

(CCLRP0031) ProPM-029

I see no real need for LRT down University Avenue.

(CCLRP0941) ProPM-037

I am speaking in opposition to light rail along University Avenue...

(CCLRP0189) ProPM-038

As a St. Paul resident who lives three blocks from University Avenue in the Aurora/St. Anthony area, I am opposed to the LRT on the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0473) ProPM-065

I believe light rail along University is a bad idea.

(CCLRP0144) ProPM-097

Do not need.

(CCLRP0225) ProPM-150

I'm against light rail because:

(CCLRP0271) ProPM-171

The preferred alternative for the proposed \$billion road construction project on University and Washington Avenues is the "No Build" alternative.

(CCLRP0330) ProPM-227

Putting light-rail right down University Ave. is an exceedingly BAD IDEA!

(CCLRP0119) ProPM-273

No light rail on University.

(CCLRP0761) ProPURP-045

I read here that the Council's 2004 survey of metro residents rank traffic congestion as the number one concern. Well, if you lived at Lowry and Lyndale in Minneapolis where I live you wouldn't think that. You would be concerned about crime, being able to get home safely from the bus stop to your residence; and if you had kids wanting to go to college, education would be more important than light rail; and if you needed a place to live, housing would be more important. So in the days ahead I'm going to find out who did the survey and how it was done.

(CCLRP0082) ProPURP-077

Since the downtowns of Minneapolis and St. Paul are already rather well-supplied with transit connections, a Central Corridor LRT would probably not be worth its cost in dollar and disruption.

(CCLRP0785) ProPURP-082

And like the war in Iraq, I suspect the cost of the proposed Central Corridor LRT will be vastly greater than its benefits and will actually make life worse for both citizens and beneficiaries. As many have said of the Iraq war so it can be said of the LRT in the Central Corridor. Mainly that it amounts to a fraud.

(CCLRP0918) ProPURP-133

I really think this is a mistake. I think it's really misusing our transit dollars. In I get fact, that was part of -- and I did mention in one of my literature -- I already turned it in -- that I do

take the bus every day. In fact, I take as many as 12 buses a day. Everywhere on the bus.

(CCLRP0886) SocNC-215

And so at the end of the day why should our communities have a second-rate system? Why should our employees have a second-rate system? The west metro has huge investments coming in with the Twins. They have a huge investment coming in with the Guthrie. They've got Hiawatha up and running. They have the Northstar that's ahead of us, and we have to balance out these major investments because -- my time is up.

(CCLRP0005) SocNC-219

I feel that the selection of Light Rail on University Avenue will put unnecessary strain on this community due to the multitude of adverse and environmental impacts

Response PlaTP-130. After publication of the AA/DEIS and completion of the public hearings, the Metropolitan Council adopted the AA/DEIS LPA for the Central Corridor (June 28, 2006, Metropolitan Council Resolution No. 2006-15). The adopted LPA satisfied project goals and objectives that were developed for this project. These goals and objectives formed the basis for the project development process which analyzed and screened numerous project alternatives. The AA/DEIS, SDEIS and this FEIS document the environmental process that was followed in the ultimate selection of the Preferred Alternative. Additionally, a robust public involvement program was developed and followed to actively engage the public throughout project development.

Section: 1.0 - Who Will Benefit?

Issue Summary EcoEE-013. Concerns in regard to benefit to commuters working near corridor (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0475) EcoEE-87

p. 5-29 Over 1,000 employees will move out of downtown if the US Post Office is moved for LRT, which is planned. This is not economic vitality.

(CCLRP0775) EcoEE-150

And most of the small businesses will not be near the stops either. You can find that many of their customers do take buses. If you did a customer survey in the businesses and asked if they took buses, I think you'd find that many of them take the bus to shop, but they couldn't because of they'd probably just buy a car and not bother to come to University Avenue.

(CCLRP0038) EcoEE-160

4. The transfer of wealth from working people to fund favored "transit oriented developments" built by rich developers through tax breaks and incentives.

Response EcoEE-013. Implementation of this project is part of this region's long-range plan. The project improves general mobility, improves transit travel time and meets other goals as established for the overall project, as outlined in Chapter 1 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EcoEE-017. Project can benefit local businesses and citizens (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0273) EcoEE-129

Second - though this Central Corridor should never be touted as an even modest solution to congestion, nor the Hiawatha LRT line in a low density populated Twin Cities, as a mass transit and economic development corridor it could be a powerful inner city tool that equally serves local business and all citizens - if it is done right.

Response EcoEE-017. Benefits and impacts of the project are documented in many sections of the FEIS. Specific transit user benefits have been documented in Section 3.8 and Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProHLP-019. Project will not be beneficial (8)

Comments:

(CCLRP0063) PlaTP-007

In any case, if you really want to provide upgraded transit service along the corridor, you must take into account the actual numbers and kinds of people who rely on this corridor to get where they are going. You must look beyond the volume of cars, trucks and buses.

(CCLRP0755) ProALT-358

I'm opposed to the light rail. I think it's too little, too late and will not really serve very many people. It's going to be too slow.

(CCLRP0086) ProHLP-037

1. What are the 3 main reasons for LRT?

(CCLRP0271) ProHLP-058

During his appearance on MPR this morning, Mayor Coleman cited studies which have been conducted over and over again showing that the Central Corridor light-rail line has to be constructed along University Ave. rather than along the existing rail corridor.

http://www.publicradio.org/tools/medialplayer/news/midday/2006/01/06_midday1 Where are these over and over again studies? Who produced them?

(CCLRP0913) ProHLP-092

The second part of this scam is that they say a million people are coming to the Twin Cities. Well, they're not coming to Ramsey County because the prediction is only 60,000. Most of them elderly who won't be taking transit in the city, and so where they're putting this transportation is not for a group of people.

(CCLRP0355) ProPURP-193

I take a bus that travels along Como Ave. to Rice St. and enters downtown on St. Peter St., so it wouldn't benefit me unless I moved closer to University Ave. Thank you for your interest in my opinion.

(CCLRP0007) ProPURP-205

Light rail may be economical for some, but for most it is not needed.

(CCLRP0920) SocNC-035

I just want to say there's something radically wrong with this picture. I've listened to everybody speak. I can think of only one -- maybe there was two out of 90 or whatever who even came close to living right on the light rail. Everybody has glowing things to say about what it will do for the whole metro area, for their businesses, but if it's so wonderful why aren't they volunteering to put it in their neighborhood? Amen.

Response ProHLP-019. The purpose and need for the Central Corridor project is variously described in the Central Corridor Scoping Summary Report (2001) the Alternatives Analysis / Draft Environmental Impact Statement (2006) and the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (2008). Effects on and benefits to adjacent neighborhoods are described in Section 3.2 and Chapter 5 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProPURP-002. Local community will not benefit (7)

Comments:

(CCLRP0447) PlaTP-089

As one official said in a public meeting stated, this is for you all (the communities) so you can ride and shop at the Midway and travel to downtown. Well, from where we live I'd have to walk two blocks to Lexington Avenue to get on to get along. Midway is only three more blocks up so we may as well walk. Please don't insult our intelligence with this false statement.

(CCLRP0473) ProHLP-050

The question is for whom would the light-rail system be convenient? To only those who can afford it. Leave it in downtown Minneapolis and their suburbs where it logically belongs. It does not belong on St. Paul's University Avenue.

(CCLRP0021) ProHLP-071

(4) Who gains by light rail. Not the community that it's supposed to serve. They will still need buses every block or two. They won't be able to walk 8-10 blocks in snow or sub-zero. Private interests groups, legislatures, business people will be the bigger benefit and of course the construction and supply people. But not the average guy.

(CCLRP0086) ProHLP-117

2. What do the residents who border University Ave. gain from limited stops? 3. How does running a line on University Ave. reduce congestion on I-94? Those on I-94 did not begin their commute in the downtown. Many are coming from eastern suburbs and Wisconsin.

What does the Central Corridor do for them? They have no where to park their cars if they were even remotely interested in riding the line.

(CCLRP0165) ProPURP-114

The only ones who would benefit and profit from this corridor transit are the Minneapolis businesses. Minneapolitans very seldom come to St. Paul and if they do, it is for a once or twice a year event to attend the Minnesota Science Center or maybe a hockey game. It would definitely be a one-sided benefit. To compare the Central Corridor with the Light Rail in Minneapolis is no comparison because that takes in so many important areas. We are requesting that you consider the many disadvantages in comparison to maybe one advantage for constructing the Central Corridor transit on University Avenue. We senior citizens need accessible transportation also.

(CCLRP0775) ProPURP-200

I think you're making a big mistake. Everybody says it will serve everybody. It doesn't serve the car-less people. I can tell you that.

(CCLRP0899) ProPURP-211

And then the bottom line is what does the community benefit? We know what the people on the west end and the east end and in the suburbs are going to benefit, but what is our direct benefit?

Response ProPURP-002. The purpose and need for this project has been established with broad community involvement (see Chapter 1 of the AA/DEIS, SDEIS, and FEIS). Transit improvements are needed in this corridor. The FEIS documents impacts associated with the proposed project. Benefits and impacts of the project are documented in many sections of the AA/DEIS, the SDEIS, and the FEIS. The increased access to the neighborhoods brought by transit improvements and the siting of LRT stations may act as catalysts for new investment in the University Avenue corridor. Proposed stations would also be considered community amenities that would add to the stature of the adjacent neighborhoods and serve as focal points of daily activity. Concentrations of pedestrians at stations would also create new opportunities for businesses. Specific transit user benefits have been documented in Section 3.8 and Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProPURP-010. Project will benefit handicapped, elderly, and persons without cars (4)

Comments:

(CCLRP0853) ProPURP-047

Secondly on a more personal note, I know an individual that is about to move into Reflections Condominium up in the Bloomington Central Station. They're both handicapped. They cannot wait for the freedom of being able to get around using a light rail. It provides them with the opportunity to get places that they cannot get to today at a rate that is not available to them any other way.

(CCLRP0207) ProPURP-052

I have used the Hiawatha LRT and am very impressed. My father is in his 70's in Bloomington and felt comfortable using LRT. He has never been a bus rider, although he lives 3 blocks from the popular Nicollet Ave line. The elderly and poor citizens among us will benefit greatly from an investment in LRT.

(CCLRP0079) ProPURP-152

It is more convenient for people who have mobility issues (older people, people in wheelchairs, etc) because the trains allow access without stairs or time-consuming lifts.

(CCLRP0754) ProPURP-173

Personally, I am interested in seeing the Central Corridor built because, as the gentleman just mentioned, it's a connection with many other systems. I have always been taught to look forward and I see that when I'm 86 and my children take my car keys away I'll need a way to get downtown. My hope is that the Central Corridor gets built and then likewise after that the Red Rock Corridor gets built and I can grab the Red Rock train from there and get into downtown to do whatever I like to do. Thank you and please move this project forward as fast as possible.

Response ProPURP-010. Comment noted

Section: 1.0 - Report Corrections Needed

Issue Summary ProPM-016. Report corrections needed (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0457) ProPM-049

Page 1-19 (Section 1.6): Role of Draft EIS This section should be stated at the beginning of section 1.

(CCLRP0457) ProPM-053

- Page 2-17 (Section 2.4.1): Soft Costs a) It is not clear what the 30 % is under the Engineering and Administration for infrastructure improvements is. Please clarify. b) It is not clear what the 5% is under the Engineering and Administration for vehicles is. Please clarify. c) Please clarify % stated under the Contingencies also.

Response ProPM-016. All chapters and sections of the AA/DEIS have been updated since publication of the AA/DEIS and selection of the AA/DEIS LPA. The Metropolitan Council has conducted and published an SDEIS to assess the impacts of necessary changes to key elements of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is fully described in Chapter 2 of the FEIS, and all chapters and sections assess the potential beneficial and adverse impacts of the Preferred Alternative and present mitigation strategies. The FEIS utilizes the latest information and analysis methods available for each section. It uses the most current data, studies, community plans, model outputs, and assumptions, and is based on the current design and engineering studies for the Central Corridor LRT.

Section: 2.3 - Selection of Locally Preferred Alternative

Issue Summary PlaTF-013. **LRT ridership estimates versus BRT ridership estimates** (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0184) PlaTF-5

Ridership - I find it puzzling that forecast LRT ridership is only 6% higher than BRT. At an April 25, 2006 seminar in Austin, Texas, Cal Marsala, General Manager of Denver's RTD, explained that ridership on that agency's rail services has consistently exceeded projections and generally averages about 30% to 50% above that of comparable bus services.

Response PlaTF-013. Estimates of ridership for the various modes were developed from the Metropolitan Council 2030 Regional Travel Demand Model, using a methodology that was approved by the Federal Transit Administration. These estimates have been updated during preliminary engineering and are discussed in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-139. **Purpose of alignment shift near U of M** (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0154) PlaTP-203

Is the detour to facilitate the tunnel or line with the U of M busway?

Response PlaTP-139. The alignment shift to the north from Washington Avenue and University Avenue between Huron Boulevard and 29th Ave SE was chosen because it best meets the purpose and need of the project. The alignment shift is more cost-effective and minimizes the impact to this section of University Avenue.

Section: 2.3 - Stations

Issue Summary EngTI-007. **The Snelling Station should be shifted** (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) EngTI-8

Shifting the Snelling Station to the east has at least two major advantages to a station right at the intersection. First, the concentration of likely patron destinations is closer to Pascal than to Snelling. Relocation would benefit patrons by shortening walking distances. Second, the Snelling/University intersection is one of the most congested in the corridor. By shifting the station eastward, there would be greater opportunities for retaining turning lanes that are essential to the capacity of the intersection.

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-032

To 2-8, Figure 2.3-2 and Figure 5.2-10, add consideration of shifting the Snelling Station to the east.

Response EngTI-007. The Preferred Alternative shows a split-side platform station at Snelling Avenue, with the eastbound platform east of Snelling Avenue, and the westbound platform west of Snelling Avenue. This location was chosen based on input from several public meetings, and issue resolution team meetings. The Preferred Alternative station platform locations also minimize walking distance from the bus stops at this intersection. All left-turn lanes will be retained at the University Avenue and Snelling Avenue intersection. See FEIS Section 6.2.

Issue Summary PlaTE-002. Concerns in regard to station placement (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0207) PlaTE-10

My only concern is the possibility of building too many station stops in the Central Corridor because it can displace so many individuals and businesses, as well as slow down the commuting time between the cities.

(CCLRP0788) PlaTE-13

I'm a strong supporter of expanding public transit and perhaps the Light Rail Transit, but only if it's done the right way. If it's done the right way it provides essential transit alternatives for people in the community. If it's done the wrong way it can be devastating economically to people and businesses in this community. This must be seen as transit in the community for people in the community and not just transit through the community.

Response PlaTE-002. Implementation of this project is part of this region's long-range plan. Various alignment options with varying station placement patterns were examined during AA/DEIS. The project improves general mobility, improves transit travel time and meets other goals as established for the overall project, as outlined in Chapter 1 of the FEIS. Transit travel times between the two cities are discussed in Section 6.1 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-015. Concerns about the location of stations relative to roadway intersections (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0532) PlaTP-018

- All light rail stations should be located approximately one block off the main intersection to avoid congestion.

Response PlaTP-015. Stations located at high-volume intersections were designed as split-side platforms in order to provide for left-turn lanes and to avoid / minimize any negative traffic impacts at these locations.

Issue Summary PlaTP-017. Recommendations for location of East Bank Station (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-019

page 2-8, Stations: University of Minnesota & Prospect Park - East Bank Station - The depressed center platform has been recommended by the Central Corridor staff to be relocated to Church Street with a mezzanine design station. The DEIS station location will not work due to limited right of way and grades.

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-186

The locations of the West Bank and East Bank Stations have been modified based on additional design conducted jointly by the University of Minnesota, Hennepin County, and Central Corridor staff (see Technical Memorandum: Tunnel Evaluation at University Campus, April 11, 2005). The Central Corridor staff and their consultants both agreed that these changes were appropriate and should be included in future design efforts.

Response PlaTP-017. The Preferred Alternative through the U of M campus is a Transit/Pedestrian Mall with LRT operating at-grade with bus and emergency vehicle traffic only. The East Bank Station is split-side located near Union Street. The location and configuration of the East Bank station is discussed in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-019. Concerns about station location relative to common destinations (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0473) PlaTP-021

You would be doing a disservice to the people who want to shop or dine anywhere in the Midway - be it Cub Foods, Wal-Mart, Dollar Tree, Payless Shoes, Little Caesars, Herberger's, Leeann Chin, Border's Books, Blockbuster or Target. Those two proposed stops are way too far apart to adequately serve those businesses and countless others in the area. There are too many families with small children, elderly folks, and others who currently shop those businesses that would have a hard time walking from one light rail stop to their destination in this area.

(CCLRP0775) PlaTP-154

Stores like Cub, Target, and Wal-Mart will not have LR stops.

Response PlaTP-019. The SDEIS evaluated three additional stations at Hamline Avenue, Victoria Street and Western Avenue. The project as proposed in the FEIS includes below grade infrastructure to allow for station construction at a future date. Local bus service will be continued on University Avenue.

Issue Summary PlaTP-020. Concerns in regard to the location of the Minneapolis West Bank Station (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0457) PlaTP-022

Minneapolis supports a location of the West Bank Station closer to 19th Avenue to equally serve the Cedar Riverside Neighborhood and to support businesses along Cedar Avenue in addition to the University of Minnesota West Bank Campus. This station location should be further explored.

(CCLRP0341) PlaTP-042

While I am pleased that the light rail came to our neighborhood, many of us advocated for constructing it ON Cedar Avenue, but for whatever the reason politically or otherwise, we were not heard. I continue to believe that was a mistake. WE ARE THE ONLY LIGHT RAIL STOP THAT DOES NOT HAVE A DIRECT CONNECTION TO A BUS. For this reason, many people still do not know about all the good things happening and diversity of activity and restaurants and business we have in our neighborhood. It feels discriminatory. I am concerned the same thing will happen with the construction of the Central Corridor, IF the stop is not located on Cedar Avenue, and is at Anderson Hall. I know the Universities thinking on this, but frankly, it also would be much better if the light rail construction could be above the surface. There are many stop lights along this way, and will be a much worse problem than already encountered on Hiawatha.

(CCLRP0752) PlaTP-091

Second, I think the appropriate place for a station on the West Bank in Minneapolis would be on Cedar Avenue.

(CCLRP0331) ProHLP-047

Please include the following resolution passed by the West Bank Community Coalition - WBCC on Wednesday May 17, 2006 in community commentary on environmental impact and planning of the proposed Central Corridor Transit Line. "The West Bank Community Coalition - WBCC, supports locating the West Bank - Minneapolis, Central Corridor Light Rail Station between Cedar Avenue and 19th Avenue."

(CCLRP0443) ProHLP-109

West Bank Station: During these design efforts, the location of the West Bank Station moved westerly, and based on community meetings during 2004-05, a walk connection was added in the shadow of the platform to permit vertical access to the Cedar Avenue and the 19th Avenue South Bridges.

Response PlaTP-020. The Preferred Alternative shows the West Bank Station as a center platform station located east of Cedar Avenue with access provided to the station platform from the Cedar Avenue Bridge and the 19th Avenue Bridge. This alignment and configuration was reviewed closely with the Cedar/Riverside businesses and residents as well as with the U of M and the City of Minneapolis.

Issue Summary PlaTP-021. Concerns in regard to spacing and locations of stations in St. Paul (18)

Comments:

(CCLRP0288) PlaTP-016

There MUST be a stop on Hamline and University! Not having a stop between Snelling and Lexington would be a huge mistake.

(CCLRP0178) PlaTP-017

1. Stations - number and location. A. The DCC supports a station sitting outside the Central Business Districts at approximately half-mile increments to best serve the pedestrian-heavy traffic pattern and transit-dependent populations living and working nearby. B. Specifically, the DCC believes that citizens and businesses are best served by additional station stops near the intersection of Western Avenue, Victoria Street, Hamline Avenue, and Cleveland/Vandalia in St. Paul, and at Cedar/Riverside on the West Bank of Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0772) PlaTP-023

I have a couple concerns about the environmental impact study. One concern is community involvement. I noticed looking at the map that the five miles -- five and a half miles between Rice Street and the St. Paul City Limits there are five stops. In the two and a half miles between the City Limits and the Metrodome where it merges there are five stops. It seems like the stop has a certain benefit in Minneapolis. Of the four places along the route where the gap is a mile or more, three of them are in St. Paul.

(CCLRP0067) PlaTP-026

Stops should be every 1/2 mile with excellent connecting buses on Lexington, Hamline, and all the rest.

(CCLRP0549) PlaTP-031

We believe it is essential to add at least one or two stations between Raymond Avenue and Rice Street. Possible locations for additional stations include Western, Victoria, Hamline, and Cleveland avenues.

(CCLRP0531) PlaTP-033

- Light rail, if constructed, must have stops at Lexington, Victoria, Dale, Western, and Rice Streets.

(CCLRP0787) PlaTP-034

The Council support is qualified, however, by three requests. First, the Council believes that light rail should serve the people who live and work along the corridor in addition to those traveling from downtown to downtown. To meet this goal, it is necessary to add at least one or two stations on University Avenue with special attention to serving people who depend on mass transit as their only transportation.

(CCLRP0531) PlaTP-041

1. The proposed system must include stops at Western and Victoria. The current proposal has stops planned at Rice, Dale and Lexington in our area. Our neighborhood cannot be a "fly over" to connect the two downtowns. A Light Rail line on University must serve the residents and businesses of the area. Given the proposed concentration of stops at either end of the line, it is clear there is benefit to allowing riders to access the system from points convenient to them.

(CCLRP0180) PlaTP-046

With that said, and having reviewed the proposed Draft EIS plan, it is apparent, with almost 1/3 of our community under the age of 14 and another 1/3 being senior citizens, we need to light rail stops to be no further than one-half mile apart. We need stops at Western, Victoria, and Hamline as they are the connections to the northern and southern half of the ward and the City of St. Paul.

(CCLRP0523) PlaTP-048

In light of this major disconnect, it is strongly recommended that stops be added at the intersections of University Avenue and Western, Victoria and Hamline, so that the neighborhoods can be "...preserved and enhanced."

(CCLRP0462) PlaTP-053

They also believe that light rail should serve the people who live and work along the corridor. To meet this goal, it is necessary to add one or two stations on University Avenue with special attention to serving people who depend on mass transit as their only transportation.

(CCLRP0040) PlaTP-094

D. More stops in the middle are necessary - stops should be 1/2 mile apart in Midway and Frogtown communities.

(CCLRP0139) PlaTP-134

Six stops from Rice to Hamline

(CCLRP0458) PlaTP-140

Mr. Schweigert outlined nine issues, concerns, or potential benefits raised by the district councils, in consultation with each other and their constituents, that have to be addressed or included in this project: 1) the Optimum number, placement and design of stations

(CCLRP0789) PlaTP-169

It seems stops are too far and wide -- too far apart.

(CCLRP0184) PlaTP-193

5. Stations - It does appear that more stations on the eastern segment of the line would be advisable, roughly every 1/2 mile. While implementing additional stations today might actually reduce ridership because of a lack of density, some time could be regained by using amore direct approach to downtown St. Paul and eliminating some stations there as well. If not possible today, stations could be planned with a commitment to actually construct them

once population reaches a level that would warrant a station.

(CCLRP0788) PlaTP-204

There must be more stops, as has been said by others, to assure economic development. Stops should be no more than a half-mile apart.

(CCLRP0030) ProHLP-096

More stops are needed between Snelling and Larpernter.

Response PlaTP-021. The criteria for station spacing and location was discussed in the Central Corridor Scoping Summary Report (2001). The AA/DEIS evaluated 16 new station locations and five shared locations with the existing Hiawatha LRT. The SDEIS evaluated three additional stations at Hamline Avenue, Victoria Street and Western Avenue which would result in approximately half-mile station spacing through much of the Central Corridor. The project as proposed in the FEIS includes below grade infrastructure to allow for station construction at a future date. A detailed description of the station locations is included in Chapter 2 of the FEIS. -----

Issue Summary PlaTP-024. [Need a station at 10th and Cedar in St. Paul](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0881) PlaTP-027

One caution I would have. I first heard some discussions about only having maybe one station downtown. If that were the case I would want to make sure that that station was kept on Tenth and Cedar. That is how our employees get to work. That's how our patients get to our hospital and our clinics.

Response PlaTP-024. The Preferred Alternative does include a station at 10th and Cedar streets in downtown St. Paul.

Issue Summary PlaTP-026. [Concerns in regard to proposed station locations](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-030

There are, however, legitimate concerns regarding the location of stations along the Central Corridor. These concerns, voiced over the past 5 years within the community, need further consideration. They include: • Adding a station at Western & University, and possibly at Victoria & University and Hamline & University; • Consolidating the 6th & Cedar and 4th & Robert stations into a station within the Athletic Club block; • Locating the LRT station at Union Depot to the train platform (and off of 4th Street); • Shifting the Snelling & University station eastward to a center platform between Asbury and Pascal; and • Shifting the Capitol East station to Robert Street north of 12th Street.

Response PlaTP-026. The SDEIS evaluated three additional stations at Hamline Avenue, Victoria Street and Western Avenue. The project as proposed in the FEIS includes below grade infrastructure to allow for station construction at a future date. The Preferred

Alternative includes an alignment and station option that would travel south on Cedar Street to a point south of 5th Street, where it then would turn southeast onto the 4th/Cedar Street block. The alignment would continue diagonally across the block, emerging onto 4th Street at Minnesota Street. This alignment consolidates two AA/DEIS stations (6th Street and 4th Street) into one station on the diagonal through the block. The Preferred Alternative includes a center platform station at Union Depot on 4th Street between Sibley Street and Wacouta Street. The Preferred Alternative shows a split-side platform station at Snelling Avenue, with the eastbound platform east of Snelling Avenue, and the westbound platform west of Snelling Avenue. This location was chosen based on input from several public meetings, and issue resolution team meetings. The Preferred Alternative has shifted the Capitol East station from Columbus Street to Robert Street. A detailed description of the station locations is included in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-029. Recommend shifting station and changing alignment near Capitol (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-036

To 2-8, Figure 2.3-2 and Figure 5.2-14, add consideration of shifting the Capitol East Station on to Robert Street north of 12th Street, and show alignment staying on Robert Street to 12th Street, and southwest on 12th Street to Cedar Street.

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-043

The preferred Capitol East Station should shift to Robert Street north of 12th Street. The RCRRRA, City and others worked with the State of Minnesota to design the recently constructed Public Health and the Ag/Health Lab buildings to accommodate the station on Robert Street. In addition, the setbacks for the Lab now allow for the LRT alignment on the north side of 12th Street, and allow for a larger-radius 90 degree turn on to Cedar Street.

Response PlaTP-029. The Preferred Alternative continues along Robert Street past Columbus Avenue, turning to head west on 12th Street to Cedar Street, and then to continue south on Cedar Street into downtown St. Paul. The Preferred Alternative has shifted the Capitol East station from Columbus Street to Robert Street. Figure 2-4 included in Chapter 2 of the FEIS illustrates the alignment and stations in the Capitol Area.

Issue Summary PlaTP-030. Suggests having a station at 29th Ave in Minneapolis (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0313) PlaTP-037

The proposed LRT route jog off of University Ave between 29th Ave and Washington Ave doesn't make sense unless there is a station on it. It would be better to use that alignment jog for general westbound traffic and keep the LRT line on University and Washington avenues, just like the Route 50 is now. A Stadium Village Station at Oak St. serves the Proposed U of M Stadium adequately. The 4th St. SE/University Ave one-way pair could extend eastward to 29th Ave. SE, with 4th St gently bending around the south edge of the stadium, just like 5th St. flows around the Metrodome in downtown Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0457) PlaTP-047

Minneapolis strongly supports the inclusion of the 29th Avenue SE Station as shown in the Draft EIS. This station will serve the Prospect Park Neighborhood and could potentially be a very popular station as the City of Minneapolis works with its partners to redevelop the University Research Park (SEMI) area.

Response PlaTP-030. The Preferred Alternative includes a station at 29th Avenue. A detailed description of the station locations is included in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-034. Concerns about lack of LRT stops, specifically near Cleveland Ave and the Amtrak station (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0132) PlaTP-044

I am distressed about the some of the stops, or lack thereof, on proposed light rail transit proposal.

1. The proposed stop on Fairview appears to be the closest stop to Cleveland Ave and the Amtrak station--this seems to far to have to walk to the train station, particularly with luggage, and/or with inclement weather.

(CCLRP0154) PlaTP-192

For the segment of the route bordering Merriam Park, a station at Cleveland and University is desired and a necessary compliment to bus route 87.

(CCLRP0087) PlaTP-200

However, given the proximity of the proposed light rail line (down University Ave) and the Amtrak station (on Cleveland Ave near University) it is advisable to link the two lines. Presently, the proposal lacks a station at Cleveland Ave. I recommend that this LRT line be connected to an Amtrak station one way or another. This should be a selling point to federal government that still subsidizes long-distance rail, increasing the likelihood for federal funding. As a result, connecting the Airport to long-distance rail services via LRT expands transportation options for the whole state. Effectively, the state of MN could leverage Amtrak's Empire Builder line and a University LRT line to interconnect the existing St. Cloud and Red Wing stations, optimizing State funds. Therefore, it is my recommendation that metro transit reconsider a station on Cleveland Ave that connects directly to the Amtrak station itself. If the plans have already incorporated Amtrak's line in some other manner, perhaps at the Union Depot, than please this comment.

Response PlaTP-034. Comment noted. Criteria for station spacing and location was discussed in the Central Corridor Scoping Summary Report (2001). There is no station proposed for Cleveland Avenue as part of the Preferred Alternative. Development of the Preferred Alternative considered all constrained regional plans as well as on-going planning efforts. Ramsey County has plans for moving the Amtrak station to Union Depot as part of its plans for the Union Depot Multimodal Transit Center. The transportation network is included in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-045. Add a station at Cleveland Ave. (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0101) PlaTP-207

2. Stations min. 300' or longer for 3 car trains. 5. Add station at Cleveland Ave.

Response PlaTP-045. The Preferred Alternative includes sufficient tangent on the platforms to accommodate two-car trains initially and three-car trains in the future. Criteria for station spacing and location was discussed in the Central Corridor Scoping Summary Report (2001). There is no station proposed for Cleveland Avenue as part of the Preferred Alternative.

Issue Summary PlaTP-052. Station spacing in University Ave. should be decreased to 1/2 mile (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0313) PlaTP-217

It would be a serious mistake to make the Central Corridor a copy of Hiawatha, especially when it comes to station spacing and connecting bus service. University Ave should have station spacing of about every 1/2 mile not every mile. Many of the most successful rapid transit lines have this distance between stations. Shorter walking distances and more frequent bus service will be significantly more important to the success of the Central Corridor than it was to the Hiawatha Line.

(CCLRP0840) PlaTP-241

... I would support stations at half-mile intervals...

Response PlaTP-052. Criteria for station spacing and location was discussed in the Central Corridor Scoping Summary Report (2001). The AA/DEIS evaluated 16 new station locations and five shared locations with the existing Hiawatha LRT. The SDEIS evaluated three additional stations at Hamline Avenue, Victoria Street and Western Avenue, which would result in approximately half-mile station spacing through much of the Central Corridor. The project as proposed in the FEIS includes below grade infrastructure to allow for station construction at a future date. The importance of feeder and local bus service to the success of the Central Corridor LRT has been noted and a plan for this service is discussed in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-053. Station design recommendations (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-218

In general: there are several key issues regarding station design to be addressed during Preliminary Engineering: • Safety • Length of stations - see comments above regarding accommodating 3 car trains • Design (functionality and branding image)

Response PlaTP-053. Section 3.7 of the FEIS discusses safety in detail. The Preferred Alternative includes sufficient tangent on the platforms to accommodate two-car trains initially and three-car trains in the future. The design of stations is being done in close coordination with the various stakeholders and the public along the corridor. By being transparent and visible, the simplicity of station design takes security and safety into account.

Issue Summary PlaTP-093. Concerned about the intervals between stations. (4)

Comments:

(CCLRP0154) PlaTP-092

Station spacing at half-mile intervals is preferable to the current proposal (Figure 5.1-1) as travel time is extended by only 45 seconds per stop while development potential and local service is greatly enhanced.

(CCLRP0153) PlaTP-109

More stops.

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-125

PART 2 - Critical Issues, LRT STATION LOCATIONS (Section 2) - The location of stations is a critical issue being discussed within the community. There has been much discussion over the past 20 years as to the spacing of stations with respect to travel times. With the continuation of the Route 16 bus and express bus service on I-94, the City in the 1990s confirmed the spacing of 1/2 to 1 mile between stations along University Avenue (City Council Resolution 99-1164, December 8, 1999). Furthermore, the location of stations at or near the primary north/south streets maximizes the accessibility of Saint Paul transit patrons and maximizes the potential for new investment in the Corridor.

(CCLRP0643) PlaTP-196

The rail will stop every mile into the cities. Just like the big cities around America.

Response PlaTP-093. Criteria for station spacing and location was discussed in the Central Corridor Scoping Summary Report (2001). The AA/DEIS evaluated 16 new station locations and five shared locations with the existing Hiawatha LRT. The SDEIS evaluated three additional stations at Hamline Avenue, Victoria Street and Western Avenue, which would result in approximately half-mile station spacing through much of the Central Corridor. The project as proposed in the FEIS includes below grade infrastructure to allow for station construction at a future date.

Issue Summary PlaTP-111. Properly locate stations and integrate with bus systems (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0086) PlaTP-128

4. How does LRT fit with the City of St. Paul plans at the hubs, specifically at Dale St., Lexington and Snelling?

(CCLRP0524) PlaTP-173

- Maintain and increase access to transportation, affordable housing and jobs for low-income citizens through proper location of stations and integration of the bus and light rail systems.

Response PlaTP-111. The cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis are working with the Metropolitan Council in the development of plans to achieve specific neighborhood goals around stations. These plans are documented in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, and Chapters 5 and 6 of the FEIS. The Preferred Alternative adopted after preparation of the SDEIS is consistent with local planning efforts in the Twin Cities. Specifically, St. Paul has undertaken planning efforts in the vicinity of Central Corridor LRT stations.

Issue Summary ProALT-010. Selection of LRT stations for Preferred Alternative (6)

Comments:

(CCLRP0865) PlaTP-025

We're currently investing over \$80 million into our campus. This is coming from our parent company HealthEast in St. Paul. We're very excited about the project. We're excited about being part of the revitalization of St. Paul and the surrounding community and we also would like to see a stop down at St. Joseph's Hospital and we appreciate your consideration of that for our patients and our employees.

(CCLRP0921) PlaTP-029

I do wish the light rail went closer to St. Peter like the other person said because that is where I work, the St. Paul Public Library, the Ordway, the RiverCentre, Landmark Center, et cetera.

(CCLRP0545) PlaTP-124

That transit stops are appropriately placed for both residents' and commuters' use. We recommend that LRT or BRT stops in our neighborhood be located at Lexington, Hamline, Snelling and Fairview avenues.

(CCLRP0048) ProALT-032

I believe it is a great idea to minimize stations along the line. An overabundance of stations would slow down the service and make it less useful as a viable transportation option. I fully agree with the University Avenue alignment option and the station locations.

(CCLRP0781) ProALT-045

In closing, TLC asks Ramsey and Hennepin County and the Metropolitan Council to consider the following items: Increase the number of stops along University and reduce the number of stops in Downtown St. Paul;

(CCLRP0777) ProHLP-119

St. Joseph's Hospital administration. We're part of the HealthEast Care System and personally and our organization are in strong support of construction of Light Rail Transit on University Avenue with a stop at St. Joseph's Hospital.

Response ProALT-010. The Preferred Alternative includes a total of 20 stations. Of these stations, 15 are exclusive to Central Corridor and five will be shared with the Hiawatha Line. Below-ground infrastructure for future stations at Hamline Avenue, Victoria Street, and Western Avenue are also included. Chapter 2 of the FEIS includes a detail of the stations.

Issue Summary ProALT-025. Future LRT stations (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0523) ProALT-034

These groups of people provide much of the justification for the project, yet the actual light rail stops in the many of the neighborhoods where they live are limited to one stop per mile. It would appear as though these groups of people are indispensable in justifying the project, but dispensable in the provision of service.

(CCLRP0849) ProHLP-061

I'm here this evening to propose a stop at Iris Park. The reason why is, well, I do live two blocks from there, but there are these other reasons, too, and it's organized by location starting with the park. You could exit the train into a park. The other one that's less obvious is that the park has a large flat area in the back and large events could be planned there and would have great access for those.

Response ProALT-025. Criteria for station spacing and location was discussed in the Central Corridor Scoping Summary Report (2001). The AA/DEIS evaluated 16 new station locations and five shared locations with the existing Hiawatha LRT. The SDEIS evaluated three additional stations at Hamline Avenue, Victoria Street and Western Avenue, which would result in approximately half-mile station spacing through much of the Central Corridor. The project as proposed in the FEIS includes below grade infrastructure to allow for station construction at a future date.

Issue Summary ProHLP-003. Concerns in regard to station placement in St. Paul (4)

Comments:

(CCLRP0532) PlaTP-020

2. The community wants an opportunity to negotiate on the number of stops for the light rail and the frequency of busses that will run as a result of it.

(CCLRP0280) ProHLP-030

3. Station Placement. We endorse adding LRT stops at Cleveland, Hamline, Victoria, and Western. If these stops are not regarded as necessary now, they will be in the future.

(CCLRP0549) ProHLP-089

If required in order to meet the Cost-Effectiveness Index requirements, we would favor one or more of the following trade-offs: a. Reduce travel time by eliminating one or more stations in downtown St Paul where they are very close together.

(CCLRP0406) ProHLP-122

To 2-8, and Figure 2.3-2, add consideration of stations at Western, Victoria and Hamline.

Response ProHLP-003. Criteria for station spacing and location was discussed in the Central Corridor Scoping Summary Report (2001). The AA/DEIS evaluated 16 new station locations and five shared locations with the existing Hiawatha LRT. The SDEIS evaluated three additional stations at Hamline Avenue, Victoria Street and Western Avenue, which would result in approximately half-mile station spacing through much of the Central Corridor. The project as proposed in the FEIS includes below grade infrastructure to allow for station construction at a future date.

Issue Summary ProHLP-010. Need good connection to Union Depot to Downtown Minneapolis (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0823) ProHLP-010

It's critical that the corridor extend from Union Depot to Downtown Minneapolis. Any proposal that stops the line short of Union Depot is not acceptable.

(CCLRP0823) ProHLP-021

We need to clarify how the Central Corridor will actually connect at the depot, and we need to think about strong connections from Union Depot to regional destinations like the Minneapolis-St. Paul Airport.

(CCLRP0631) ProHLP-098

I do not understand why the renderings of the Union Depot stop put it in front of the headhouse, outside the concourse area. Given that every other transportation mode will enter via the concourse area (commuter rail, buses, Amtrak, etc.), it does not make sense to me that the Central Corridor LRT would be separated from them. This is reminiscent of the original Hiawatha Mall of America stop that would have been placed across the street from the complex. The Union Depot video on the centralcorridor.org site implies that the Central Corridor LRT would stop in the concourse area. I hope that is the case. If the timing of the post office vacating the Depot is the problem, perhaps it is possible to construct a temporary stop near the depot until the concourse can be renovated.

Response ProHLP-010. The Metropolitan Council has worked closely with RCRRA to ensure that the Central Corridor LRT plans are consistent with the RCRRA's plans to re-use Union Depot, in particular to accommodate existing freight rail and future passenger rail operations. The RCRRA will publish an Environmental Assessment providing information to agencies and the public regarding this planned re-use to provide multi-modal connection to the Central Corridor LRT, including intercity bus, commuter rail, and inter-city rail.

Issue Summary ProHLP-011. Concerns in regard to East Bank Station (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) ProHLP-028

3.6.2, page 3-48, University of Minnesota: The DEIS alignment and station location will not physically work based the 2004-05 design efforts by the University and Central Corridor staff. The East Bank Station needs to be located at Church Street with a Mezzanine connecting the sidewalks and existing tunnels. Elevators would be located along the north and south sidewalks for ADA access to the mezzanine.

(CCLRP0443) ProHLP-110

East Bank Station: The 2004-05 design effort was also reflected in the inability to physically construct the East Bank Station at the Mall and continue to permit any vehicular traffic on Washington Avenue SE. The East Bank Station was moved east to be a subsurface station at Church Street including a mezzanine connection to the sidewalks on both the north and south side of Washington and potentially connecting to the existing University of Minnesota Tunnel system.

(CCLRP0443) ProHLP-113

Section/page/table is S.1.1 page S-6: The depressed center platform has been recommended by the Central Corridor staff to be relocated to Church Street with a mezzanine design station. The DEIS station location will not work due to limited right of way and grades.

Response ProHLP-011. The Preferred Alternative identifies the East Bank Station as an at-grade, split-platform station located at Union Street. Chapter 2 of the SDEIS and the FEIS describe the details of the East Bank Station.

Issue Summary ProHLP-020. Analyses must be done which include the development potential around possible stations at Western and at Victoria (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) ProHLP-095

Analyses must be done which include the development potential around possible stations at Western and at Victoria.

Response ProHLP-020. The City of St. Paul is working with the Metropolitan Council in the development of plans to achieve specific neighborhood goals around stations including the future stations at Hamline Avenue, Victoria Street, and Western Avenue. The City of St. Paul will prepare station area plans for these future stations during 2009. The Preferred Alternative adopted after preparation of the SDEIS is consistent with local planning efforts in the Twin Cities. Section 3.1, Chapter 5, and Chapter 6 of the FEIS discuss station area plans.

Section: 2.3 - Grade Separation

Issue Summary EngTI-013. **LRT should be underground at Snelling and University** (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0030) EngTI-15

Underground at Snelling and University will assist with traffic.

Response EngTI-013. The Preferred Alternative, which is based on significant community input, does not provide for a grade-separated LRT crossing at Snelling Avenue. The Preferred Alternative shows an at-grade split-side platform station at Snelling Avenue, with the eastbound platform east of Snelling Avenue, and the westbound platform west of Snelling Avenue. This location was chosen based on input from several public meetings, and issue resolution team meetings. A resolution was passed by the Metropolitan Council in July of 2008 for a study on intersection redesign of Snelling Avenue at University Avenue to commence in 2009. Additional information on station locations is included in Chapter 2 of the FEIS. Traffic is discussed in detail in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngTI-023. **Grade separation to minimize impact to other transportation types** (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0651) EngTI-45

Putting light rail right down the middle of University Avenue would seem to have a negative impact on every other form of transportation on that street. I hope that it is not too late for other options to be considered.

We know what traffic issues have resulted from the Hiawatha LRT, and that line has its own right of way (except for downtown Minneapolis). Think of how many more streets cross University, and the issues multiply. I recently read some articles about monorail systems, and it appears that a monorail on University could be a better option than LRT at street level. Unfortunately, after listening to Rafael Ortega on Minnesota Public Radio this morning, it sounds like any public input will be too little too late. He ignored a question about elevated options (although he did say that tunnels are very expensive), and he makes it sound like 'the issues have all been investigated, here is the best solution, if we get the money this is what we are going to do'.

(CCLRP0898) ProALT-159

I'm an area resident here and I am a hundred percent in favor of effective mass transit and the reason that I'm - I look at models like Atlanta with MARTA. I look at the Bay Area transit system in San Francisco. I look at the Washington, D.C. area. Two weeks ago I was looking at the system as far as in Paris to see what their system was there and the common thread through all of those systems are you have a rapid transit system that is not affected by surface traffic and it does not affect surface traffic. That is the key issue.

Response EngTI-023. During the Screen I Evaluation (September 2000), various transit technologies were considered, including monorail, and then dismissed for several reasons. The AA/DEIS evaluated LRT and BRT. The Preferred Alternative is LRT at-grade except for aerial structures over major roadways and the shared use of the existing Washington Avenue Bridge facility over the Mississippi River. Chapter 2 of the SDEIS and the FEIS describes the alternatives considered prior to adoption of the Preferred Alternative. Traffic congestion is expected to increase in the area with or without the Central Corridor LRT Project. LRT will cause some intersections to operate at a decreased level of service. There are several strategies that may be employed to help mitigate these impacts. The new signal control systems and track systems will be integrated to provide extended "green" signal times to promote the efficient movement of trains along the corridor, while minimizing disruption to automobile traffic. The lengthening of turning lanes for some intersections may also be incorporated. Further details on traffic are described in 6.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaPla-008. Suggests elevating LRT (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0162) PlaPla-10

I believe that because I volunteer at the V.A. Hospital in Minneapolis that that line in that area is partially overhead except when it comes to the Hospital. Traffic gets backed up real bad in the a.m. and p.m. when most people are coming and going. That was a bad move putting the Light Rail on the ground in front of the V.A. Hospital. It is bad for the hospital and the general public. Just think what kind of effect it is going to have on the businesses along the Avenue. It will be a great big negative one.

Response PlaPla-008. No grade separations, elevated portions or tunnels, are planned for the Central Corridor LRT. The current design of the Preferred Alternative is discussed in Chapter 2 of the FEIS. Traffic impacts are discussed in Section 6 of the FEIS. The Central Corridor Partnership, an alliance of St. Paul and Midway area business leaders, will be providing assistance to help businesses with marketing strategies and business planning to survive the construction process and let their customers know they are still open. The partnership is developing a business management plan and seeking funding sources. The Central Corridor LRT Project will be handling construction, which includes providing information about detours, signage, etc.

Issue Summary PlaTE-019. Favors the University Avenue at-grade alignment (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0006) PlaTE-36

I believe that University Avenue is the best location for LRT because pedestrian access to stations will be easier and transit-oriented development will take place more easily.

Response PlaTE-019. The Preferred Alternative includes LRT running at-grade down the center of University Avenue.

Issue Summary PlaTP-010. Snelling and University intersection should have grade separation (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0288) PlaTP-012

The intersection at Snelling and University. This intersection is already terrible and I am afraid that it will only get worse. In my opinion, it would be worth the extra money to either put in a bridge for cars to pass over University on Snelling or to put in a bridge for LRT to pass over Snelling on University or put LRT underground for a short while on University at that corner

(CCLRP0448) PlaTP-045

The intersection of University and Snelling is by far one of the busiest in the state. I urge that the Snelling Station be built elevated above motor vehicle traffic level at least at this intersection.

(CCLRP0215) PlaTP-108

I also hope that it will be built above ground at Snelling and University - the timing systems have not worked well enough on Hiawatha to risk alienating thousands of people if the Snelling/University intersection becomes more congested.

Response PlaTP-010. The Preferred Alternative does not provide for a grade-separated LRT crossing at Snelling Avenue. The Preferred Alternative shows an at-grade split-side platform station at Snelling Avenue, with the eastbound platform east of Snelling Avenue, and the westbound platform west of Snelling Avenue. This location was chosen based on input from several public meetings, and issue resolution team meetings. A detailed description of the station locations is included in Chapter 2 of the FEIS. Traffic is discussed in detail in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-011. Supports above-grade or below-grade LRT (22)

Comments:

(CCLRP0798) PlaTP-013

That is to if not consider an elevated train, perhaps a subway down portions of University Corridor that would accommodate to the commerce that is now going on.

(CCLRP0900) PlaTP-060

If a tunnel or grade changes are needed at congested intersections I hope those investments in this project are made on the front end. And, lastly, if there's room I'd like to see a bike lane squeezed in. you.

(CCLRP0156) PlaTP-061

LRT would be a great asset to the Univ of MN. A tunnel option, while more expensive, should be completed. The East Bank of the U is filled with pedestrians, and there is already a great deal of bus and car traffic along Washington Ave. Adding a LRT line on the surface would crowd this already busy street. A tunnel would take traffic off the street, along with some traffic that would be in Single Occupancy Vehicles, who are now riding the LRT.

(CCLRP0848) PlaTP-072

The Draft EIS provides for a tunnel separating light rail from bus, auto, pedestrian, bicycle traffic. This is essential to optimizing the operation of the Central Corridor Line, thus ensuring the optimal predictable travel times along the avenue. In addition, the proposed option will promote safety to riders and nonriders alike.

(CCLRP0447) PlaTP-129

The University of Minnesota Officials have proposed that the Light Rail run underground through a tunnel and that they would like to add more stops. Running LRT underground would increase the cost of this project significantly. It stands at about 840 million. Would the Met Council, Commissioners and other state officials give the wishes of the U of MN more credence than the wishes of the communities directly impacted? The University of Minnesota is a State Funded Institution and funded in part by us the people of the surrounding wards. We would expect that our voices would carry as much weight as the University of Minnesota.

(CCLRP0030) PlaTP-142

Go underground!

(CCLRP0744) PlaTP-151

The Draft EIS provides for a tunnel to separate light rail from the bus, out of pedestrian and bicycle traffic. This is essential to optimizing the operation of the Central Corridor line, thus ensuring optimal and predictable transit times along the avenue. In addition, the proposed tunnel will promote the safety of riders and non-riders alike and the functionality of the University of Minnesota Campus.

(CCLRP0256) PlaTP-163

If you do Light Rail... please do not have crossings at street level. While initially it is more expensive... in the long run it will pay off in safety, speed and less traffic congestion....I believe that is the one major flaw with the Hiawatha Line....

(CCLRP0472) PlaTP-168

As I said at the hearing, putting light rail at grade on University Avenue is a foolish, short-sighted notion. Implementing such a plan will create more problems than it solves.

(CCLRP0182) ProALT-022

In order to mitigate some of the physical impact of the light rail, I would like the city to look into elevating or burying the line in areas that would be most impacted, or perhaps along the entire line.

(CCLRP0057) ProALT-026

I think that the light rail should be up high, not down low. That's all have to say.

(CCLRP0162) ProALT-028

But I think it should be overhead along University Avenue.

(CCLRP0374) ProALT-035

Rail can move more people faster than busses if built properly. However, if the line is built cheaply, then they had might as well go for busses. There are places where it might be best to tunnel or elevate the line due to heavy traffic, for example Washington Avenue through the U of M, and a few places along University Avenue. Stations could be elevated as they are at Lake Street. Somehow, the line must be built so that it can be very high speed, and not just a slow speed, street car which is bogged down by cars and traffic lights

(CCLRP0084) ProALT-043

It's very important for city officials and Metro Transit to give serous consideration to an elevated structure to run above University Street, including the stretch that leads through the University of Minnesota campus area toward downtown Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0084) ProALT-044

Elevated structures have been highly successful in many major cities. The University stretch is too long, and with too many stops, for a slow-paced ride. One of the benefits of the Hiawatha Line is that trains don't have to worry as much about traffic flow. The trains don't run down the middle of the street....And there is a stretch of elevation for the Hiawatha Line near Highway 62. The same kind of structure can be used above University, and it only has to be widened for stops and platforms. It is understandable for trains to run through streets in downtown St. Paul, as the Hiawatha Line does in downtown Minneapolis, but once trains approach university, the route should be elevated.

(CCLRP0792) ProALT-046

So I would really recommend maybe considering an elevated structure on University to really avoid all the traffic delays and traffic hassles you may get. I'm telling you, I've been around the country in many cities and I haven't seen a highly successful light rail system on the streets considering the distance that you're running on University from, say, downtown to all the way to Minneapolis. You can do it downtown, but to run that long a distance it's going to be tough and I would really hope that maybe somebody would consider an elevated structure to run over University to really save the traffic snarls and parking.

(CCLRP0264) ProALT-076

All the same, I must urge you to make an effort to put LRT up in the air, out of traffic. If properly built (not by shoddy contractors) it would last well over 100 years and have a much greater return on the investment than the grade-level LRT, which is unlikely to last 30 years. If we can build 2 or 3 stadiums, surely the extra cost of Elevated Fast Rail should not be an insurmountable burden.

(CCLRP0005) ProALT-420

An elevated railway will be more feasible.

(CCLRP0179) ProALT-541

Though I do not entirely support a ground level light rail system. I support a lifted light rail, such as the famous "el" train systems in Chicago. A lifted light rail will supply Minneapolis/Saint Paul with smoother traffic, less danger, and faster speeds. Building a lifted light rail will ease congestion on busy streets such as, Snelling Avenue, Rice Street, Dale, and University Avenue itself. For example, there will be guaranteed no conflicting light changes while the train is passing by Snelling Avenue or any other major intersection that is light controlled. Therefore, if Snelling has a green light creating crossing traffic to University Avenue, there will be no conflicting traffic on Snelling and the rail that is passing above. I know for one, not everything or everyone is perfect in this world. There will be many times when the rail will have to stop due to red lights on Dale, Snelling, etc. Ultimately, this will slow down the commute every time the rail will have to stop due to crossing traffic. Traffic running below the rail on University Avenue, will run smoother because this will cause less confusion, and better peripheral, and direct vision of oncoming as well as cross traffic. Ultimately, creating a better environment.

(CCLRP0179) ProALT-582

Also, individuals riding the line will travel at a slightly higher speed and have quicker stops, due to no red lights they may encounter; concluding riders will have a quicker commute. Building a raised light rail maybe more expensive, but building a ground light rail in the proposed areas will have a much more hazardous effect.

(CCLRP0078) ProPM-013

I am opposed to above surface rail along University Avenue

(CCLRP0179) SocSS-10

If you do wish to build it on ground, I think a better location is the divide between interstate 94, much like that of Chicago's "el" train, where there are no lights, pedestrians and cross traffic. A lifted train would definitely provide a safer neighborhood than building on ground level. If you do concrete research you will find that University ranks number one in the twin cities as the most dangerous street in the metro area. I am sure there are a few other roads but I do have my conclusions. I grew up around that area, having many friends from midway and frogtown. Each time I drove and still drive down University I see at least one dozen j-walkers, and I am sure building a ground light rail could be a hazardous object to put in these neighborhoods. Even though j-walking is illegal; the law will be broken by individuals in the area time after time, even with a light rail system built in. A lifted train will be many times less hazardous than a ground light train. Also, traffic will not deal with the light rail at all if it is lifted, so there will be no question that no cars will hit the light rail or a light rail would hit a car.

Response PlaTP-011. The Central Corridor Preferred Alternative would be at-grade except for aerial structures over major roadways and the shared use of the existing Washington Avenue Bridge facility over the Mississippi River. Although the AA/DEIS included a tunnel through the U of M, the SDEIS evaluated an At-Grade Transit/Pedestrian Mall, which was adopted as part of the Preferred Alternative. A detailed description of the design options developed in the early stages of PE is discussed in Section 2.2.2.3 of the SDEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-035. Some form of grade separation should be considered at University and Snelling (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0199) PlaTP-187

2) Some form of grade separation must be considered at critical points along the corridor. In particular at University Avenue and Snelling Avenue. At this intersection either dropping the line below street level, or raising it above will permit effective flow of automobile traffic through the intersection.

(CCLRP0425) PlaTP-225

We think at University and Snelling that the rail has to be either elevated or underground. That's our biggest request. Please try to do an El-train or a Subway, at least for this stretch of the track.

Response PlaTP-035. The Preferred Alternative does not provide for a grade-separated LRT crossing at Snelling Avenue. The Preferred Alternative shows an at-grade split-side platform station at Snelling Avenue, with the eastbound platform east of Snelling Avenue, and the westbound platform west of Snelling Avenue. This location was chosen based on input from several public meetings, and issue resolution team meetings. A detailed description of the station locations is included in Chapter 2 of the FEIS. Traffic is discussed in detail in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-039. Concerns about preferred alignment and grade (21)

Comments:

(CCLRP0067) EngRW-2

LRT should not be at grade, should not make grade level crossings, and should not have to be governed by traffic signals on University Ave. LRT should not be at grade in downtown St. Paul either. It's not fun, and no advantage to be on the train in downtown Minneapolis where it has to stop at every light.

(CCLRP0481) PlaTP-076

It belongs on the rail tracks north of Pierce Butler where limited stops could create a truly valuable link between St. Paul, the Capitol, the Midway, the University, and downtown Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-102

3.5.3, page 3-39 - University Avenue LRT Alternative: Stadium Village Station to 29th Avenue Southeast Station: The University of Minnesota will continue to utilize the University Transitway in the area from 23rd Avenue Southeast to the Saint Paul Campus. Adequate right of way and paved surface must remain to allow the continued operation of the transitway.

(CCLRP0084) PlaTP-147

An elevated structure above University would be a great relief to businesses along the route.

(CCLRP0472) PlaTP-159

Planners rejected a route closely skirting I-94. Instead, they say light rail should run on University Avenue at GRADE LEVEL.

Think: Between Huron Boulevard at the eastern edge of the University of Minnesota Campus in Minneapolis, and Rice Street in St. Paul, there are 25 traffic lights on University Avenue. Planners aren't saying how this can be handled; no doubt because there is no good way to handle it at grade level.

(CCLRP0188) PlaTP-167

Why not run the line along an existing hi-way like 94?

(CCLRP0741) PlaTP-178

It's disappointing you didn't go further and examine the possibility of a truly first-class line that would run mostly overhead and in tunnels underground in the downtown areas as well as the University. That kind of line would move a lot of people and it would be attractive to a lot of people and every station along University Avenue could be as good as the Lake Street Station in Minneapolis which is the best on the Hiawatha line. A second deck could be added if the day comes, as it surely will, when we believe that we need an express line between the two cities.

(CCLRP0916) PlaTP-185

Trains are best suited to covering longer distances at speeds as great or greater than the automobile. To do so they should travel in their own separated right-of-way. LRT is an inappropriate application of rail technology. LRT is the wrong idea in the wrong place at the wrong time for the wrong reasons and if we go down this road I think our transit system will wind up being a small herd of white elephants.

(CCLRP0777) PlaTP-195

If I could add briefly, we ask you to consider modifying your route in Downtown St. Paul to include a stop at St. Joseph's Hospital.

(CCLRP0330) PlaTP-237

A better idea is to run it along the north side of freeway I-94, just a block and a half, or two, south of University Ave. If you have to disrupt the service road there it would not affect things nearly as bad as it would on University Ave. In Minneapolis they did not run the light-rail through or along a commercial district. What would be the idea? To be fast the light-rail can't stop too often anyway. I hope you will consider my suggestions, and please use some common-sense here.

(CCLRP0068) PlaTP-238

One lane of loud traffic in each direction along with light rail and perhaps a bike lane should be the configuration of Washington Ave through campus.

(CCLRP0447) ProALT-010

A compromise: Design the LRT to turn south at transfer road then travel parallel to the Am Track rail two blocks to freeway 94. Engineer it to run on the north side of freeway 94 making the stop at the designated cross streets. There wouldn't be the substantial infrastructure i.e. buildings, gas, sewer electrical, safety and the total inconvenience issues this would bring to the area. It may also shed light on how to deal with the traffic jams during morning and evening rush hour on the freeway. Remember the LRT is to alleviate the transportation of the future number of people moving to the area. It then could also alleviate the present freeway congestion we have.

(CCLRP0643) ProALT-023

I am requesting that the light rail go up and down Interstate 94. It would not affect any homes or businesses

(CCLRP0881) ProALT-024

I do have another suggestion, however, that maybe the light rail could go down St. Peter Street making it much closer to the hospital and also closer to the entertainment district, by the Science Museum, the Xcel Center, and to all the restaurants that are on St. Peter.

(CCLRP0792) ProALT-025

When I first heard about a light rail system here I was kind of curious about knowing why they didn't think about running the train down I-94. In Chicago they've had great success with that kind of a system through the medians and the expressways and Chicago's been a pioneer on that, but since I've been standing here I've noticed that there's a passion for the businesses on University Street.

(CCLRP0471) ProALT-027

LRT is an express method of travel. It belongs in an express corridor, such as along the service drives of I-94. To put it on University will create a 2-tier transportation system, with LRT as a pass-through for the wealthy and the remaining low-frequency bus service for transit-dependant residents. It will cause horrendous traffic backups on north-south streets which will add to the already polluted air. It will reduce the number of intersections where people can cross University, and add more cars to our already congested streets as suburban commuters drive into our neighborhoods to park their cars so they can avoid paying for parking in either downtown.

(CCLRP0152) ProPM-051

We need light rail, but not on University.

(CCLRP0151) ProPM-060

LRT not on University.

(CCLRP0020) ProPM-128

I am pro LRT, but not on University Avenue. Try the BNSF route - is better!

(CCLRP0857) ProPM-267

There is room for Light Rail Transit on University. The right-of-way used by the streetcars on University that was lined and rebuilt in 1948 to 1950 is still there as unused space.

(CCLRP0271) ProPM-271

Pedestrian and bicycle access to the existing section of Central Corridor transitway has also already been built, less than a block from my South St. Anthony Park home and office. Extend the existing Central Corridor transitway to the 2 downtowns and beyond. Put light-rail transit where it belongs. Put it on the transitway. Put it in my backyard.

Response PlaTP-039. During the AA/DEIS, several alignment alternatives were evaluated based on the results of several earlier studies. After publication of the AA/DEIS and completion of the public hearings, the Metropolitan Council adopted the AA/DEIS LPA for the Central Corridor. The AA/DEIS LPA was 11 miles in length, of which 9.8 miles consisted of new alignment and 1.2 miles using the existing Hiawatha LRT alignment in downtown Minneapolis. The AA/DEIS LPA was at-grade along most of the alignment with the exception of a tunnel through the U of M's East Bank. Subsequent to the completion of the AA/DEIS for the Central Corridor LRT Project, several unresolved policy questions and design element options arose which required additional study. These unresolved issues and design changes resulted in the completion of the SDEIS. After the publication of the SDEIS, the Metropolitan Council adopted a Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is defined as LRT operating at-grade on Washington and University Avenues, passing north of the State Capitol and turning south on Robert Street, turning west at 12th Street to Cedar Street, and then continuing south on Cedar Street into downtown St. Paul turning diagonally at 4th Street, and continuing east to end at St. Paul's Union Depot with tail track leading to an operations and maintenance facility farther east (Metropolitan Council Resolution

No. 2008-26). A more detailed description of the Preferred Alternative is included in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-104. Include analysis of future possibility of Snelling Ave grade separated from University Avenue (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0436) PlaTP-113

Currently the City of St. Paul, in conjunction with Ramsey County Regional Rail, Ramsey County Public Works, and Mn/DOT is in the midst of a capacity/traffic analysis of the Snelling/University Ave. intersection. An option that is still under consideration is to grade separate Snelling Ave. It would be useful to include some discussion of how this may affect the proposed action, and how the proposed action may affect the viability of such an option.

Response PlaTP-104. The Preferred Alternative does not provide for a grade-separated LRT crossing at Snelling Avenue. The Preferred Alternative shows an at-grade split-side platform station at Snelling Avenue, with the eastbound platform east of Snelling Avenue, and the westbound platform west of Snelling Avenue. This location was chosen based on input from several public meetings, and issue resolution team meetings. A resolution was passed by the Metropolitan Council in July of 2008 for a study on intersection redesign of Snelling Avenue at University Avenue to commence in 2009. A detailed description of the station locations is included in Chapter 2 of the FEIS. Traffic is discussed in detail in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProHLP-021. In favor of above grade or below grade LRT (13)

Comments:

(CCLRP0241) ProALT-428

I cannot be more for mass transit, I would like subway to be considered in the central corridor, as the disruption of University Ave traffic should be taken into consideration.

(CCLRP0472) ProALT-603

I would not disagree, except to say that it seems even more appropriate to tunnel and put in heavy rail. The heavy rail lines in such cities as New York and Boston have served those communities well for many years. Tunneling beneath the Twin Cities should be relatively easy, due to the prevalence of limestone, sandstone, sand and cavernous substrata. We should plan for the time, soon approaching, when the population here reaches the level it was in Boston when that city wisely began installing heavy rail after previously installing slower, lighter capacity lines.

(CCLRP0287) ProHLP-001

If you feel you must put in light rail, elevate it (at least at certain major intersections) because a ground-level interaction with cars wrecks it for cars crossing the street... I don't cross the light rail along Hiawatha because of this - I go under it at Lake Street or over it on the Mhha Parkway! (I also in general stay off of Hiawatha entirely and take Snelling Ave instead. We motorists hate the light rail because it really screws up getting around across the tracks.)

(CCLRP0828) ProHLP-018

Another feature that I think needs to be considered is to depress the right-of-way beneath major intersections on University Avenue to avoid the problems that occur on the Hiawatha line, for example, at East 26th Street, East 42nd Street. This would also make left turns and traffic control much more efficient. That is, take light rail out of the equation at Snelling and University, Vandalia, Rice and University, Lexington Parkway.

(CCLRP0752) ProHLP-026

I urge you to consider elevating this line, tunneling it, or else placing the line in the I-94 trench, elevating it there possibly or running it parallel to I-94 perhaps on the south side of the I-94 trench.

(CCLRP0910) ProHLP-045

Down underground. Underground transportation. Let's make it a real light rail system. Stop being around on top, shoving it down our throats. It took us 50 years to get a viable community again. Why destroy it at this point? And we don't even know what's offered to us. You know, we have no idea. I say how much money is even left to do anything and if there isn't enough money maybe we need to go back somewhere else and get some more because if you can't do it right, don't do it at all.

(CCLRP0078) ProHLP-052

Along I-94 or below grade preferable.

(CCLRP0179) ProHLP-062

A raised light rail system will have an ability to travel at faster speeds due to no traffic or pedestrian crossing. This will ultimately create better flow for both drivers and light rail commuters. As well, this will decrease time by possibly ten minutes, making the commute between Saint Paul and Minneapolis twenty-five minutes rather the proposed thirty-five minutes, due to trains traveling near forty-five miles an hour rather than thirty-five miles per hour. This will increase customer levels and in turn, raise a higher amount of money to pay for the expenses of building the light rail. Stop intervals through whole corridor could save possibly five to ten minutes of time, because the train can simply take off without no worries of cross traffic, red lights, pedestrians, and parallel traffic.

(CCLRP0084) ProHLP-076

The potential problems with traffic and business obstruction along University would be greatly diminished and ease the disruption (cut-off) for people living and traveling along the route. There would also be no disruption to cross traffic. People can still drive and walk across University with an elevated structure above. The reduced inconvenience is immeasurable.

Imagine the backup on Snelling, which is already congested at times at university, if motorists have to wait a little longer for train to pass through, particularly in rush hour. Also, if current express bus routes (94B and 94C) are able to connect riders between downtown St. Paul and downtown Minneapolis quicker than the light-rail, the rationale for the train is defeated.

(CCLRP0898) ProHLP-086

I ask the important question, folks. Any leaders in this area here? Why can Atlanta and many other cities have effective rapid transit systems in their cities and we have to be looking at sticking small, about putting a railroad down one of our main thoroughfares connecting one city to another? Why? Why can't we think - (Applause) Why can't we think big? Why can't we have a system that's invisible? Clearly. Are we second-rate? Are we not what we need to be here? We need to look at the number of hours, the number of minutes that are saved but also the number of minutes that are delayed. When you force a railroad down University Avenue you're going to squeeze precious space from parking, from

(CCLRP0822) ProHLP-093

The Draft EIS provides for a tunnel to separate light rail from bus, auto, pedestrian, bicycle traffic. This is essential to optimizing the operation of the Central Corridor, thus ensuring optimal and predictable travel times along the avenue.

(CCLRP0074) ProHLP-099

Would it be too expensive to make the system elevate, like in Chicago?

(CCLRP0275) ProHLP-111

Why don't we build this thing right the first time and get the train out of traffic so that it can travel faster? The mistakes that we made with the Hiawatha Line are something we can learn from. Half of my commute is spent in the downtown waiting for lights to turn, etc. If we had spent the money up front and tunneled underground, this would be a much better system. It seems to me that we need to elevate the train over the major intersections or go beneath them. I know that this would increase the cost of the line substantially, but in the long run it would be worth it. I think that St. Paul should be getting an improved version of the light rail system, not a slowed down version stuck in traffic. If buses can travel faster on the freeway, why even bother to build it? People are looking for an improved version of public transit with light rail. In light of increasing gas prices, more people will be riding public transit. I think we have an obligation to spend a little more money and build this thing right the first time.

Response ProHLP-021. The Central Corridor Preferred Alternative would be at-grade except for aerial structures over major roadways and the shared use of the existing Washington Avenue Bridge facility over the Mississippi River. Although the AA/DEIS included a tunnel through the U of M, the SDEIS evaluated an At-Grade Transit/Pedestrian Mall. A detailed description of the design options developed in the early stages of PE is discussed in Section 2.2.2.3 of the SDEIS.

Issue Summary ProProjBdj-007. [Should consider eliminating tunnel](#) (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0154) ProProjBdj-010

Should further cuts in the project's cost be necessary to maintain a favorable CEI (Cost Effectiveness Index), the MPCC recommends elimination of the U of M tunnel or as many as two of the five stations in downtown St. Paul.

(CCLRP0015) ProProjBdj-014

The cost and construction impacts of a tunnel through the U of M concern me. Is a tunnel absolutely required?

Response ProProjBdj-007. The Preferred Alternative includes an at-grade LRT alignment on Washington Avenue running from the Washington Avenue Bridge to Oak Street, which would function as a transit mall. This alternative would change the operation of this segment by excluding automobile traffic. Enhancements would be made to pedestrian and other transit facilities operating in this segment. Emergency vehicle access would be maintained. The Stadium Village Station would be located at the proposed U of M multi-modal center. The East Bank Station would be located on Washington Avenue at Union Street.

Issue Summary SocNC-015. Concerns about impact on community for on-grade LRT
(1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0741) SocNC-082

It would have a negative impact on daily life in the local communities and it would limit the number of trains that you could put on the track just as the Hiawatha's grade-level structure limits it.

Response SocNC-015. Daily life in the local communities along the Central Corridor LRT alignment will be different with implementation of the project because new transit service will be available and areas around the stations will be busier with riders waiting to board the trains and with passengers alighting and going into the neighborhoods. To provide adequate access for transit users, LRT alignments are usually taken through areas where population and employment are more dense. The AA/DEIS and SDEIS examined numerous alignment options that are detailed in Chapter 2 of both documents. The Central Corridor Preferred Alternative would be at-grade except for aerial structures over major roadways and the shared use of the existing Washington Avenue Bridge facility over the Mississippi River. Pedestrians and bicyclists will be able to cross University Avenue at all signalized intersections. Crossings of the Avenue will also be possible at non-signalized pedestrian crossings, which will be provided at all intersections that do not have a traffic signal. Detailed preliminary engineering plans indicating the various locations for these crossings are included in Appendix L of the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocNC-016. Concern in regard to raised rail (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0030) SocNC-204

If you raise the rail it ghettoizes the area below and no one wants to rent on the upper floors because it's loud with people.

Response SocNC-016. The Central Corridor Preferred Alternative would be at-grade except for aerial structures over major roadways and the shared use of the existing Washington

Avenue Bridge facility over the Mississippi River.. Noise is discussed in Section 4.6 of the FEIS.

Section: 2.3 - University of Minnesota

Issue Summary PlaTP-009. Should reroute through-traffic around U of M (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0193) PlaTP-011

The project should include a rerouting of through-traffic around campus, leaving that section of Washington Avenue as one lane for local traffic as well as light rail in each direction. City, county and regional rail staff have indicated to me that this is both feasible and desirable. Please prepare plans for such traffic re-routing so that we may view and comment on them. If vehicle traffic is maintained at four lanes through campus (not recommended), it would be preferable to put it below grade through campus and put the less intrusive and safer light rail at grade, not the reverse.

(CCLRP0068) PlaTP-116

The light rail design proposal through the U of M East bank Campus should include either a diversion of through-traffic around campus or a tunnel for traffic (not by light rail) through part of campus (Mall-Caufman area).

Response PlaTP-009. The Preferred Alternative includes an at-grade LRT alignment on Washington Avenue running from the Washington Avenue Bridge to Oak Street, which would function as a transit mall. This alternative would change the operation of this segment by excluding automobile traffic. Enhancements would be made to pedestrian and other transit facilities operating in this segment. Emergency vehicle access would be maintained. The Stadium Village Station would be located at the proposed U of M multi-modal center. The East Bank Station would be located on Washington Avenue at Union Street. Chapter 6 includes a detailed discussion of the traffic diversion through the U of M.

Issue Summary PlaTP-056. Supports a tunnel section near the U of M Campus (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0457) PlaTP-170

The City of Minneapolis supports the tunnel near the U of M Campus. Further discussion and evaluation regarding the tunnel near the U of M Campus is needed. A tunnel would better address traffic capacity needs and bus service needs along Washington Avenue SE. A tunnel would also provide an opportunity to improve the aesthetic characteristics of the corridor. The affected Minneapolis neighborhood (Prospect Park) and business association (Stadium Village Commerce Association) also support the tunnel.

(CCLRP0437) PlaTP-223

The DEIS lists five issues that justify the need for transportation improvements in the Central Corridor: Traffic congestion; increased traffic demand; increased travel times; decreased safety; and lack of available and affordable parking. The University believes that the LRT alternative with a below-grade alignment best addresses these issues.

Response PlaTP-056. Chapter 2 of the SDEIS includes the reasons for dismissing the tunnel from further consideration. The Preferred Alternative includes an at-grade LRT alignment on Washington Avenue running from the Washington Avenue Bridge to Oak Street, which would function as a transit mall. This alternative would change the operation of this segment by excluding automobile traffic. Enhancements would be made to pedestrian and other transit facilities operating in this segment. Emergency vehicle access would be maintained. The Stadium Village Station would be located at the proposed U of M multi-modal center. The East Bank Station would be located on Washington Avenue at Union Street.

Issue Summary PlaTP-068. Concern about bus stops on and near U of M campus (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-057

Section/page/table is 2.3.3, page 2-13 Stations: University of Minnesota and Prospect Park. The University questions the statement: "Buses would not stop in front of Coffman Union on Washington Ave." The bus stop in front of Coffman Union is a major stop for both Metro Transit and the University's Shuttle System. It is unclear from figure 2.3-5 where such East Bank stop would be.

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-253

Section/page/table is S.3.1, page S-7: The University questions the statement: "Buses would not stop in front of Coffman Union on Washington Ave." The bus stop in front of Coffman Union is a major stop for both Metro Transit and the University's Shuttle System. It is unclear from figure S.1-2 where such East Bank stop would be.

Response PlaTP-068. The Metropolitan Council is working closely with the U of M to develop an engineering conceptual layout and transit service plan with details of where and how buses will stop within the Washington Avenue At-Grade Transit/Pedestrian Mall.

Issue Summary PlaTP-070. Alternative routes near U of M (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0910) PlaTP-256

It's my understanding that there's very little money at this point to do much about what's happening except from the University because they weren't able to go through where they wanted to. They had to negotiate three different ways: In front of the University, behind the University, and now it's going under the University.

Response PlaTP-070. The Preferred Alternative includes an at-grade LRT alignment on Washington Avenue running from the Washington Avenue Bridge to Oak Street, which would function as a transit mall. This alternative would change the operation of this segment by excluding automobile traffic. Enhancements would be made to pedestrian and other transit facilities operating in this segment. Emergency vehicle access would be maintained. The Stadium Village Station would be located at the proposed U of M multi-modal center. The East Bank Station would be located on Washington Avenue at Union Street. Chapter 6 includes a detailed discussion of the traffic diversion through the U of M.

Issue Summary PlaTP-085. Should have stops on the U of M campus and in downtown St. Paul near the Securian campus (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0238) PlaTP-075

I live in Ramsey (Anoka County) and work at Securian Financial Group in downtown St. Paul. My husband works at the University of Minnesota. The proposed commuter rail links to Anoka County in addition to the Central Corridor would serve as a valuable option for us to commute to work each day. I would like to see stops near University and Huron on the U of M campus and in downtown St. Paul near the Securian campus.

Response PlaTP-085. The Preferred Alternative includes a total of 20 stations. Of these stations, 15 are exclusive to Central Corridor and five will be shared with the Hiawatha Line. Below-ground infrastructure for future stations at Hamline Avenue, Victoria Street, and Western Avenue are also included. Chapter 2 of the FEIS identifies the station locations for the Preferred Alternative.

Issue Summary ProALT-008. Selection of Preferred Alternative alignment through U of M campus (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0429) ProALT-030

In order to keep traffic interruption to a minimum if light rail is routed down University Avenue, run it through a tunnel underground with escalators and stairs up to ground level. I have traveled in many areas and have noticed that underground transit moves swiftly and this would eliminate people trying to drive across the tracks.

(CCLRP0539) ProALT-033

1. Any alignment of the line on Washington Avenue through the U of M must be below grade.

(CCLRP0480) ProALT-036

3) While I do not have a concrete suggestion for the Saint Paul section of the LRT route (there are too many things I do not know), I do have a concrete suggestion for the Minneapolis segment, which perhaps illustrates the sort of thinking that I fear has not been sufficiently applied to the Saint Paul portion of the alignment. I'm flabbergasted at the plan to

tunnel under the Mississippi river at the Washington Ave bridge, and then under the U of M campus, rather than to use existing, abandoned rail corridors over nearly the same region. The cost of the tunnels and underground stations could be much better spent elsewhere. Other than some rationale specifying that the LRT must run right through the center of the U of M campus, I am at a loss to see why the Washington Ave tunnel route would be favored over this one. This proposed route requires far less infrastructure, utilizes existing bridges and tunnels to improve transit speeds, and does not require the removal of any existing structures, save for some parking lot asphalt. Granted, this route isn't quite as convenient for students, but were that of utmost importance a tunnel could begin where this route reaches the east bank, and be put through the heart of the campus.

(CCLRP0313) ProALT-037

I am not convinced that a subway is needed only for LRT on the east bank of the U of M under Washington Ave. If it is essential for LRT, then it would be for BRT also. More study needs to be done to determine what could be done to divert enough general traffic off of Washington Ave SE to convert it into a semi-mall. Consider how a complete Granary Rd/Piece Butler Route, including interchanges at I-35W near 2nd St SE and at Hwy 280, could draw traffic off of University Ave. Consider how East River Road between the Washington Ave bridge and Oak St. / I-94 could take U of M traffic off of Washington Ave. These ideas deserve a fair assessment as they could significantly reduce the cost of the Central Corridor project. I think that it is very possible to design in room for transit lanes and stations and leave more curb parking on University Ave. with a design like those attached to this e-mail. The images are intended to be printed landscape. 11X17 paper is best, but 8.5X14 (legal) sheets will work OK. The images proceed from View 0 thru 3, then the "It" views show intersections with left turn lanes, no station. The concept illustrated uses the 120 foot-wide right of way very efficiently. The LRT tracks would need to "serpentine" at intersections with either stations or left turn lanes. The reward this design gives: Most curb parking is maintained and bus stops can be kept close to the rail stations. If you are expecting transfers between buses and trains (that's a big yes), then this proximity matters a lot!! How far would passengers need to walk between Route 16 bus stops and rail platforms with the current concepts? Note the 11 foot - wide lanes. These are becoming more acceptable again in progressive traffic engineering departments because they are a proven way to urge motorists keep within a 30 MPH speed limit. My concepts do not show left turn lanes at all intersections, since I am assuming the creative (and proven) option for major intersections of having left turns routed by making a right turn a block early, then go a block to the cross-street, then make a left turn. This is using side streets as a well-signed "ring road". I have read that well designed ring roads can actually have more traffic capacity than convention intersections with left turn lanes and signals with left turn arrows.

(CCLRP0753) ProALT-039

I also truly believe in the tunneling section under the University because it would keep safety number one in mind, but I believe that that tunnel should start maybe on the West Bank side and go tunnel, bridge, tunnel so that the Washington Avenue Bridge and Washington Street would not be closed during construction and that it would also keep the four lanes open.

Response ProALT-008. The Preferred Alternative includes an at-grade LRT alignment on

Washington Avenue running from the Washington Avenue Bridge to Oak Street, which would function as a transit mall. This alternative would change the operation of this segment by excluding automobile traffic. Enhancements would be made to pedestrian and other transit facilities operating in this segment. Emergency vehicle access would be maintained. The Stadium Village Station would be located at the proposed U of M multi-modal center. The East Bank Station would be located on Washington Avenue at Union Street.

Issue Summary ProALT-012. LRT alignment through the U of M complex (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) ProALT-311

Section/page/table is 3.3.2 page 3-21 University Avenue LRT Alternative: University of Minnesota Campus Paragraph #3 -References to the addition of retaining walls, fencing, and tunnel portal at Church Street should be amended to reflect the updated plans for the East Bank Station. In addition, the existing pedestrian tunnel referenced in the DEIS would be replaced.

Response ProALT-012. The Preferred Alternative includes an at-grade LRT alignment on Washington Avenue running from the Washington Avenue Bridge to Oak Street, which would function as a transit mall. This alternative would change the operation of this segment by excluding automobile traffic. Enhancements would be made to pedestrian and other transit facilities operating in this segment. Emergency vehicle access would be maintained. The Stadium Village Station would be located at the proposed U of M multi-modal center. The East Bank Station would be located on Washington Avenue at Union Street..

Issue Summary ProHLP-001. Concerns in regard to tunnel sections through U of M (10)

Comments:

(CCLRP0738) ProHLP-002

Our campus, as it was said, is going to be greatly affected by the Central Corridor line and I would like to really emphasize that I personally think that the tunnel idea is the best for our campus, specifically for students. Students ride bikes a lot and Washington Avenue is already extremely congested and dangerous for bicycling, but students still do it, of course. So having an aboveground LRT would affect the traffic on that corridor even more and would make it even more dangerous than it already is.

(CCLRP0931) ProHLP-020

The other thing is I would also like to see this tunnel section be configured in this way to where the stadium village and east bank become part of one station and construct another station right along the University of Minnesota transit way so that you can essentially set up for a feeder line up to the St. Paul campus and state fair grounds up to the Rosedale Shopping Center, as well as the Shoreview Industrial Park.

(CCLRP0101) ProHLP-022

4. Tunnels at (a) U of M East Bank. Have separate bike tunnels separate from people, sidewalks and stations. (b) Snelling Ave. Have separate bike and people tunnels under University and Snelling. No grade people / bike crossings.

(CCLRP0443) ProHLP-027

Section 6.3, page 6-26, University Avenue LRT Alternative - The tunnel exit by Huron Boulevard per the 2004-05 design and remain in open trench beyond 25th Avenue SE. 25th Avenue SE is a main connection to SEMI and potential heavy truck traffic and design should reflect no at-grade crossing of the LRT and 25th Avenue SE.

(CCLRP0443) ProHLP-032

The 2004-05 University preferred redesigned alignment was not agreed to by the Central Corridor due to the additional estimated cost of extending the tunnel easterly from the DEIS alignment. The University of Minnesota would like to pursue the tunnel extension, including the air rights development over the Transit Station between 23rd Avenue Southeast and 25th Avenue Southeast from Washington Avenue to the University of Minnesota Transitway.

(CCLRP0807) ProHLP-051

...any alignment on the line on Washington Avenue going through the University of Minnesota should be maintained at below-grade.

(CCLRP0549) ProHLP-074

If required in order to meet the Cost-Effectiveness Index requirements, we would favor one or more of the following trade-offs: c. Find cost reductions in the University area by shortening or eliminating the tunnel.

(CCLRP0443) ProHLP-082

Section/page/table is 3.2.2, page 3-8 COMPREHENSIVE AND SMALL AREA PLANS A Livable Campus: University of Minnesota Twin Cities Campus Master Plan. The current Campus Master Plan was adopted in 1996. The University is in the process of updating the plan. In 2001, the University's Board of Regents adopted a set of transportation principles related to the Central Corridor. These principles are the most recent action by the Board on the subject and therefore take precedence over the 1996 Master Plan. These principles state that LRT should operate in a tunnel through the East Bank of Campus if an alignment along Washington Avenue is selected.

(CCLRP0828) ProHLP-084

It's important that the design maintain the tunnel under the University of Minnesota.

(CCLRP0443) ProHLP-085

Section/page/table is 3.2.5 page 3-13 CONSISTENCY WITH LOCAL PLANS AND IMPACTS RELATED TO LAND USE University Avenue LRT Alternative As noted in the DEIS, in 2001, the Board of Regents took a position favoring a tunnel if LRT were to run on Washington Avenue. This action supersedes the 1996 Master Plan. The Master Plan is in the

process of being updated. The University favors a tunnel alignment on Washington Avenue in order to ensure optimal and predictable travel times, provide for a safer environment, and promote the functionality of the Campus.

Response ProHLP-001. Chapter 2 of the SDEIS includes the reasons for dismissing the tunnel from further consideration. The Preferred Alternative includes an at-grade LRT alignment on Washington Avenue running from the Washington Avenue Bridge to Oak Street, which would function as a transit mall. This alternative would change the operation of this segment by excluding automobile traffic. Enhancements would be made to pedestrian and other transit facilities operating in this segment. Emergency vehicle access would be maintained. The Stadium Village Station would be located at the proposed U of M multi-modal center. The East Bank Station would be located on Washington Avenue at Union Street.

Issue Summary ProPM-011. Comment about the tunnel design at the U of M being addressed in the AA/DEIS and FEIS (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) ProPM-181

Section VIII - PUBLIC AND AGENCY Involvement Program. The University (an agency) in cooperation with the Central Corridor staff and consultants conducted evaluations in 2004 - 05 to refine the LRT tunnel design including station design. The DEIS and FEIS should reflect this work and outcome in Section 8.

Response ProPM-011. Chapter 2 of the SDEIS includes the reasons for dismissing the tunnel from further consideration. The Preferred Alternative includes an at-grade LRT alignment on Washington Avenue running from the Washington Avenue Bridge to Oak Street, which would function as a transit mall. This alternative would change the operation of this segment by excluding automobile traffic. Enhancements would be made to pedestrian and other transit facilities operating in this segment. Emergency vehicle access would be maintained. The Stadium Village Station would be located at the proposed U of M multi-modal center. The East Bank Station would be located on Washington Avenue at Union Street.

Issue Summary ProProjBdj-009. Separate cost estimate for project component related to the proposed U of M Stadium (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0539) ProProjBdj-016

4. If the location of the U of M Football Stadium would require an increase in cost for the construction of LRT, that location should be adjusted to ensure that those cost are not added to the cost of the project.

(CCLRP0443) ProProjBdj-021

CAPITAL COST ESTIMATES, Section/page/table is 2.4.1, page 2-18, Preliminary Project Cost Estimate of Build Alternatives: The University recently received State approval and

funding to construct an on-campus football stadium. The planned stadium location and surrounding research facilities will impact the DEIS proposed location of the Stadium Village station. This will need to be factored into a revised cost-estimate.

(CCLRP0807) ProProjBdj-024

Four, if the location of the U of M football stadium would require an increase in the cost of the construction of the LRT, that location should be adjusted to ensure that those costs are not added to the cost of the project.

Response ProProjBdj-009. Comment noted. An alternative routing of the Central Corridor LRT in a tunnel in order to accommodate the construction of the TCF Bank Stadium on the East Bank was part of the early stages of preliminary engineering. This solution was not found to be cost effective. The Preferred Alternative includes an at-grade LRT alignment on Washington Avenue running from the Washington Avenue Bridge to Oak Street, which would function as a transit mall. This alternative would change the operation of this segment by excluding automobile traffic.

Section: 2.3 - Alternatives Analysis

Issue Summary ProALT-001. **Favors Central Corridor LRT alternative** (708)

Comments:

(CCLRP0769) EcoEE-78

It's very important to me to send a message today from an employer's point of view. We have a hundred employees over in Energy Park, not right on University Avenue, but our employees still come from distances on both sides of where this light rail would be and so for me I want my employees to get to work. That's very, very important. And I need them there in the most efficient, economical way possible and I do believe this is the way to do it with the Light Rail Transit in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0781) PlaTE-9

LRT on a dedicated right-of-way will ensure that transit riders get to their destination in considerably less time than either the Number 16 or Number 50 bus line. Further, travelers can count on predictable travel times as LRT is unaffected by congestion, vehicle crashes, breakdowns, or road construction. LRT has level boarding through many doors, thus making it fast and easy toward riders in wheelchairs or riders with bicycles, strollers, groceries, luggage, et cetera.

(CCLRP0894) PlaTE-24

BRT would require a bus every two minutes on University Avenue in order to serve the projected ridership. Today bus service breaks down and we end up with buses grouped together; some overpacked with riders, another next in line empty.

(CCLRP0294) PlaTE-30

Both of us have been loyal bus riders in the past, but that is past. If anyone believes that more buses should run down University Avenue as the best choice, have probably never rode the 16. There is nothing to compare a smooth ride to work on a rail vs. a bumpy, jerky, noxious ride in a bus.

(CCLRP0873) PlaTE-35

I personally would not ride the bus. It's just looking at schedules and everything else. Whereas I know if I hop on the train it will take me one way or the other and I just don't have to think about it. I would use that light rail train.

(CCLRP0877) PlaTE-39

I support the light rail alternative because the Draft EIS makes it clear that it's truly the better alternative in terms of development, ease of transit metro-wide, and capacity.

(CCLRP0103) PlaTE-42

Light rail is important because it is a permanent structure. Business can locate near it and know that their customers have easy access to the business. Individuals can plan their home purchases and work locations based on the fact the transportation is available. Buses can not be counted on in the same way.

(CCLRP0770) PlaTE-44

I am not a bus rider, but I will ride light rail and that's really what this is all about. It's providing transportation options for thousands of people, some of whom are currently transit riders, but there's a whole group of us who aren't who will ride light rail as the Hiawatha line has shown.

(CCLRP0250) PlaTE-76

I travel from the east side of the metro and see the opportunities for expansion from this area to add onto this efficient mode of transportation. Having traveled overseas I see the efficiencies gained by rail transportation. It's quick, clean and cost effective. It reduces in town traffic. It also gives opportunities for those without cars to more easily access opportunities for employment opportunities, the same rides on a bus would take significantly longer.

(CCLRP0857) PlaTE-86

Light Rail Transit can best accommodate the projected ridership over the long term that Bus Rapid Transit and regular bus service will not have the capacity to meet the transit demand. Currently the Hiawatha Light Rail is at capacity during peak periods moving about 397 passengers and that's a equivalent of about six or seven buses.

(CCLRP0781) PlaTE-87

Light rail can best accommodate the projected ridership over the long term and it will provide current and future bus riders with improved service.

(CCLRP0356) PlaTE-89

And, the current express buses have fewer stops than the most recent plan I've seen of the light rail, so convenience would decrease, rather than increase, if bus rapid transit is adopted. With light rail, we will have both rapid transit and convenience, and if shuttles are in place as they are in Portland, convenience increases without having to have a large number of internal combustion engines adding pollutants and traffic congestion. If we look to Houston as an example of a large bus rapid transit system, studies have shown that actual per capita ridership is lower than that on Portland's light rail, and the vast majority of traffic carried on special HOV lanes tends to be private automobiles, not transit. That means that the buses create extra, not less, traffic that creates additional demands on the street system and parking capacity downstream, especially in the central city and other compacted areas.

(CCLRP0244) PlaTE-97

It would be my fondest wish to be able to find suitable housing near a light rail station. The idea of hopping on the rail to travel to Minneapolis to make purchases, see the Twins play or attend a theater event is very attractive to me. I would rarely take the bus. It's just a different experience.

(CCLRP0799) PlaTE-100

I know the community along University Avenue and in the east metro do not deserve a second-class system; and I know that the Bus Rapid Transit system will not be at capacity and will not fulfill capacity for the number of people that have to ride this system;

(CCLRP0357) PlaTE-101

I'm a grad student at the university and I currently live near the intersection of Snelling and University in St. Paul. I think it's about time the twin cities had a decent rail system-- I love the Hiawatha line and nothing would be better for development in St. Paul, decreasing the number of cars on the congested highways, and improving commute times than something similar connecting the two cities. The light rail option is a good, permanent transportation solution; a bus rapid transit system is nothing more than a temporary band-aid.

(CCLRP0166) PlaTE-103

LRT provides easier and faster boarding for wheelchairs, bicycles, and strollers, and people carrying groceries or luggage.

(CCLRP0760) PlaTE-127

Another point is people will ride LRT that will not ride a bus. We found on Hiawatha that more than 40 percent of the people riding LRT there were not bus riders. That same thing I am certain will happen along the Central line and that gives us just that many more people off the roads and into transit.

(CCLRP0779) PlaTE-128

Light rail is a significantly more attractive mode of transit than the bus. It has the capacity to turn the Central Corridor into one of the most interesting and vibrant areas in the Twin Cities.

(CCLRP0327) PlaTE-134

It surpassed everyone's expectations. And it's bound to make an even bigger impact on the congested, noisy areas of University Ave - esp. at Snelling Ave. LRT will be faster, less noisy and a much cleaner alternative to the BRT. We've wasted a lot of time already (and they say we may even have possibly lost some federal monies/funding if we don't get moving) the time is now! It could actually increase pedestrian traffic along the Avenue - with its ease, convenience and frequency - which would obviously be positive for the existing business community and for any future development.

(CCLRP0914) PlaTE-136

However, in light of this light rail I don't see the route that is taken coming down University Avenue. Can we realize economic development on University Avenue without light rail?

(CCLRP0883) PlaTE-140

I'm a business owner. I own a number of businesses in St. Paul and Minneapolis. My experience with mass transit is in order for it to succeed you've got to change people's perceptions and you've got to change their habits.

Light rail has done that. Bus transit hasn't. I own a business in Downtown St. Paul with direct competitors in Minneapolis. Both my businesses and their businesses are on bus lines. None of our businesses have seen a benefit of the bus lines. My businesses in Minneapolis -- my competitors are seeing success with the light rail and they're seeing a verifiable result with regard to that form of transit.

(CCLRP0751) PlaTE-155

A couple of just short things I wanted to say. One is that I, too, travel on business. I love going to cities that have LRT. It's so much better in a strange city to ride on LRT where you can figure it out than to try to interpret bus systems and things, and I'm glad that we will soon be one of those cities that has LRT also.

(CCLRP0156) PlaTE-177

This option will attract ridership that would not ride a bus-this is shown on the Hiawatha Line. Businesspeople and Univ of MN employees may not ride the busline, but would a LRT line.

(CCLRP0011) PlaTE-184

Buses work to a degree, but if you want to accomplish the goal of mass transit, which is to get more people to ride, light rail is the answer.

(CCLRP0879) PlaTE-195

Light rail had a lot of advantages for me when I was working in Minneapolis. When the weather comes in the wintertime a Bus Rapid Transit would still have to be plowed and still be affected by the weather. The light rail had very few interruptions and had very little effect when the winter came.

(CCLRP0166) PlaTP-082

LRT can best accommodate the projected ridership over the long term, while BRT and regular bus service won't have the capacity to meet the transit demand.

(CCLRP0756) PlaTP-083

Light rail provides ease of access, comfort, and reliability to its users whether carrying bags, using wheelchairs, or riding bikes. The quality experience of LRT will attract ridership.

(CCLRP0757) PlaTP-121

First: Long-term capacity. As we've heard, the Bus Rapid Transit system will not be able to support capacity just a few years down the road after completion by about 2020. Why invest in something that is outdated just a few years after we're done? We should do it right away the first time.

(CCLRP0861) PlaTP-123

You might say that public transportation already exists meaning the bus. I'd like to share some personal perspective about that. I grew up in New York and then lived in Boston and Chicago. I never owned a car until I moved here. I never needed a car. I never wanted a car. Road rage, air pollution, and the price of gas have done nothing to change my mind. I never took buses in those other cities, but I did ride the train. Similarly, I won't take the bus here in the Twin Cities, but I would take the light rail train to work, to our hospitals for meetings, to lunch in either downtown or along University Avenue. I firmly believe that I represent the rule rather than the exception. People who will not take a bus will take a train. Please give us that opportunity.

(CCLRP0185) PlaTP-182

Light rail, the technology that I believe should be preferred as a result of the study, is principally a high-density, medium-speed, semi-express mode of transit between two points. Therefore it must have characteristics embedded into its design to ensure its effectiveness: sufficient vehicle availability and frequency, unobstructed (and to the extent available, exclusive) right-of-way, stations spaced apart to serve separate neighborhoods and districts, etc. To certain extents, the other considered technology--express busway--must have many of these same features to be successful.

(CCLRP0280) PlaTP-184

The Lexington-Hamline Community Council (LHCC) supports the greater commitment to public transit represented by the Central Corridor Project. At the same time, we are wary of the possibility that shortsighted planning, with corner-cutting measures driven by federal funding requirements, will squander a rare opportunity to revitalize the inner city of St. Paul Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0650) PlaTP-194

Studies have also shown that it is more cost effective in the long-term and it can more easily handle increased ridership in the future. I would use it any time I wanted to go to downtown Minneapolis, to the airport, and up to visit my family in Elk River (assuming the Northstar line gets built).

(CCLRP0343) PlaTP-234

Also, the restaurant is located on the north side of University Ave. With LRT, we would lose the turn from the eastbound side of traffic across the westbound traffic and into part of our parking lot. This turn is located in the middle of the block. This is also of concern to us. If the policy makers can assure us that our business will not suffer because of LRT, and that the BRT will remain for our customers & employees, then and only then would we be able to support Light Rail Transit.

(CCLRP0634) ProALT-007

I am a Ph.D. Candidate in urban geography at the University of Minnesota. I have studied urban form and urban sustainability, and I'm convinced that lightrail can bring a whole host of interrelated benefits to an urban core area. I have also lived in numerous cities (including Portland, Vancouver BC, and Vienna, Austria) with light rail, and my experience in each place was that it enhanced the livability of the area far more than any other form of transit would have done. In each place, the basic arteries of light rail were supplemented by good bus systems, which are essential here, too. But the heart of the system was rail. Light rail works well, people love to ride it. I agree with the points of the Transit for Livable Cities group. On the Central Corridor, light rail would improve air quality, decrease noise, be faster and safer than buses, and be more pleasant to ride.

(CCLRP0271) ProALT-009

The route along the rail corridor north of University, on the other hand, would result in additional service. LRT on or beside the existing rail corridor would serve neighborhoods, businesses and institutions not currently served by the existing bus service.

Both Central Corridor alternatives serve 3 major destinations - the 2 downtowns and the University of Minnesota. Both alternatives also serve neighborhoods and businesses along the route. And both alternatives contain large parcels of land that is ripe for development. Without knowing the exact costs of the 2 alternatives, I think it is safe to say that the existing rail corridor and accompanying right-of-ways, including the already developed University Transitway, would connect people to the University and the downtowns, serve neighborhoods and businesses, and encourage transit-oriented development in less time, with less disruption, and for less money than a highway construction project on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0771) ProALT-012

The Foundation supports Light Rail Transit in the Central Corridor for all of the obvious reasons that were mentioned before; the economics of what it attracts, it's good for regionalism, and most importantly Light Rail Transit is more environmentally friendly than the alternatives, but the real agenda of the Wilder Foundation above and beyond that is we have particularly impacted our interest and impact of light rail on low-income individuals and maintaining that light rail has the opportunity right now to make many more services including Wilder's 22,000 visits a year from the community much more accessible for neighborhood folks.

(CCLRP0337) ProALT-014

I have read the DEIS, and believe the LRT option is better than the BRT option because it would be more pleasant to ride, less polluting, and capable of carrying more passengers. With gas prices so high, and global warming a serious problem, the Twin Cities really need the Central Corridor LRT line, and as soon as possible.

(CCLRP0781) ProALT-015

Transit for Livable Communities is a citizen-based organization working for greater public investment in transit including buses, trains, bicycling, and walking. TLC believes that Light Rail Transit is the right technology for the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0167) ProALT-016

I am aware that public officials and the public are debating whether Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is the best option. There is no doubt in my mind that LRT is the superior choice and I encourage the community and public officials to support this option.

(CCLRP0525) ProALT-017

Support for Light Rail. We applaud the efforts underway to improve public transportation, and we support the LRT Alternative. Connecting St. Paul and Minneapolis with light rail transit (LRT) is a vital step towards increasing public mobility while decreasing congestion, reducing emissions, and improving the area's economic vitality.

(CCLRP0636) ProALT-019

LRT service will be faster, more reliable and more convenient than any bus plan. And LRT provides easier and faster boarding for wheelchairs, bicycles, and strollers, and people carrying groceries or luggage.

(CCLRP0464) ProALT-020

...said he strongly supports light rail on University Avenue for three reasons: 1) it will provide better service for people who currently ride other routes; 2) it has the potential to attract more new riders than bus rapid transit; and 3) it has major potential to promote and support development that is more pedestrian friendly than currently exists. It could also potentially require much less parking with current developments on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0795) ProALT-051

The Central Corridor Light Rail Transit will secure transit for our patients and improve the infrastructure which is fundamental for access to quality health care. The Central Corridor light rail versus Bus Rapid Transit will contribute to the future prosperity of HealthEast Care System, the largest health care organization in the Twin Cities east metro, serving thousands of families with a spectrum of health care needs. With the Central Corridor we have the makings of a fully integrated transit system for the next century.

(CCLRP0462) ProALT-055

[name withheld] stated they support light rail transit on University Avenue for three reasons: 1) more riders will be attracted to light rail than to bus rapid transit leading to a reduction in automobile traffic; 2) transit oriented development will be better supported by light rail than

by bus rapid transit; and 3) light rail is the only alternative that can accommodate anticipated future central corridor ridership in 2025 and beyond.

(CCLRP0530) ProALT-060

I believe LRT is an investment in our future.

(CCLRP0374) ProALT-061

I am interested in the transit for this area as I ride bus to work, and because I cannot drive I use the bus to get almost everywhere. I also use the Light Rail when it is appropriate for my trips and I like it very much. I would like to see an extensive rail transit system constructed in the Twin Cities as we have in other cities like Chicago, Boston, San Francisco, Portland, etc. We tend to lag behind the rest of the country in everything here for some strange reason and I hope we don't opt for busses for this route as it's too important a corridor to relegate to that form of transportation which is not as fast, smooth and modern as rail.

(CCLRP0252) ProALT-062

My husband and I support light rail in downtown St. Paul. We live and work in downtown St. Paul and would love to see this happen in the next several years. Buses have never been a reliable form of transport in the way light rail is.

(CCLRP0831) ProALT-068

I support LRT on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0853) ProALT-070

We employ 18 people and we are very in favor of light rail.

(CCLRP0424) ProALT-073

I am an attorney in private practice in downtown Saint Paul. I must travel to downtown Minneapolis frequently in my practice. I am a resident of Highland Park. My family frequently uses the Hiawatha line to get to downtown Minneapolis for dining and entertainment. It has been a much more satisfactory experience than any experience we have had with the bus system. We find ourselves using it more than anticipated and note the development which appears to have been generated by the line which I feel would never have followed a busway.

(CCLRP0909) ProALT-077

I have been a resident of St. Paul for 35 years and I'm currently the president of Twin Cities Habitat for Humanity and I support Light Rail Transit in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0011) ProALT-078

Having had the chance to ride several transit systems around the country, light rail is a no brainer. It's the least polluting, most gas efficient (electric), and most popular form of mass transit. Buses work to a degree, but if you want to accomplish the goal of mass transit, which is to get more people to ride, light rail is the answer.

(CCLRP0222) ProALT-080

Now is the time to get light rail on track to supplement and enhance the efficiency of the automobile and bus transit currently available. Thank you for considering my support of the Central Corridor project.

(CCLRP0773) ProALT-082

I support light rail on University Avenue as the preferred mode of transportation.

(CCLRP0285) ProALT-083

As a Minneapolis resident who worked in downtown St. Paul for 11 years and made the commute, I can say that LRT would be a gift to the community: faster, cleaner, more pleasant to ride.

(CCLRP0469) ProALT-086

The Midway Chamber does support LRT on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0903) ProALT-088

We support the light rail issue.

(CCLRP0875) ProALT-093

I work for Ecolab in the community relations department and I'm here to speak in favor of the Central Corridor, the light rail option.

(CCLRP0897) ProALT-096

If I had to choose between the BRT and the LRT, I would choose the LRT. I'm a bike rider, pedestrian, bus rider and I believe that if you build the LRT, they will come.

(CCLRP0753) ProALT-097

I spoke for the Southwest Corridor which I really truly believe that it should go forth, but I also would like to speak at this thing because I think light rail would be the most appropriate form of transportation down this line

(CCLRP0533) ProALT-098

Parsons supports the Light Rail Transit option for Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0787) ProALT-099

With regard to the threshold issue, the Merriam Park Community Council supports Light Rail Transit on University Avenue for three reasons.

(CCLRP0224) ProALT-102

I see no negatives with light rail. Light rail is quiet and makes getting around easier as well as cheaper. Please build more!

(CCLRP0757) ProALT-103

I fully support the LRT, Light Rail Transit, through the Central Corridor and I support this for three main reasons.

(CCLRP0860) ProALT-105

I'm director of government relations for Ecolab based in Downtown St. Paul and I'm here to speak in support of the Light Rail Transit for the Central Corridor on behalf of Ecolab as well as our employees.

(CCLRP0894) ProALT-108

The task at hand tonight is to select a preferred mode of transit and that is LRT for these reasons:

(CCLRP0896) ProALT-109

A new era of world-class LRT in the Central Corridor can be extraordinarily successful and will provide opportunity for economic growth as well as a vital transit system linked to many local and future regional destinations.

(CCLRP0857) ProALT-110

With a great deal of personal clarity and understanding, I am in support of Light Rail Transit as the best alternative on University, not Bus Rapid Transit or the current bus system by itself or anything else.

(CCLRP0444) ProALT-111

Having lived in Chicago for 7 years without a car, I know firsthand the benefits of an extensive rail line since that was my primary mode of transit during the time I lived there. I believe so strongly in extending the light rail system that I would be willing to pay additional taxes to support such a move.

(CCLRP0329) ProALT-112

In my opinion, LRT is the obvious choice for a regional transit system on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0880) ProALT-113

I support the construction of Light Rail Transit on University Avenue as it's proposed.

(CCLRP0431) ProALT-117

A line between Minneapolis and St. Paul should be only the beginning, the light rail system must evolve to support all major axes of the Twin Cities. Supporting the light rail over the bus system, is so evident that we shouldn't even have to defend it. But it is so essential, that we shouldn't let authorities underestimate it.

(CCLRP0928) ProALT-120

I am 110% for light rail down University Avenue.

(CCLRP0759) ProALT-122

I strongly support LRT as the DEIS states that plan as the best alternative. I believe that Met Council should continue to look into rail alternatives such as the Southwest Corridor LRT and the Greenway Streetcar. I believe Americans see LRT as attractive transit for all and buses as welfare.

(CCLRP0247) ProALT-123

I agree with the Central Corridor Partnership's recommendation of light rail as the preferred transportation mode on the Central Corridor. As an employee of a large corporation in St. Paul, I understand how important public transportation is to the area.

(CCLRP0740) ProALT-124

I'm associate vice president for Health Sciences representing the University of Minnesota's Academic Health Center, and the University's Academic Health Center supports the development of Light Rail Transit in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0108) ProALT-126

I am generally in support of the place to build a LRT line along University Ave in my community.

(CCLRP0815) ProALT-130

... I support the light rail...

(CCLRP0833) ProALT-131

I'm here to support development of light rail on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0782) ProALT-135

I'm a resident of St. Paul and I'm here tonight to speak in support of LRT as a preferred mode of transportation down University Avenue. I speak tonight on behalf of myself.

(CCLRP0547) ProALT-137

On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Saint Paul Area Association of REALTORS(r) and the nearly 5,000 REALTOR(r) and affiliate members...we urge the selection of Light Rail Transit as the preferred alternative to resolving the transit issues facing the Twin Cities metropolitan region.

(CCLRP0541) ProALT-138

As a business owner in Saint Paul, I am writing to express my support for light rail as the preferred option for transit on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0832) ProALT-144

Our organization and its 24 affiliates strongly support the LRT,

(CCLRP0850) ProALT-147

I strongly support Light Rail Transit as the alternative. I do so because I think this alternative offers the best opportunity to connect more people to other people, to other organizations and places in a way that will energize St. Paul and will strengthen the entire seven-county Twin Cities metropolitan region.

(CCLRP0174) ProALT-152

As a U of M graduate student, I have been a loyal user of the Hiawatha line during the past year, and have found it (for the most part) an exceedingly comfortable, efficient mode of travel. While the Hiawatha line has been a great first step, having a single rail line hardly constitutes a system, and a metropolitan area the size of the Twin Cities needs dependable mass transit that connects the places that people want to go. Namely, the downtowns of the two cities and the University of Minnesota.

(CCLRP0861) ProALT-155

I am the director of sales for HealthEast Care System and I am a huge supporter of Light Rail Transit on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0073) ProALT-158

When evaluating choices for the Central Corridor, please consider strongly the Light Rail option.

(CCLRP0353) ProALT-160

Please give your support to the LRT in the Central Corridor. As a long time resident of St Paul I feel this is important for the city and its residents to remain competitive and provide a great service to residents of St. Paul. I write this letter in support of LRT as the preferred mode in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0171) ProALT-167

I'm a strong supporter of light rail in the Central Corridor. Done right, I believe it can provide enormous benefits to our city, and to people all along the corridor, today and in the future.

(CCLRP0478) ProALT-169

Two given reasons for preferring LRT to BRT are:

1. A greater capacity for LRT over BRT.
2. The belief that BRT is perceived poorly by commuters who would therefore not use BRT. The advantage of BRT over LRT is greatly reduced construction cost since rails are not needed.

(CCLRP0748) ProALT-170

I fully support the construction of Light Rail Transit on University Avenue both as a representative of the City of Lakes Chamber and as a member of the St. Paul and Minneapolis communities.

(CCLRP0535) ProALT-171

I, along with my membership would like to express our excitement and anticipation of the development and building of the Central Corridor Transit Project.

(CCLRP0053) ProALT-173

I believe this LRT will provide badly needed public transit service to key business and educational institutions and to people along the corridor who need travel options.

(CCLRP0484) ProALT-175

I am excited about finally, having LRT on University. I think it can be a real benefit to the neighborhood for convenience, development and perception of the area if done well. I appreciate that the LRT is clean and quiet. Many of the buses rattle on the interior and make the ride very noisy. Buses grumble and shake buildings and homes when they start, stop and pass by. Not only will LRT be useful now, but it should become even more important in the long run, with more people, higher gas prices, the need to conserve energy and to try to save the environment.

(CCLRP0099) ProALT-183

I STRONGLY support light rail transit along the central corridor. LRT along Hiawatha has been a huge success. LRT on the central corridor will be even more successful.

(CCLRP0779) ProALT-190

I know good people disagree with this choice, especially the fact that it is three and a half times more expensive to construct than the Bus Rapid Transit Alternative. In response I ask if you prefer the subway or the bus when you go to New York or to Boston.

(CCLRP0357) ProALT-191

As I am not sure if I will be in town for any of public hearings on the Central Corridor, I wanted to register my unequivocal support for the light rail option down University Avenue.

(CCLRP0840) ProALT-196

My support is for LRT on University Avenue...

(CCLRP0224) ProALT-197

Light rail is a great thing. Recently I purchased a condo on the light rail line. I use the light rail everyday to get to work.

(CCLRP0749) ProALT-202

Overall our chamber supports multimodal solutions to our regional transportation problems, those that are based on solid analysis looking at congestion relief; the economic, environmental, and community costs and benefits.

(CCLRP0431) ProALT-203

This mentality though ties your hands, if you have no resources to have a car, and it is impractical on an everyday basis. Public transport allows you to avoid traffic jams, getting irritated while driving, and also respects the environment, among other things. The benefit of the light rail, over the bus public transportation is evident. It is faster, safer, on time, more comfortable, and thus allowing scheduling both your weekday and weekend program more precisely, without worrying of staying out in the cold, or being too late for work just because you missed a bus. In Europe the implementation of the metro/underground system has decongested the streets from traffic jams, and increased the work-hours per capita, increasing the ratio of people transported over transportation vehicles, and thus decreasing the cost of public transport overall, and increasing the community's productivity.

(CCLRP0817) ProALT-204

I strongly support the development of Light Rail Transit in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0199) ProALT-209

1) I strongly support the LRT Option as presented in this Statement. Rapid Transit is needed in this corridor and busses will not be able to meet the need in the years ahead.

(CCLRP0852) ProALT-210

We joined the Central Corridor Partnership in 2004 specifically because we think it is both an excellent concept for our employees as well as for the Twin Cities at large which is an important point. We're very supportive of light rail.

(CCLRP0835) ProALT-213

... if St. Paul has any pretense of becoming a world-class city we need LRT.

(CCLRP0002) ProALT-215

I SUPPORT light rail rapid transit in the Central Corridor. Minneapolis, Saint Paul, and the State of Minnesota need to continue improving transit infrastructure in the Twin Cities to keep our largest metropolitan area livable and keep our state competitive.

LIGHT RAIL IS the APPROPRIATE technology for the Central Corridor. A bus system cannot provide adequate coverage for the distance between Minneapolis and Saint Paul. Light rail will bring significant development along a corridor, while a bus system will not.

(CCLRP0285) ProALT-217

I'd like to voice my strong support for the Central Corridor project.

(CCLRP0198) ProALT-222

This is to register my support for the Light Rail Alternative. It is clear to me that of the three alternatives, the Light Rail Alternative is the best one and it would be a mistake to choose one of the other alternatives.

(CCLRP0752) ProALT-223

First, I'm strongly in favor of rapid transit whether it's light rail, heavy rail, or PRT.

(CCLRP0924) ProALT-225

I am calling to voice my support for light rail as the mode of transit selected on Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0764) ProALT-228

I'll limit my remarks to our enthusiastic support for the mode of Light Rail Transit, leave the details and the City's comments on the other exciting opportunities.

(CCLRP0015) ProALT-230

I believe that the LRT alternative should be selected due to the capacity problems buses would not meet in the future. In addition, I prefer LRT because it attracts more people to transit than buses.

(CCLRP0925) ProALT-231

I am in favor of light rail transit for the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0765) ProALT-235

I live Cedar Riverside and I use LRT to downtown. I work Hennepin County Economic Assistance. It's about two minute to reaching downtown. So if the light rail goes to Ramsey County, I mean in St. Paul, it will be also another asset to our neighborhood.

(CCLRP0873) ProALT-238

I support light rail for several reasons.

(CCLRP0024) ProALT-239

I strongly believe LRT will promote sensible public transit, decrease car traffic, and improve life in the Twin Cities.

(CCLRP0900) ProALT-241

I am a strong supporter of the LRT option. I lived in Washington, D.C., for over six years about two blocks from a metro station. That experience led me to purchase a house about two blocks from the proposed Fairview station on University Avenue. I've used Bus Number 16 infrequently for travel to and from collegiate and professional sporting events, but were LRT constructed I would use that transit for those purposes, for shopping throughout the metro area including just a mile down to the Midway area, to the airport, to the entertainment district of Minneapolis, and for my daily commute to the eastern end of the line.

(CCLRP0633) ProALT-242

I am not in favor of an enhanced bus system as most people do not enjoy taking the bus. The LRT is much more appealing. This is obvious on the Hiawatha line, which has much higher ridership than was ever anticipated.

(CCLRP0028) ProALT-243

I wish to express my support of Light Rail only on the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0278) ProALT-245

Please accept this letter as a statement of support for the central corridor LRT.

(CCLRP0818) ProALT-254

...I encourage the support of LRT on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0212) ProALT-259

1.) Of the alternatives evaluated for consideration in the Central Corridor, I strongly support the LRT Alternative due to its ability to serve the transportation needs along the corridor far into the future. Although the BRT Alternative involves a lower first cost than the LRT Alternative, the failure of the BRT Alternative to respond to the projected transportation needs beyond the year 2020 is unacceptable.

(CCLRP0071) ProALT-268

I am supportive of light rail development!

(CCLRP0739) ProALT-269

Our population needs public transportation, uses public transportation, and we support Light Rail Transit in the University Corridor.

(CCLRP0819) ProALT-271

I support LRT.

(CCLRP0367) ProALT-273

I live in Desnoyer Park and work in downtown Saint Paul and am anxious to be one of the riders of the Central Corridor LRT. Since BRT will be at capacity in 2017 (or sooner with gas prices skyrocketing), I didn't think BRT was even a solution anymore. I don't have any comments other than I'm looking forward to being on-board.

(CCLRP0838) ProALT-274

Obviously I'm in support of the Light Rail Transit system and American Bank as an organization is in support of the Light Rail Transit in the Central Corridor as the preferred mode of transportation along University Avenue.

(CCLRP0891) ProALT-277

I support the Central Corridor Light Rail Transit as the preferred mode of transit.

(CCLRP0536) ProALT-284

... LRT represents a huge transit and quality-of-life advancement for the vast majority of individuals in the Central Corridor and Twin Cities Metro Area. I fully support this plan and look forward to the continued redevelopment of this important part of our urban community.

(CCLRP0045) ProALT-285

I am excited to see that the state and the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul are finally serious about quality public transportation. We cannot be a first class metropolitan area without it.

(CCLRP0814) ProALT-289

I support light rail strongly.

(CCLRP0167) ProALT-291

Although LRT is a much more costly investment at \$840 million versus \$241 million for BRT, LRT is best because it is faster than BRT between the 2 downtowns (35 minutes vs. 50 minutes), LRT vehicles have a longer lifespan than buses (30 years vs. 12 years), and LRT vehicles run on quiet environmentally friendly electric power.

(CCLRP0273) ProALT-297

Third - I don't support the BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) system that has been proposed, (at least I think it was buried somewhere under the tracks of LRT).

(CCLRP0816) ProALT-299

As an environmentalist I believe that light rail is the best option for our community.

(CCLRP0407) ProALT-301

The Draft EIS rightly states that the City's 1997 Transportation Plan does not overtly support LRT on University Avenue. ... However, shortly thereafter (1999) the Planning Commission and City Council reaffirmed an earlier City position of supporting LRT on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0093) ProALT-302

Build the light rail before I die of old age- (which I would, if you take as long as it took for the Hiawatha Line to be built)!

(CCLRP0439) ProALT-303

I am writing in support of the Central Corridor's efforts to bring Light Rail Transit to University Avenue.

(CCLRP0855) ProALT-305

I support the construction of Light Rail Transit on University Avenue and I specifically support light rail over the rapid transit bus option. Bus transit is not a viable option after the year 2020. Light rail represents the next generation of transportation and community development opportunity for residents, customers, employees, and businesses along the avenue.

(CCLRP0872) ProALT-308

I encourage you to pursue light rail rather than Bus Rapid Transit for many of the reasons that have been cited. Simply from a capacity perspective, light rail is clearly preferable and has proven effective in the Hiawatha Corridor.

(CCLRP0204) ProALT-312

Light rail is cleaner and quieter than bus transport, and it is evident from the usage on the Hiawatha line that more people are willing to use light rail than buses.

(CCLRP0215) ProALT-313

A BRT route is a terrible idea - it would do too little in the short term and nothing in the long term to solve our transportation issues.

(CCLRP0052) ProALT-317

I work in Minneapolis and need to attend meetings in St. Paul and would like to ride the rail.

(CCLRP0457) ProALT-318

The City of Minneapolis strongly supports Light Rail Transit as the preferred mode choice.

(CCLRP0770) ProALT-319

for the last 16 years I've lived three blocks north of University and for those same 16 years I've been involved in discussions and attending hearings like this to say I want light rail on University Avenue, and it's time we do this.

(CCLRP0284) ProALT-320

I am a Hamline-Midway resident, and both my wife and I routinely take the bus to and from work. I take the 67 to downtown Saint Paul. My wife takes the 16 or 50 to downtown Minneapolis. We both strongly favor LRT for University Avenue. This investment in our core cities will help stabilize both University Avenue and the surrounding neighborhoods, as well as provide a smooth and efficient form of transportation.

(CCLRP0769) ProALT-321

And I am here because I support Light Rail Transit on University Avenue as the preferred mode of transportation for the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0653) ProALT-323

Please make LRT the preferred transit mode for the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0027) ProALT-325

I prefer LRT by far. It's a proven technology, and with the success of the Hiawatha LRT, our critics are silenced.

(CCLRP0425) ProALT-326

My wife and I live in the Hamline-Midway neighborhood in St. Paul. We think light rail is the only way to go for the central corridor and fully support it. We use the #16 bus a lot right now and would love to see transit improvement as rail to keep us a world class cities.

(CCLRP0336) ProALT-328

I am submitting these comments in response to the draft environmental impact statement. I write this letter in support of LRT as the preferred mode in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0300) ProALT-329

There are many reasons that the Hiawatha light rail line has been successful, but the most important is that people want to use light rail transit! People don't want to ride a bus. Please don't invest in a rapid bus system! Some people do ride the bus, but only those who have to. A bus has no cachet or prestige to it.

(CCLRP0848) ProALT-332

The University of Minnesota supports the development of Light Rail Transit in the Central Corridor. A highly effective transit system is essential to our campus. The University has invested heavily to enhance service and accessibility.

(CCLRP0344) ProALT-335

As a business and leisure traveler to other cities, I've learned the value of a strong light rail system. 20 years ago I served on a task force to bring light rail to the Twin Cities. Let's make it happen in my lifetime! So, I write this letter in support of LRT as the preferred mode in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0193) ProALT-339

Light rail is the preferred backbone of the regional transit system because of its speed and long term capacity, and the central corridor is an essential part of that backbone, connecting the two hubs of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

(CCLRP0538) ProALT-340

I believe that light rail transit ("LRT") offers the most efficient and cost effective way to address their needs, and the needs of individuals living in and traveling through the Central Corridor area.

(CCLRP0837) ProALT-341

We support Light Rail Transit as the preferred mode of transportation on University Avenue and in the Central Corridor

(CCLRP0433) ProALT-343

Please vote for the LRT option.

(CCLRP0677) ProALT-345

I am a strong supporter of mass transit, light rail in particular.

(CCLRP0167) ProALT-346

Although the lower costs of BRT may be attractive to some, it is doubtful that a BRT line would deliver the same economic return on investment as an LRT would. This is the primary reason I support the LRT line.

(CCLRP0876) ProALT-347

I support the Light Rail Transit option for the Central Corridor. I frequently take the Route 74 bus connection to the Hiawatha Light Rail Station at 46th Street and take it either to work or to the airport and I believe that the Central Corridor, if constructed, will provide the same accessibility to many other people.

(CCLRP0440) ProALT-354

That's why we at the Saint Paul Port Authority fully support our many partners in promoting light rail as the preferred option for transit along University Avenue, which, as you know, is the most highly used transportation artery in Saint Paul.

(CCLRP0813) ProALT-356

...I am in favor of Light Rail Transit.

(CCLRP0859) ProALT-357

After years of analysis and discussion, the Midway Chamber board of directors unanimously came out in support of light rail on University Avenue in particular over Bus Rapid Transit.

(CCLRP0834) ProALT-359

The Riverfront Corporation... the American Institute of Architects, St. Paul Chapter...Both organizations strongly support LRT...

(CCLRP0454) ProALT-364

As I and other Hiawatha light rail riders have shown, build a LRT *****WHERE RIDERS WANT TO GO***** and we will ride it. I WILL NOT RIDE BUS RAPID TRANSPORT to between Minneapolis and St. Paul. The Fed Govt pays half of the price; it is money well-spent for transit!

(CCLRP0771) ProALT-365

I'm the president of the Wilder Foundation. Our main facility is located six blocks north of University Avenue. We are strongly in support of light rail development.

(CCLRP0406) ProALT-367

Bus Rapid Transit is a viable alternative in many corridors, but not the Central Corridor, since the present and future demand for transit outstrips the capacity available on BRT alternatives. With an exclusive right-of-way, BRT maximum capacity is 1,600 passengers per hour as compared to LRT which has a maximum capacity of 10,800 per hour.

(CCLRP0745) ProALT-369

I frequently ride the 50 and I'm an advocate for the environment. LRT eliminates or I should say emits less air pollution than single-occupant vehicles and even less than BRT. I see light rail enhancing my communities.

(CCLRP0841) ProALT-372

So we strongly favor the LRT option.

(CCLRP0026) ProALT-373

We have developed 270 residential units at University and 280. We had a homeowner's association meeting. The vote was unanimous - LRT.

(CCLRP0811) ProALT-376

I'm the president of the Greater St. Paul Association of Building Owners and Managers and we're here today to say that we support light rail in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0760) ProALT-377

Both of our organizations, as you've already heard from a few of the speakers, are very enthusiastic about LRT for this corridor.

(CCLRP0879) ProALT-382

Also, that light rail opened up transit to some friends of mine who would never ride the bus. So I think it's a good option to go with light rail and it's about time for the rapid transit and I'm a supporter of the light rail.

(CCLRP0465) ProALT-383

...the Central Corridor Partnership, a business led coalition,...They were funded to promote light rail on University Avenue which is the preferred alternative. She said they feel bus rapid transit is penny wise and pound foolish. It's less expensive to do now but by the time it's completed, it would not be sufficient to handle the traffic that will occur on the corridor. This is a business issue in many ways.

(CCLRP0079) ProALT-385

I am fully in favor of the LRT alternative linking Minneapolis and St. Paul. This is the most effective and scaleable option for transportation along this route.

(CCLRP0034) ProALT-391

I am for the light rail. I rode on one in Cleveland 25 years. It was great.

(CCLRP0106) ProALT-394

If there is any possible way to expand the current light rail system, I would greatly appreciate it.

(CCLRP0480) ProALT-396

1) I am a strong proponent of light rail transit. I believe we do need a rapid, convenient rail link between Minneapolis and Saint Paul, and strongly favor that over a Bus Rapid Transit connection between the two cities.

(CCLRP0184) ProALT-399

1. Mode - I strongly support light rail as the locally preferred alternative. In the early 1970s the Metropolitan Transit Commission had a nationwide reputation for progressive planning and research. The MTC recommended that the Twin Cities region invest in rail

in some of the busiest transit corridors because rail provided lower long term operating costs and a greater ability to attract both riders and development.

(CCLRP0926) ProALT-400

My view is that I strongly support light rail along the central corridor here on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0666) ProALT-401

I am a resident of the Seward neighborhood of Minneapolis. I would like to see LRT along the Central Corridor, as opposed to Bus Rapid Transit.

(CCLRP0048) ProALT-404

Although it will be more expensive than BRT and consume more energy than the baseline and BRT alternatives, LRT has been successful in enhancing ridership and promoting appropriate land development intensity.

(CCLRP0762) ProALT-405

And then the last point is unfortunately in the United States there are certain social stigmas associated with riding the bus which has been kind of mentioned here this evening; and I think that that should not go without saying is that the light rail system in the Central Corridor, cachet is an important thing to consider because it does affect ridership numbers. And so with that being said, the light rail system is the better option.

(CCLRP0893) ProALT-406

I'm excited about the Central Corridor project and strongly support light rail as the third mode. I am a member of St. Luke Catholic Church just down Lexington Parkway from here. I look forward to the day when I will be able to ride the Central Corridor LRT to Sunday services and other events at the parish. There are many churches and congregations along or near the Central Corridor. These communities are drawn from all parts of the metro area. The Central Corridor will provide transportation choices for these members.

(CCLRP0324) ProALT-408

I would like to see light rail as the preferred transit option for the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0083) ProALT-411

I currently use the Hiawatha Line whenever I travel to/from the airport. I park downtown Mpls and catch the train at the end of Nicollet Mall. It always arrives on schedule and is easy to use. It is very dependable and not dependent on the traffic or weather. A bus system will never be as dependable or environmentally friendly. Therefore, I will not use a bus and would drive my car instead. I much prefer Light Rail Transit due to its dependability.

(CCLRP0162) ProALT-413

I believe the Light Rail is a good thing for St. Paul and Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0457) ProALT-415

Overall Comments:

Mode choice: Consistent with adopted policy of the City of Minneapolis to stimulate development along major transit corridors, the Business Development division of Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development prefers LRT over BRT due to the significantly greater development and place making opportunities associated with light rail. Light rail is a fixed investment.

(CCLRP0251) ProALT-416

As an individual who works in St. Paul, I am very much in favor of a light rail option for the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0807) ProALT-419

...our organization's resolution passed in 2002 which calls for a mode of transit of light rail and an alignment down University Avenue, we find that the Draft EIS is in compliance with our standing resolution.

(CCLRP0411) ProALT-421

I have just moved to the Warehouse District of downtown Minneapolis. I very much want to see light rail transit extended down University Ave to St. Paul, including to the Ecolab headquarters. I would gladly give up my downtown St Paul parking space, and the nearly \$1500 of annual expense it currently requires, if light rail were available to me as an option. As a corollary, I WOULD NOT give up my parking for bus transit...rapid or otherwise.

(CCLRP0868) ProALT-422

In conclusion I believe light rail on University Avenue supports the economic development goal of the St. Paul Port Authority and the City of St. Paul.

(CCLRP0564) ProALT-427

I am writing you to urge you to select Light Rail Transit (LRT) between Saint Paul and Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0052) ProALT-429

It would provide other alternative modes of travel and would be cleaner.

(CCLRP0829) ProALT-430

TLC believes that Light Rail Transit is the right technology for the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0863) ProALT-432

I'm here tonight to support Light Rail Transit on University Avenue and Central Corridor. I'm a St. Paul resident, St. Paul business owner, and represented St. Paul in the past on the Metropolitan Council at the time we built Hiawatha; and I would like to say that it was never our intention to make the investment in Hiawatha without an additional investment in light rail in the Central Corridor. The economic development, housing, and

jobs impacts this will have on that corridor will be the biggest thing to hit the east metro, in my opinion, in the next 50 years.

(CCLRP0542) ProALT-433

1) Of the alternatives evaluated for consideration in the Central Corridor, we strongly support the LRT Alternative due to its ability to serve the transportation needs along the corridor far into the future.

(CCLRP0826) ProALT-434

The Midway Chamber board has been studying this and has been involved in this for many years and they do support light rail on University Avenue particularly over Bus Rapid Transit.

(CCLRP0762) ProALT-438

And basically that is the cachet of riding the bus and -well, excuse me. The cachet of riding light rail and a great example would be to the individuals that visited numerous other international and metropolitan communities. How many of those individuals can say that they have ridden the 50-S Bus Rapid Transit to get around in that community? For example, in Chicago how many individuals can say that they have ridden that Bus Rapid Transit route in Chicago versus riding the 'L' and the answer is probably quite a few have ridden the 'L' and not that many individuals have ridden Bus Rapid Transit, and I think there are a lot of reasons for that. One being reliability. One being timeliness. One being assurances that you know where the route is going.

(CCLRP0635) ProALT-440

It is cost effective in the long run, can accommodate more riders, eases congestion, and doesn't pollute the way buses do. Having grown up in Germany with its dense population, I know firsthand how beneficial and effective light rail is.

Thank you for taking my comments.

(CCLRP0749) ProALT-441

Let me say that in all those capacities, official and unofficial, that I support strongly the construction of Light Rail Transit on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0877) ProALT-442

I'm an attorney in Downtown St. Paul and I support the light rail alternative.

(CCLRP0762) ProALT-443

I'm here to voice strong support for Light Rail Transit in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0164) ProALT-445

I was pleased to see that the draft EIS for the central Corridor project recommended light rail as the preferred alternative in the corridor. A high-speed busway would not address long-term issues of traffic congestion and rising gas prices. Light rail will be a vital part of the Twin Cities' transit picture in years to come.

(CCLRP0091) ProALT-446

We're highly in favor of Light Rail along the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0080) ProALT-447

My husband and I are 100% behind the LRT alternative. The current bus system is slow and ineffective.

(CCLRP0780) ProALT-448

I'm here today to support light rail on University Avenue in the Central Corridor for several reasons.

(CCLRP0154) ProALT-449

The MPCC supports Light Rail Transit (LRT) as the Locally Preferred Alternative for the Central Corridor Project.

(CCLRP0089) ProALT-450

I am for the Light Rail Alternative.

(CCLRP0192) ProALT-453

Just like many people you polled, I am in favor of light rail connecting the Twin Cities.

(CCLRP0823) ProALT-456

The Capitol River Council enthusiastically supports the development of Light Rail Transit along the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0821) ProALT-465

...it is critical that we do have light rail in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0406) ProALT-466

The City of Saint Paul supports Light Rail Transit (LRT) as the preferred transit mode in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0666) ProALT-470

Imagining these 2 options were on the Central Corridor today, I am confident I would be using LRT more than BRT. If BRT was available I would be more likely to make trips to, for example, downtown St. Paul, via my bicycle along Summit Avenue. If LRT was available, I would probably be pulled to the Central Corridor to rest my legs and enjoy the sights of the city.

(CCLRP0894) ProALT-471

Selecting the BRT would be a case of being penny-wise and pound-foolish. While initially less expensive to build than LRT, by the year 2017 ridership on the Central Corridor will have surpassed BRT's capacity. LRT is the only alternative to meet future ridership demands.

(CCLRP0779) ProALT-472

I speak in favor of the Light Rail Transit Alternative for the Central Corridor with reservations and with hope.

(CCLRP0450) ProALT-473

Please select the light rail alternative for the Central Avenue Corridor project. We need to build on the successes of the Hiawatha line in order to build a truly effective lightrail SYSTEM that more equally serves metro area residents.

(CCLRP0856) ProALT-474

My support for light rail as a preferred transit option for University Avenue stems from a long-term professional and personal interest in public transportation.

(CCLRP0048) ProALT-475

I prefer LRT to be constructed in the corridor because of it's higher quality of service over the alternatives under consideration.

(CCLRP0087) ProALT-477

I prefer light rail to bus transit, but that is simply a personal preference. Similarly, I would like to see MN develop a stronger regional rail service, beyond that which Amtrak currently provides.

(CCLRP0156) ProALT-479

The preferred alternative should be, without a doubt, LRT.

(CCLRP0179) ProALT-480

First off, I will directly say, I do support the central corridor.

(CCLRP0183) ProALT-483

As a regular bus rider, I strongly support expanded transit options along the Central Corridor, and after some reading, some reflection, and listening to comments at public hearings, I would call myself a tentative supporter of the LRT option over the BRT option.

(CCLRP0204) ProALT-486

We live in Prospect Park, one block south of University Avenue. We strongly support investment in the central corridor in the form of light rail, to connect the current light rail line in downtown Minneapolis to downtown St. Paul.

(CCLRP0174) ProALT-488

I am writing to express my support for the Central Corridor light rail line.

(CCLRP0203) ProALT-489

I strongly support light rail as the best transit mode for the Central Corridor. I've worked in St. Paul for 26 years (22 yrs in the Midway area & 4 years downtown St. Paul). I also

delivered Meals on Wheels in the Merriam Park/Midway area for 10 years & I'm aware of the traffic activity & transportation needs of individuals living in these areas.

(CCLRP0270) ProALT-491

The Central Corridor must be a LRT line.

(CCLRP0635) ProALT-502

I would like to make a statement that I have a strong preference for light rail on the central corridor between Mpls and St. Paul.

(CCLRP0017) ProALT-503

I have spent an unbelievable amount of time in traffic on I-94 and University Ave. An LRT connection is long overdue.

(CCLRP0664) ProALT-505

I am writing to support the Central Corridor project to link downtown Minneapolis with downtown St. Paul by light rail transit. As an employee of Ecolab and a resident of Woodbury, I think this would be a great addition personally and, more importantly, a wonderful boost to the St. Paul, Minneapolis and midway area.

(CCLRP0406) ProALT-506

The City of Saint Paul, as the attached report indicates, supports Light Rail Transit (LRT) as the preferred mode in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0178) ProALT-507

The District Councils Collaborative (DCC) supports light rail as the locally preferred alternative.

(CCLRP0827) ProALT-513

We strongly endorse light rail as the preferred method.

(CCLRP0438) ProALT-514

We, at the Saint Paul Port Authority, favor light rail transit on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0543) ProALT-515

Choosing LRT over bus transit is the logical Central Corridor investment choice when looking towards the future long-term growth and vitality of our metropolitan community.

(CCLRP0552) ProALT-516

Parsons supports the Light Rail Transit alternative for Central Corridor, for the reasons that light rail will provide greater passenger capacity than a bus alternative, and will help alleviate

the current congestion on Washington and University Avenues.

(CCLRP0799) ProALT-517

I'm here as a citizen and an employee of General Mills, and I have spent the past year or so working on the Central Corridor Light Rail Transit Line and am very much in favor of seeing it built. I think it will be necessary for the community here in St. Paul to stay connected. I believe it needs to be Light Rail Transit versus Bus Rapid Transit.

(CCLRP0196) ProALT-520

We just returned from a trip to Washington, DC where we rode the Metro from Alexandria into Washington every day. My wife and I remarked about how wonderful it would be to have that type of public transportation available in our area. We need to start now so we will have public transportation in the future.

(CCLRP0107) ProALT-521

I live a few blocks off University and I am in favor of Light Rail.

(CCLRP0240) ProALT-523

I strongly encourage you to do the thing that is in the best long-term interest of Minneapolis, St. Paul and their residents. Bring light rail to the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0757) ProALT-529

Number two, reliable, convenient, and faster. I ride the bus and it can be quite a frustrating experience at times wondering where the bus is five, ten minutes later. As we know, light rail is very on-time and you don't have to worry about that. So the frustration is gone, which does affect people and their decisions to use transit, and that's why light rail is a much better alternative.

(CCLRP0847) ProALT-530

Of the alternatives evaluated for consideration in the Central Corridor we strongly support the LRT Alternative due to its ability to serve the transportation needs along the corridor far into the future. Although the BRT Alternative involves a lower first initial cost than the LRT Alternative, the failure of the BRT Alternative to respond to the projected transportation needs beyond the year 2020 is unacceptable.

(CCLRP0148) ProALT-531

We should have light rail transportation.

(CCLRP0111) ProALT-535

I like the idea for LR Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0539) ProALT-537

PPERRIA continues to support the resolution passed at the January 2002 PPERRIA Board/Membership meeting. That resolution stated that light rail was the preferred mode for transit improvements in the Central Corridor and recommended a University Avenue alignment through Prospect Park. PPERRIA finds that the DEIS is consistent with that standing Resolution.

(CCLRP0437) ProALT-539

As noted during the public hearings, the University of Minnesota supports the development of light rail transit as the preferred alternative for the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0756) ProALT-542

Speaking as an individual, I am strongly in favor of light rail in the Central Corridor and I have three main reasons.

(CCLRP0016) ProALT-543

I'm 100% for light rail - keep building the system!

(CCLRP0004) ProALT-544

Mode preference - light rail.

(CCLRP0869) ProALT-548

The City of St. Paul supports Light Rail Transit as the preferred mode in the Central Corridor. The City of St. Paul through months of study and community discussion with a public hearing before the council last week has identified a series of issues to be addressed for preliminary engineering.

(CCLRP0208) ProALT-549

I look forward to the day when people in many neighborhoods can ride the train to work, to the farmer's market, or to the Science Museum rather than clog the freeways and surface streets with their vehicles.

(CCLRP0047) ProALT-551

I am in favor of the LRT alternative.

(CCLRP0875) ProALT-553

So with that in mind I highly recommend that we do the Central, the light rail strategy. It's highly efficient, it's more environmentally-friendly, and it's way overdue.

(CCLRP0887) ProALT-557

We at Allina strongly support the Central Corridor Light Rail Line Alternative and what it will accomplish to bridge transportation between our two cities and connect with the Hiawatha Light Rail Line.

(CCLRP0748) ProALT-558

Failure to invest in a comprehensive metro-wide transit system undercuts the state's ability to assert leadership against national competition. We strongly support the Light Rail Alternative for the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0551) ProALT-560

On behalf of St. Paul Travelers, I'm writing to express our support for Central Corridor Light Rail Transit Project,...

(CCLRP0888) ProALT-561

I'm here to tell you that I support light rail and I think it's in the best interest of all the citizens.

(CCLRP0272) ProALT-563

LRT would be much better (if we need LRT) along Pierce Butler road or even I-94.

(CCLRP0010) ProALT-567

LRT is the best option for the central corridor.

(CCLRP0871) ProALT-568

Light rail is the preferred method of travel for the businessperson. I can't think of a better place to construct light rail than between Downtown St. Paul and Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0407) ProALT-570

- The City supports the current depicted LRT alignment.

(CCLRP0203) ProALT-573

The light rail is my preferred method of transportation. I've used light rail in other parts of the country and the Twin Cities is the last major metro area to implement a LRT line. I've enjoyed using the Hiawatha LRT and I look forward to an expansion of LRT in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0284) ProALT-574

None of these things will be accomplished by Rapid Bus Transit or keeping the current system. Whether it is rational or not, Rapid Bus Transit has the same stigma that buses have. Time and time again it has been proven that people favor LRT over buses, just look at the Hiawatha line in Minneapolis as well as the light-rail lines in St. Louis, Dallas, and Denver. Investors are also skeptical of Rapid Bus Transit because it lacks the permanency of an LRT line. Funding for Rapid Bus Transit could be cut or eliminated fairly easily, whereas LRT is major infrastructure that is far more difficult to eliminate. Thus, investors who are in for the long-term will be more confident in investing near an LRT stop when compared to a Rapid Bus Transit or ordinary bus stop.

(CCLRP0820) ProALT-575

On behalf of District Energy, I am pleased to make a statement supporting LRT.

(CCLRP0270) ProALT-579

As one who has ridden the bus constantly for over five years I can tell you how much people do not like buses and how everyone I've talked to would far rather have a train. People that have cars would especially appreciate trains, these optional riders put value on comfort, efficiency, and speed. Buses are less than comfortable and are prone to traffic jams and the BRT alignment relies heavily on existing traffic lanes in some of the most congested areas, including the University of Minnesota.

(CCLRP0072) ProALT-583

I support the LRT mode for the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0789) ProALT-587

I want light rail on University, but I do have some concerns.

(CCLRP0006) ProALT-588

I am very excited about the possibility of LRT coming to the Central Corridor. I really enjoy riding the LRT that now goes from the Mall of America to Downtown Mpls. As a resident of St. Paul, I am eager to use LRT to go between the Mpls and St. Paul downtowns. LRT will be faster, more reliable, more frequent and more cost effective than bus rapid transit.

(CCLRP0459) ProALT-589

... said she is a strong supporter of light rail in the Central Corridor...

(CCLRP0754) ProALT-593

I'm here to strongly support the LRT Alternative for the Central Corridor and my reasoning for that is several.

(CCLRP0719) ProALT-595

I moved to this great community from Chicago. The one area I saw a major difference is the public transportation. Rail systems are a phenomenal method of mass transportation. I'm glad to see the Twin Cities taking the initiative to recognize the need for light rail, and taking the initial steps in the Central Corridor project.

(CCLRP0862) ProALT-600

I'm here to speak in favor of the LRT Alternative. I live in the neighborhood served by the Hiawatha LRT. I've worked in or around Downtown St. Paul since 1970 and have been a frequent transit user over the years.

(CCLRP0634) ProALT-609

I am writing in strong support of creating a Light Rail line along the Central Corridor. I believe that this is the best alternative for the future of the Twin Cities, as well as something that I would love to use personally.

(CCLRP0745) ProALT-613

I'm surprised that BRT is still being considered as it is expected to reach maximum capacity

in 2017 or sooner as the cost of gas skyrockets. I am personally looking forward to -- no. I'm excited to become one of light rail riders to climb aboard.

(CCLRP0871) ProALT-616

I'm in support of the construction of Light Rail Transit on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0052) ProALT-619

I support the rail alternative.

(CCLRP0149) ProALT-620

I like that the light rail is coming since I got to Minneapolis all the time.

(CCLRP0183) ProALT-622

While the cost of building LRT concerns me, a number of factors make this a better option, in my view, than BRT: If we are going to embark on a major new construction project for transit, we should build it for the long haul and not have to build it more than once. If BRT's capacity will be reached only a few years after it is completed, then perhaps the significantly higher cost of constructing LRT will be worth it. Once light rail is built, I would imagine you could add an extra car (or cars) to the train easier than adding an extra bus to University Avenue.

(CCLRP0549) ProALT-623

1. The Merriam Park Community Council supports the building of light rail transit (LRT) on University Avenue ...

(CCLRP0101) ProALT-624

Favor LRT. The TC Area needs 100 + miles LRT System

(CCLRP0054) ProALT-625

My wife and I live in St. Paul and support the LRT option for Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0548) ProALT-626

On behalf of U.S. Bank and its Minneapolis and Saint Paul employees, I am writing to encourage you to support Light Rail Transit (LRT) as the means of mass transit along the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0328) ProALT-628

As a resident of Minnesota and the Twin Cities Metro area, please consider my following thoughts on any transit development project, currently pertaining to the Central Corridor between Minneapolis and St. Paul. Multiple modes of transportation is crucial to any economic system. Trying to fit all of our eggs into a basket of highways will crush many eggs through congestion and pavement. I support transit development for this reason.

(CCLRP0808) ProALT-631

I think that in particular light rail is the best solution.

(CCLRP0881) ProALT-634

I strongly support light rail. We have many employees and at our last commuter fair a lot of these employees lived in the Merriam Park, Highland, and Midway areas and they wholeheartedly supported light rail.

(CCLRP0750) ProALT-637

I have come here speaking as a business owner in Downtown Minneapolis and also as an architect, and I'm also here to enthusiastically support LRT along the Central Corridor. Not BRT. LRT.

(CCLRP0407) ProALT-639

The City of Saint Paul support LRT as the preferred mode.

(CCLRP0763) ProALT-640

So, therefore, I definitely prefer the Light Rail Transit; will use it. Otherwise I will drive my car out to the airport like everyone else has to do. It's very essential for highway congestion and reducing air pollution. We're one of the last metro areas to have an important Light Rail Transit line. With the Northstar development and the Hiawatha it's on the way to having a fully-integrated transit system. We are in line to get federal funding. A lot of other cities are competing for it as well. So I strongly encourage you to develop Light Rail Transit along the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0173) ProPM-007

I want to give my support to Light Rail Transit in the Central Corridor. I believe it makes the most sense to continue expanding our existing LRT system.

(CCLRP0194) ProPM-014

I am a resident of the Midway area, living at 1243 Van Buren Ave. in St. Paul. I am writing to express my support for light rail along University Avenue.

(CCLRP0230) ProPM-022

I am generally in favor of the light rail plan for the University Ave Corridor. I would like to see the Twin Cities have a strong rail transit system to the east and west, north and south. I believe our transportation needs will require such service.

(CCLRP0446) ProPM-025

I support light rail down University Avenue.

(CCLRP0406) ProPM-026

RESOLVED, that the Saint Paul City Council accepts the report entitled Light Rail Transit on University Avenue: A Review a/the Potential dated November, 1999; and

(CCLRP0240) ProPM-028

I am writing in support of construction of a light rail line for the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0346) ProPM-035

Please support the proposed plan and select LRT as the preferred alternative in the Central Corridor. Thank you for your attention in this matter. I look forward to riding the Light Rail from St. Paul to Minneapolis!

(CCLRP0279) ProPM-059

Thank you for reviewing my comments. The Twin Cities need to expand the Light Rail Transit system. I believe the next logical link is the Central Corridor. I write this letter in support of LRT as the preferred mode in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0249) ProPM-070

I am in support of improving rapid transit in the Central Corridor. Specifically, I strongly support a light rail line being built to connect downtown Minneapolis and downtown St. Paul.

(CCLRP0484) ProPM-090

I am in support of light rail along the Center Corridor, provided the following is accomplished...

(CCLRP0258) ProPM-092

I support the LRT alternative for the central corridor for the following reasons:

(CCLRP0449) ProPM-093

I'm in favor of expanding light rail through the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0423) ProPM-099

Because I am unable to attend the public hearing I am writing a brief email for my support of Light rail on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0529) ProPM-103

Extending the LRT on University Avenue should be implemented without question.

(CCLRP0872) ProPM-120

The reasons we support the Light Rail Transit project in the Central Corridor are pretty straightforward. We have three major locations along the route; our corporate offices that also have an outpatient surgery center and other outpatient services, our Bethesda Hospital that's located within two blocks of the route, and our St. Joseph's Hospital that's located in the downtown area. We also have several other smaller operations, clinics and a city passport center that serves in excess of 25,000 members every year in downtown.

(CCLRP0346) ProPM-124

As a lifelong St. Paul resident and lover of the Twin Cities area I support Light Rail Transit for the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0154) ProPM-133

It is fully consistent with Policy 25 of the Merriam Park Community Plan, which calls for improved transit service, and Policy 26, which recognizes University Avenue as the desired corridor for the development of LRT.

(CCLRP0652) ProPM-136

I would like to make a statement in support of LRT for the central corridor.

(CCLRP0027) ProPM-142

I urge our political leaders to select LRT as the LPA.

(CCLRP0288) ProPM-149

I am a resident of St. Paul and live in the Hamline/Midway area near Blair and Hamline, only about 1/2 mile from the central corridor. I am also an avid user of the bus, taking it to and from my work in downtown Minneapolis. I support the building of LRT as the solution for the central corridor.

(CCLRP0356) ProPM-157

I'm unsure of the format for the public hearings next week, so am sending my comments for your attention via e-mail. Having visited family members living in Portland Oregon, and having seen what light rail did for Portland's urban quality, I am completely in support of light rail, rather than bus rapid transit.

(CCLRP0191) ProPM-159

I have worked in downtown St. Paul for 30 years. I am writing to urge support for the Central Corridor Transit project as a light rail transit project.

(CCLRP0337) ProPM-164

I strongly support construction on the Central Corridor LRT option.

(CCLRP0260) ProPM-175

I would like to go on record as an avid supporter of light rail in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0243) ProPM-176

I am writing to voice my encouragement for developing light rail in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0636) ProPM-197

I just wanted to give my support for the plan for new LRT.

(CCLRP0455) ProPM-200

My vote would go for a light rail solution.

(CCLRP0633) ProPM-208

I am a long time resident in Prospect Park, which is adjacent to University Avenue. I am in favor of the LRT on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0795) ProPM-210

The Central Corridor light transit is a major connector of the Twin Cities that will stimulate growth, economic development, and strategically transporting people to fill the business needs for HealthEast and other organizations. Therefore, I support construction of light rail on University Avenue with a stop at St. Joseph's Hospital.

(CCLRP0044) ProPM-212

I would like to share my support of the light rail option for the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0172) ProPM-215

I am writing to you to let you know that I am very supportive of the development of light rail transit in the Central Corridor. I support the recommendations of our partners from the broader University of Minnesota and the University of Minnesota's Academic Health Center.

(CCLRP0215) ProPM-217

I am writing in regards to the public comment period for LRT along University. I live at 1614 Selby Ave, St Paul. As it is, I frequently take the 16 or 50 as I live close to the corridor. I am a strong supporter of a transition to LRT.

(CCLRP0228) ProPM-219

I am a small business owner on the west end of University Ave. in St. Paul. I am in favor of light-rail as the most efficient and effective mode of transportation for the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0238) ProPM-220

I support the light rail for the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0246) ProPM-221

I strongly support the construction of Light Rail Transit on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0293) ProPM-222

I feel that it is important to the city of St. Paul and the greater metro area to have the capital and 2nd largest city connected via this sustainable transportation mode.

(CCLRP0272) ProPM-224

I support the concept of LRT - just not on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0307) ProPM-225

As a business that relies on a healthy Downtown Saint Paul for the Convention Decorating and Skyway Sign services, I write this letter in support of LRT as the preferred mode in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0327) ProPM-226

LRT is definitely the way to go on University - just take a look at the Hiawatha route.

(CCLRP0654) ProPM-239

My family lives in St. Paul, just south of I-94, and we are in FULL SUPPORT of the Central Corridor light rail proposal.

(CCLRP0654) ProPM-240

We must link the two metropolitan centers and the University of Minnesota campus with light rail. PLEASE approve LRT on University Avenue/Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0323) ProPM-258

I strongly support the construction of light rail on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0650) ProPM-262

I have been a Hamline-Midway neighborhood resident for 3 years. I am writing in strong favor of light rail transit (LRT) on University.

(CCLRP0208) ProPM-264

As a resident that lives less than 100 yards from the proposed University, I am very supportive of the alternative defined in the DEIS to create a light rail line connecting Saint Paul and Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0223) ProPM-265

As a resident of Ramsey County and an employee working in downtown St. Paul, I wish to express my support for light rail transit on the central corridor connecting downtown Minneapolis and St. Paul.

(CCLRP0634) ProPM-268

Please count my support for light rail

(CCLRP0444) ProPM-282

I understand that you are currently receiving comments from the public concerning plans for the Central Corridor. As a resident of Minneapolis, I want to express my strong support for an extension of the light rail system from Mpls to St. Paul.

(CCLRP0207) ProPM-285

I am strongly in favor of investing in Light Rail Transit to run in the Central Corridor of University Ave between Mpls and St. Paul. I am a proponent of mass urban transit.

(CCLRP0244) ProPM-288

Please support light rail development for the Central Corridor. From a future citizen of St. Paul,

(CCLRP0528) ProPM-294

...we generally support projects that bolster local business by driving more visitors to our city and our store. Central Corridor Light Rail Transit is such a project, and while we strongly favor the construction of light-rail Lines into downtown, we are writing to express our preferences concerning some elements of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

(CCLRP0206) ProPM-296

I would support the light rail in the central corridor.

(CCLRP0667) ProPM-297

Please count me among the growing number of strong supporters of light rail expansion in the Twin Cities.

(CCLRP0323) ProPURP-004

I view the other transportation options on University Avenue as short term fixes. Light rail is the only way to build for the long-term and infuse investment into our neighborhoods.

(CCLRP0324) ProPURP-007

I would also be drawn to use the Central Corridor as a shopping destination if light rail was the preferred transit option instead of driving elsewhere in the metro to do my shopping.

(CCLRP0780) ProPURP-061

I think rail is the right way to go because the Hiawatha Line has demonstrated that there are a lot of people that will take rail that won't take buses. I take the bus occasionally myself, but there are a lot of people that won't. I know So I think the rail is personally within the building that I work in I've talked to several people who have chosen to take the Hiawatha Line to come downtown where in the past they lived in neighborhoods with buses but they didn't take the bus important.

(CCLRP0044) ProPURP-068

I think light rail will be better than Bus Rapid Transit because it will have greater capacity and it is easier for the disabled to get on and off without feeling disruptive to other passengers. I think in the future the Twin Cities will have more seniors, more disabled people, and more people who are car-less or trying to reduce their care trips by choice, so we need to be prepared for this.

(CCLRP0270) ProPURP-078

LRT would be able to bypass the traffic and speed the journey to the riders end destination. Not to mention the lower operating cost, one three car train is the same size as five articulated buses. Fewer operators, less fuel, more energy savings, and high capacity. One three-car train every five minutes would mean a bus every minute to match the number of seats - trying to cram that many buses into the corridor would be a mess.

(CCLRP0880) ProPURP-104

I drive a big Ford V-B and the last time I filled it up it was \$65. So if you want people like me to take public transit -- there's plenty of people out there who drive big vehicles who use a lot of gas. If you want people like me to take public transit, we need light rail.

(CCLRP0892) ProPURP-120

We all know that the highway system is in dire need of attention. The organization I serve supports multimodal solutions including highway improvements as well as a solid dependable mass transit system. Buses will play a large role in that enhanced system, but we need to move to the next level, LRT. It's reliable, energy efficient, and it's able to grow with the demand which is a huge point when we think of the LRT versus Bus Rapid Transit.

(CCLRP0341) ProPURP-124

Yes, the cost is more, BUT this is a permanent solution to transportation, not a stop gap. I always tell people that it is highly costly to maintain our Minnesota highways, and that is on-going, because of our changeable weather. Light rail is permanent, so the investment is worth it. I hope you will give this serious consideration and not think only of right now.

(CCLRP0344) ProPURP-136

The successful redevelopment of the Central Corridor depends on mobility and access. It is my belief LRT offers the most effective solution to the regions economic, residential and environmental needs. I stand behind the proposed plan and encourage you to select LRT as the locally preferred alternative in the Central Corridor. Let's move forward with LRT and help our neighbors and communities find convenient ways to move around the Twin Cities. I also believe that it will improve economic development. We will all prosper from this initiative.

(CCLRP0787) ProPURP-141

First, more riders would be attracted to light rail than the Bus Rapid Transit. Second, transit oriented development will be better supported by light rail than by Bus Rapid Transit.

(CCLRP0335) ProPURP-158

The successful redevelopment of the Central Corridor depends on mobility and access. It is my belief LRT offers the most effective solution to the region's economic, residential and environmental needs. I stand behind the proposed plan and encourage you to select LRT as the locally Preferred Alternative in the Central Corridor. I like the promise of moving forward and seeing some valued activity for all people in this arena.

(CCLRP0892) ProPURP-160

We also support LRT in the corridor for reasons of regional equity. The west metro is home to the first leg of LRT. The east metro cannot be left out. St. Paul has to be a part of the solution.

(CCLRP0895) ProPURP-171

Who's going to ride this bus? Not a lot of people here, but how are they going to get down to it if they don't live right within it. And how many people along University have said, well, I won't take that job in Downtown Minneapolis because I have to ride a bus, but I would if I could ride a train.

(CCLRP0274) ProPURP-175

It is my belief LRT offers the most effective solution to the regions economic, residential and environmental needs. I stand behind the proposed plan and encourage you to select LRT as the locally preferred alternative in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0258) ProPURP-187

I believe that at this critical point in our nation's history each area must do the maximum possible to reduce our dependence on foreign oil from unstable regions. LRT is much more pleasurable to ride than a bus; thus, I believe, will attract more riders.

(CCLRP0773) ProPURP-227

Like it's been mentioned before, I am not a bus rider, although I would be a light rail rider. I believe light rail is the next step in getting to a fully-integrated transit system in the Twin Cities metropolitan area, which as we expand geographically as a region I believe is absolutely critical. Some figures I've seen on the Bus Rapid Transit line is that it would be filled to capacity almost immediately as it would be opened.

(CCLRP0433) ProPURP-228

I am writing because I think it is extremely important to build a LRT to connect Minneapolis with St. Paul. I believe that with the rising costs of oil the LRT option is going to be far more economical and beneficial to the area residents. The ridership from people living in St. Paul who work in Minneapolis or go to school at the University of Minnesota will largely support the project. Also, more people will take advantage of the system if it is a LRT rather than a bus system.

(CCLRP0564) ProPURP-253

Our dependence on oil, increasing highway congestion, and the reliance on the automobile as the only viable method of travel in the MSP metro area all argue for alternate transit methods. These problems will not reverse itself and we need to address the issue now. The selection of LRT as the preferred alternative is the best decision to make.

(CCLRP0254) SocNC-046

The LRT will enhance economic vitality, housing choices, the opportunity to own a home, along with a healthy environment and access to an area's amenities. The increase in travel times to and from work and the area's amenities and everyday necessities are affecting these quality of life factors. This trend will not reverse itself and we need to address the issue now. The selection of LRT as the preferred alternative is the best decision to make.

(CCLRP0006) SocNC-066

Please support LRT in the Central Corridor and enhance the sustainability of our urban...(cut off)

(CCLRP0845) SocNC-178

Light Rail Transit will significantly knit together various neighborhoods in St. Paul and the St. Paul community with other communities. It will enhance our already strong urban environment and will provide an amenity in a very high traffic area. We urge you to approve the Central Corridor Light Rail Transit Project.

(CCLRP0652) SocSS-003

Rail transit is also better suited for the Minnesota winter. We have seen how well the Hiawatha trains made it through our winter's ice and snowstorms, while buses, like cars, slide around on the ice.

(CCLRP0244) SocSS-029

It's safe and easy to hop on the train and visit the downtown areas with this resource. I find that I never use buses which tend to be dirty and put out smelly exhaust fumes. I feel safer on light rail.

(CCLRP0627) ProALT-136

(CCLRP0314) ProALT-149

(CCLRP0304) ProALT-192

(CCLRP0351) ProALT-216

(CCLRP0276) ProALT-226

(CCLRP0349) ProALT-232

(CCLRP0332) ProALT-381

(CCLRP0205) ProALT-424

(CCLRP0306) ProALT-467

(CCLRP0350) ProALT-469

(CCLRP0342) ProALT-493

(CCLRP0347) ProALT-566

(CCLRP0274) ProALT-572

(CCLRP0354) ProALT-577

(CCLRP0334) ProALT-580

(CCLRP0305) ProALT-594

(CCLRP0352) ProPM-184

(CCLRP0335) ProPM-228

(CCLRP0348) ProPM-229

(CCLRP0639) ProPM-274

I write this letter in support of LRT as the preferred mode in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0822) ProALT-205

(CCLRP0744) ProALT-292

The University of Minnesota supports the development of Light Rail Transit in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0118) ProALT-227

(CCLRP0117) ProALT-635

Yes for light rail on University.

(CCLRP0544) ProALT-362

(CCLRP0553) ProALT-533

On behalf of the University Enterprise Laboratories, Inc. (UEL), I support the proposed Central Corridor Light Rail Transit (LRD) project.

(CCLRP0083) ProALT-349

(CCLRP0846) ProALT-374

(CCLRP0243) ProPM-024

(CCLRP0231) ProPM-293

I support the construction of Light Rail Transit on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0585) ProALT-057

(CCLRP0572) ProALT-063

(CCLRP0503) ProALT-064

(CCLRP0624) ProALT-066

(CCLRP0603) ProALT-071

(CCLRP0202) ProALT-075

(CCLRP0316) ProALT-084

(CCLRP0317) ProALT-085

(CCLRP0620) ProALT-090

(CCLRP0519) ProALT-092

(CCLRP0501) ProALT-094

(CCLRP0292) ProALT-100

(CCLRP0262) ProALT-101

(CCLRP0516) ProALT-118

(CCLRP0574) ProALT-119

(CCLRP0558) ProALT-121

(CCLRP0496) ProALT-127

(CCLRP0512) ProALT-129

(CCLRP0493) ProALT-133

(CCLRP0569) ProALT-142

(CCLRP0565) ProALT-145

(CCLRP0497) ProALT-146

(CCLRP0618) ProALT-150

(CCLRP0583) ProALT-153

(CCLRP0211) ProALT-154

(CCLRP0291) ProALT-157

(CCLRP0513) ProALT-161

(CCLRP0520) ProALT-163

(CCLRP0590) ProALT-164

(CCLRP0309) ProALT-165

(CCLRP0625) ProALT-166

(CCLRP0588) ProALT-172

(CCLRP0229) ProALT-176

(CCLRP0617) ProALT-177
(CCLRP0268) ProALT-178
(CCLRP0615) ProALT-180
(CCLRP0606) ProALT-181
(CCLRP0515) ProALT-182
(CCLRP0261) ProALT-185
(CCLRP0613) ProALT-189
(CCLRP0319) ProALT-195
(CCLRP0214) ProALT-198
(CCLRP0567) ProALT-199
(CCLRP0596) ProALT-200
(CCLRP0575) ProALT-201
(CCLRP0213) ProALT-207
(CCLRP0499) ProALT-212
(CCLRP0610) ProALT-218
(CCLRP0609) ProALT-220
(CCLRP0242) ProALT-234
(CCLRP0582) ProALT-236
(CCLRP0299) ProALT-237
(CCLRP0511) ProALT-240
(CCLRP0210) ProALT-246
(CCLRP0557) ProALT-248
(CCLRP0505) ProALT-252
(CCLRP0562) ProALT-253
(CCLRP0568) ProALT-255
(CCLRP0573) ProALT-257
(CCLRP0517) ProALT-258
(CCLRP0619) ProALT-263
(CCLRP0614) ProALT-265
(CCLRP0221) ProALT-270
(CCLRP0290) ProALT-272
(CCLRP0559) ProALT-276
(CCLRP0502) ProALT-282
(CCLRP0498) ProALT-287
(CCLRP0500) ProALT-293
(CCLRP0601) ProALT-294
(CCLRP0201) ProALT-296
(CCLRP0269) ProALT-306
(CCLRP0598) ProALT-309
(CCLRP0580) ProALT-310
(CCLRP0584) ProALT-314
(CCLRP0600) ProALT-316
(CCLRP0233) ProALT-322
(CCLRP0310) ProALT-327
(CCLRP0322) ProALT-330
(CCLRP0255) ProALT-337

(CCLRP0579) ProALT-342
(CCLRP0219) ProALT-348
(CCLRP0254) ProALT-353
(CCLRP0509) ProALT-361
(CCLRP0578) ProALT-363
(CCLRP0576) ProALT-366
(CCLRP0227) ProALT-378
(CCLRP0297) ProALT-386
(CCLRP0506) ProALT-392
(CCLRP0587) ProALT-393
(CCLRP0616) ProALT-395
(CCLRP0556) ProALT-397
(CCLRP0265) ProALT-407
(CCLRP0217) ProALT-414
(CCLRP0623) ProALT-418
(CCLRP0521) ProALT-423
(CCLRP0495) ProALT-425
(CCLRP0220) ProALT-426
(CCLRP0592) ProALT-435
(CCLRP0504) ProALT-444
(CCLRP0604) ProALT-451
(CCLRP0622) ProALT-454
(CCLRP0621) ProALT-458
(CCLRP0226) ProALT-459
(CCLRP0595) ProALT-461
(CCLRP0594) ProALT-463
(CCLRP0181) ProALT-481
(CCLRP0197) ProALT-485
(CCLRP0257) ProALT-490
(CCLRP0491) ProALT-494
(CCLRP0510) ProALT-495
(CCLRP0555) ProALT-496
(CCLRP0605) ProALT-500
(CCLRP0607) ProALT-501
(CCLRP0612) ProALT-518
(CCLRP0518) ProALT-522
(CCLRP0295) ProALT-528
(CCLRP0267) ProALT-532
(CCLRP0218) ProALT-534
(CCLRP0570) ProALT-538
(CCLRP0586) ProALT-540
(CCLRP0315) ProALT-545
(CCLRP0266) ProALT-547
(CCLRP0253) ProALT-550
(CCLRP0566) ProALT-552
(CCLRP0321) ProALT-556

(CCLRP0560) ProALT-559
(CCLRP0591) ProALT-564
(CCLRP0494) ProALT-571
(CCLRP0514) ProALT-581
(CCLRP0593) ProALT-591
(CCLRP0581) ProALT-596
(CCLRP0175) ProALT-597
(CCLRP0602) ProALT-598
(CCLRP0508) ProALT-602
(CCLRP0196) ProALT-605
(CCLRP0597) ProALT-607
(CCLRP0312) ProALT-608
(CCLRP0571) ProALT-612
(CCLRP0577) ProALT-614
(CCLRP0311) ProALT-617
(CCLRP0599) ProALT-618
(CCLRP0563) ProALT-632
(CCLRP0507) ProALT-636
(CCLRP0318) ProHLP-046
(CCLRP0234) ProPM-141
(CCLRP0608) ProPM-278
(CCLRP0200) ProPURP-215

I urge you to select Light Rail Transit(LRT) as the preferred alternative to resolving the transit issues facing the Central Corridor, a vital link between Saint Paul and Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0205) ProALT-457
(CCLRP0347) ProPURP-038
(CCLRP0353) ProPURP-041
(CCLRP0305) ProPURP-043
(CCLRP0332) ProPURP-046
(CCLRP0349) ProPURP-064
(CCLRP0348) ProPURP-099
(CCLRP0306) ProPURP-117
(CCLRP0639) ProPURP-130
(CCLRP0627) ProPURP-144
(CCLRP0276) ProPURP-150
(CCLRP0352) ProPURP-159
(CCLRP0351) ProPURP-164
(CCLRP0279) ProPURP-189
(CCLRP0304) ProPURP-195
(CCLRP0342) ProPURP-199
(CCLRP0350) ProPURP-212
(CCLRP0307) ProPURP-219
(CCLRP0354) ProPURP-224
(CCLRP0334) ProPURP-235
(CCLRP0336) ProPURP-246

(CCLRP0314) ProPURP-247

The successful redevelopment of the Central Corridor depends on mobility and access. It is my belief LRT offers the most effective solution to the regions economic, residential and environmental needs. I stand behind the proposed plan and encourage you to select LRT as the locally preferred alternative in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0226) SocNC-069

(CCLRP0214) SocNC-076

(CCLRP0219) SocNC-081

(CCLRP0227) SocNC-102

(CCLRP0196) SocNC-110

(CCLRP0234) SocNC-116

(CCLRP0233) SocNC-118

(CCLRP0202) SocNC-137

(CCLRP0229) SocNC-149

(CCLRP0201) SocNC-151

(CCLRP0211) SocNC-155

(CCLRP0218) SocNC-207

(CCLRP0175) SocNC-222

(CCLRP0220) SocNC-225

(CCLRP0210) SocNC-228

(CCLRP0200) SocNC-230

(CCLRP0217) SocNC-240

(CCLRP0213) SocNC-243

As a REALTOR we sell more than just homes. We sell neighborhoods, communities and "quality of life." This includes economic vitality, housing choices, the opportunity to own a home, along with a healthy environment and access to an area's amenities. The increase in travel times to and from work and the area's amenities and everyday necessities are affecting these quality of life factors. This trend will not reverse itself and we need to address the issue now. The selection of LRT as the preferred alternative is the best decision to make.

(CCLRP0604) SocNC-034

(CCLRP0516) SocNC-037

(CCLRP0514) SocNC-038

(CCLRP0269) SocNC-040

(CCLRP0612) SocNC-041

(CCLRP0559) SocNC-042

(CCLRP0614) SocNC-044

(CCLRP0585) SocNC-045

(CCLRP0583) SocNC-047

(CCLRP0257) SocNC-048

(CCLRP0501) SocNC-050

(CCLRP0312) SocNC-051

(CCLRP0512) SocNC-054

(CCLRP0497) SocNC-056

(CCLRP0578) SocNC-057

(CCLRP0581) SocNC-058
(CCLRP0500) SocNC-059
(CCLRP0321) SocNC-060
(CCLRP0508) SocNC-062
(CCLRP0319) SocNC-063
(CCLRP0268) SocNC-064
(CCLRP0586) SocNC-065
(CCLRP0590) SocNC-067
(CCLRP0255) SocNC-068
(CCLRP0568) SocNC-071
(CCLRP0266) SocNC-072
(CCLRP0574) SocNC-074
(CCLRP0570) SocNC-077
(CCLRP0617) SocNC-078
(CCLRP0622) SocNC-079
(CCLRP0573) SocNC-083
(CCLRP0601) SocNC-086
(CCLRP0605) SocNC-088
(CCLRP0566) SocNC-089
(CCLRP0297) SocNC-091
(CCLRP0624) SocNC-092
(CCLRP0618) SocNC-094
(CCLRP0620) SocNC-095
(CCLRP0509) SocNC-096
(CCLRP0505) SocNC-097
(CCLRP0291) SocNC-098
(CCLRP0580) SocNC-100
(CCLRP0315) SocNC-101
(CCLRP0567) SocNC-105
(CCLRP0602) SocNC-106
(CCLRP0593) SocNC-107
(CCLRP0518) SocNC-108
(CCLRP0556) SocNC-111
(CCLRP0491) SocNC-112
(CCLRP0596) SocNC-113
(CCLRP0262) SocNC-117
(CCLRP0576) SocNC-119
(CCLRP0520) SocNC-120
(CCLRP0261) SocNC-122
(CCLRP0267) SocNC-123
(CCLRP0572) SocNC-124
(CCLRP0607) SocNC-125
(CCLRP0322) SocNC-126
(CCLRP0623) SocNC-127
(CCLRP0571) SocNC-129
(CCLRP0579) SocNC-131

(CCLRP0609) SocNC-132
(CCLRP0515) SocNC-133
(CCLRP0625) SocNC-135
(CCLRP0299) SocNC-136
(CCLRP0569) SocNC-138
(CCLRP0309) SocNC-140
(CCLRP0621) SocNC-141
(CCLRP0577) SocNC-142
(CCLRP0600) SocNC-144
(CCLRP0496) SocNC-145
(CCLRP0595) SocNC-148
(CCLRP0598) SocNC-157
(CCLRP0558) SocNC-158
(CCLRP0594) SocNC-159
(CCLRP0502) SocNC-160
(CCLRP0591) SocNC-163
(CCLRP0221) SocNC-165
(CCLRP0181) SocNC-167
(CCLRP0608) SocNC-168
(CCLRP0511) SocNC-169
(CCLRP0506) SocNC-170
(CCLRP0599) SocNC-171
(CCLRP0557) SocNC-173
(CCLRP0495) SocNC-175
(CCLRP0292) SocNC-176
(CCLRP0603) SocNC-177
(CCLRP0295) SocNC-180
(CCLRP0503) SocNC-181
(CCLRP0575) SocNC-183
(CCLRP0584) SocNC-184
(CCLRP0616) SocNC-185
(CCLRP0242) SocNC-186
(CCLRP0318) SocNC-187
(CCLRP0197) SocNC-188
(CCLRP0588) SocNC-190
(CCLRP0493) SocNC-192
(CCLRP0521) SocNC-195
(CCLRP0563) SocNC-196
(CCLRP0610) SocNC-199
(CCLRP0265) SocNC-200
(CCLRP0606) SocNC-202
(CCLRP0510) SocNC-203
(CCLRP0253) SocNC-206
(CCLRP0519) SocNC-209
(CCLRP0592) SocNC-210
(CCLRP0597) SocNC-212

(CCLRP0615) SocNC-214
(CCLRP0498) SocNC-220
(CCLRP0587) SocNC-221
(CCLRP0565) SocNC-223
(CCLRP0507) SocNC-226
(CCLRP0560) SocNC-227
(CCLRP0494) SocNC-229
(CCLRP0290) SocNC-231
(CCLRP0317) SocNC-233
(CCLRP0619) SocNC-234
(CCLRP0504) SocNC-235
(CCLRP0311) SocNC-237
(CCLRP0613) SocNC-238
(CCLRP0513) SocNC-239
(CCLRP0555) SocNC-241
(CCLRP0316) SocNC-242
(CCLRP0499) SocNC-244
(CCLRP0562) SocNC-245
(CCLRP0310) SocSC-001
(CCLRP0582) SocSC-002
(CCLRP0517) SocSC-004

As a member of the REALTOR family I sell more than just homes. I sell neighborhoods, communities and "quality of life." This includes economic vitality, housing choices, the opportunity to own a home, along with a healthy environment and access to an area's amenities. The increase in travel times to and from work and the area's amenities and everyday necessities are affecting these quality of life factors. This trend will not reverse itself and we need to address the issue now. The selection of LRT as the preferred alternative is the best decision to make.

Response ProALT-001. During the AA/DEIS, several alignment alternatives were evaluated based on the results of several earlier studies. After publication of the AA/DEIS and completion of the public hearings, the Metropolitan Council adopted the AA/DEIS LPA for the Central Corridor. The AA/DEIS LPA was 11 miles in length, of which 9.8 miles consisted of new alignment and 1.2 miles using the existing Hiawatha LRT alignment in downtown Minneapolis. The AA/DEIS LPA was at-grade along most of the alignment with the exception of a tunnel through the U of M's East Bank. Subsequent to the completion of the AA/DEIS for the Central Corridor LRT Project, several unresolved policy questions and design element options arose which required additional study. These unresolved issues and design changes resulted in the completion of the SDEIS. After the publication of the SDEIS, the Metropolitan Council adopted a Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is defined as LRT operating at-grade on Washington and University Avenues, passing north of the State Capitol and turning south on Robert Street, turning west at 12th Street to Cedar Street, and then continuing south on Cedar Street into downtown St. Paul turning diagonally at 4th Street, and continuing east to end at St. Paul's Union Depot with tail track leading to an operations and maintenance facility farther east (Metropolitan Council Resolution No. 2008-26). A more detailed description of the Preferred Alternative is included in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProALT-004. Selection of Preferred Alternative (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0271) PlaTP-150

How does a train to Target, WalMart, CVS and the other University Avenue big box parking lot projects better serve the residents of St. Paul and the metro region than a train serving all the St. Paul neighborhoods, businesses and institutions along the existing corridor just north of University? How are the residents of the Frogtown, North End, Como, Midway, and St. Anthony Park neighborhoods better served by the University Avenue alignment? How are the Hamline and University of Minnesota students, staff and visitors better served by the train service to the big box parking lots? How are the businesses located on or very near the existing rail corridor better served by a University Avenue alignment?

(CCLRP0114) ProALT-087

Use the freeway instead.

(CCLRP0035) ProALT-114

There must be a better way to connect St Paul and Minneapolis (e.g. Shep road from Airport to Downtown St Paul).

(CCLRP0273) ProPOL-15

What the lack of having any real alternative to LRT is about is not that it doesn't exist, but that it is due to the inertia of lobbying forces, which has been the Regional Rail Authority and the labor unions (which as a progressive I support as well), and oddly in a coalition with the Chamber of Commerce. However, what this is really, really about is the process of leadership or rather the lack of leadership. A lack of innovative leadership in this state, which is also about to give us three stadiums for 1.5 billion instead of one technologically and architecturally advanced one in the inner city for 750 million, means that leadership won't even look beyond what the lobbyists tell them to look for. They can't seem to make a few research calls to look at highly advanced, newly designed rapid mass transit vehicle systems, and all the current technology that can guide them, and realize this may not only be the best technology and one with the best economic development potential, but the cheapest as well.

(CCLRP0271) SocEE-10

LRT on or beside the existing rail corridors, extending all the way to the Maplewood Mall area, in addition to serving the 2 downtowns, both the St. Paul and Minneapolis U of M campus, and all the neighborhoods, businesses and institutions in between, would also serve all the neighborhoods, businesses and institutions north and east of downtown St. Paul. There are still- more drive-by polluters, driving in and driving out of the downtown and University area parking facilities, who originate in the suburbs north and east of St. Paul, than there are people driving into the core city locations who originate along University and Washington Avenues

Response ProALT-004. Alternative alignments for LRT through the U of M, State Capitol, and downtown St. Paul were suggested during Scoping. Project partners including the U of M, St. Paul's Capitol Area Architectural and Planning Board (CAAPB), the City of St. Paul, and the City of Minneapolis advocated minor changes in the alignment or affirmed their preference for specific alignments. Additional analysis was undertaken to satisfy concerns and to respond to comments received. Through the scoping process, modes, alignments, and alternatives that were not prudent or reasonable and did not satisfy requirements of the purpose and need were not carried forward for additional analysis in the AA/DEIS. Scoping results are included in the Scoping Summary Report (December 7, 2001). Three build alternatives were selected for evaluation in the AA/DEIS in addition to a Baseline Alternative. The build alternatives included: University Avenue LRT and University Avenue BRT.. Chapter 2 of the FEIS describes the alternatives studied in the AA/DEIS. As shown on Figure 2-3 of the FEIS, the current Preferred Alternative is an at-grade light rail transit line that is 11 miles in length, of which 9.8 miles consists of new alignment and 1.2 miles use the existing Hiawatha LRT alignment in downtown Minneapolis. The current design of the Preferred Alternative is discussed in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProALT-005. [Baseline alternative](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0457) ProALT-585

- Page S-5 (Section 3.1): Baseline Alternative The baseline alternative is not clearly defined. Please provide a one to two sentence definition at the beginning of this section.

Response ProALT-005. The Baseline Alternative serves as a basis for comparison to the build alternatives as part of the FTA's New Starts Process. It is also designed to do the "best that can be done" to improve transit service in the Central Corridor LRT Study Area without a major capital investment. Low capital cost infrastructure and bus transit improvements for the Central Corridor included bus operations, intelligent transportation systems (ITS) techniques, travel demand management (TDM), and other system improvements. Bus operation strategies that build upon existing transit services and facilities provide connectivity within the Central Corridor LRT Study Area. ITS uses the latest technology for more effectively managing transportation systems. TDM strategies help reduce congestion by encouraging the use of alternative modes of transportation rather than driving alone. See Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProALT-030. [Alternatives Analysis](#) (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0174) PlaTP-052

More weather protection in stations: while most stations on the Hiawatha line are extremely attractive, and do contain heaters in the shelters, the protection isn't enough on winter days.

The partitions are not enclosed enough to block significant amounts of wind or even precipitation in some cases. The heaters are often located so high that you can barely feel them when the temperature is below freezing. On the trains: Is there a way to install clocks with the screens that display the upcoming station?

(CCLRP0753) PlaTP-058

in looking at this line, it would connect the north, the south, the east, and points in between

(CCLRP0232) PlaTP-088

Overall there seems to be a horse-blinkered view of a narrow set of alternatives in the DEIS. The coordination of transport systems, fares, process for transfer from one to the other systems is lacking. Other systems being car park-ride,

(CCLRP0448) PlaTP-220

If this elevated station cannot be built, my opinion is that I do not think we should build the LRT link between the two cities.

(CCLRP0916) PlaTP-224

I see this as a choice between a system oriented to concentration and a system oriented to accessibility. When gas prices do go up to five or \$10 a gallon, the region will need an accessible system, what I would say commuter rail and expanded bus service, that can cover more locations with more frequency.

Response ProALT-030. Comment Noted.

Issue Summary ProALT-045. Concerned that non-LRT alternatives were not analyzed adequately (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0273) ProALT-219

After sitting through and reading every piece at several public hearings on the Central Corridor it is obvious to anyone of even limited policy or government project background (I'm a former Minnesota legislator and electric mass transit lobbyist), that the Central Corridor project is wired for LRT, and has been from day one. It wasn't just that every almost every group that came before the microphones, or that put forward literature and such was for LRT (including local engineering firms like TKDA that didn't identify themselves as being possibly or currently financially involved at some point in the process) it was that LRT was the only real alternative even researched. There were hundreds, literally hundreds of lobbyists, and officials and corporate executives touched by lobbyists, that touted LRT. There was virtually no one representing the state of the art of any other viable solution.

Response ProALT-045. LRT and BRT, in addition to a Baseline Alternative, were the modes of transportation analyzed in detail in the AA/DEIS to determine which alternative best met the project purpose and need as summarized in Chapter 1 of that document. These modes were identified through a scoping process that looked at multiple modes and alignments, as documented in the Central Corridor Summary Report (2001). LRT was

identified as the locally preferred alternative, best meeting project purpose and need, as an outcome of the AA/DEIS process which concluded in June 2006.

Issue Summary ProPM-001. Alternatives Analysis (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) ProPM-119

WHEREAS, the Saint Paul City Council requested that the Planning Commission "analyze LRT and other transit alternatives in the Central Corridor, and evaluate specific issues related to construction impacts, design with respect to traffic and parking, redevelopment impacts and design aesthetics" and "obtain community input on LRT in the Central Corridor with respect to the aforementioned issues, evaluate the previous positions of the City on LRT development, and consider making specific recommendations on LRT development in Saint Paul;" and WHEREAS, the Planning Commission only found that significant changes due to improved technology made University Avenue an option for light rail transit, reported those findings with conclusions and recommendations in a report entitled Light Rail Transit on University Avenue: A Review of the Potential; and WHEREAS, the Ramsey County Regional Rail Authority will be undertaking a major study o[the Central Corridor beginning next year that will include consideration of potential alignments; and WHEREAS, development policy adopted by this Council in the Saint Paul Comprehensive Plan establishes a priority for the Central Corridor Options linking the two downtowns for major new transit; and

(CCLRP0436) ProPM-140

General Comments • Figure S-3: The document indicates that commuter rail recommendations will go to the Mn/DOT Commissioner and that other recommendations will go elsewhere, and perhaps be referred to the Mn/DOT Commissioner. We believe any recommendations that directly involve Mn/DOT facilities or right of way should be sent to the Commissioner. For example, this may include but not be limited to bus shoulders, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Light Rail Transit (LRT) or bike facility connections that cross Mn/DOT Trunk Highways (TH).

(CCLRP0271) ProPM-169

Several months ago, I had the opportunity to witness the monthly meeting of the Central Corridor Coordinating Committee. At the meeting, Steve Morris from the Ramsey County Regional Rail Authority stated that the cost effectiveness of the Central Corridor LRT is largely dependent upon serving the 2 downtowns and the University. According to Mr. Morris, the origin and the destination are the 2 pieces to connecting people to the 2 downtowns and the University.

(CCLRP0758) ProPM-198

After this project gets built, if it gets built, there will still be no public transit there.

(CCLRP0190) ProPM-216

I live very near the intersection of Bedford Street SE and University Ave SE and am a regular user of public transportation. While I'm a big supporter of the proposed light rail project, I do have some concerns:

Response ProPM-001. Comment noted.

Section: 2.3 - Alternatives Analysis (LRT & Buses)

Issue Summary NatVA-001. Concerns about lack of BRT budget (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0859) NatVA-1

Currently there is 90 million in the LRT budget for streetscape. There is zero in the budget for BRT.

Response NatVA-001. Two build alternatives were selected for evaluation in the AA/DEIS in addition to a Baseline Alternative. The build alternatives included: University Avenue LRT and University Avenue BRT. After publication of the AA/DEIS and completion of the public hearings, the Metropolitan Council adopted the AA/DEIS LPA for the Central Corridor as LRT on University and Washington Avenues.

Issue Summary NR-006. Buses are better alternative (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0225) NR-44

3. Buses are cheaper and you can change the routes to follow the people and businesses.

Response NR-006. Comment noted. Two build alternatives were selected for evaluation in the AA/DEIS in addition to a Baseline Alternative. The build alternatives included: University Avenue LRT and University Avenue BRT. After publication of the AA/DEIS and completion of the public hearings, the Metropolitan Council adopted the AA/DEIS LPA for the Central Corridor as LRT on University and Washington Avenues. Furthermore, Chapter 5 of the FEIS discusses the development potential for land areas around proposed station locations.

Issue Summary NR-008. Prefers bus route along highway 94 (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0154) NR-25

The University alignment of LRT is well suited to accomplish the goal of moving people within the Central Corridor. The goal of moving people THROUGH the corridor is best accomplished by the 94D bus route, which is projected to have a downtown-to-downtown travel time of 31 minutes, four minutes less than LRT.

Response NR-008. Comment noted. While some persons may take the train end to end, ridership projections indicate that the majority of trips made will be intra-corridor trips, meaning that travelers likely have a destination between the two ends of the line. Route 94 express bus service would continue uninterrupted in its current capacity. A discussion of transit impacts and trip-making behavior is provided in FEIS Chapter 6, Section 6.1.

Issue Summary PlaPla-011. Concerned about impact to public bus system (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0475) PlaPla-8

p. 5-10 As far as LRT attracting higher class people than the bus does, it might not attract so many if they had to pay a higher fare than what is being charged for Hiawatha LRT and if the parking provided for LRT wasn't free. When Hiawatha LRT opened a \$40 monthly rail only unlimited ride pass was offered, while a monthly express bus pass was \$95. Also, if you bought a \$10 or \$20 stored value pass and asked for a rail-only transfer when you got on a bus with the stored value pass you got a transfer good for 22 1/2 hours, while a regular transfer is only good for 2 1/2 hours. This was later down-sized to 12 1/2 hours. I don't know what it is now.

As far as Hiawatha LRT being preferred over bus in general by all classes of people, we can't tell. Bus routes were dead-ended into LRT stations, so you couldn't continue unless you got on the train.

LRT is hurting people who depend on the bus. In the 2006 Minnesota Legislature they took \$7.8 million in state money that was to replace Snelling bus garage (apparently tom down to make room for future LRT development--development isn't just promoted by LRT, government spends tax dollars to promote LRT development) and put it towards Central Corridor planning. Nearly \$40 million in Federal money that was to go to purchase buses used instead to extend Hiawatha to connect to Mall of America instead of Hiawatha ending a couple blocks away.

Response PlaPla-011. As discussed in the FEIS, the fares to ride Metro Transit buses, the Hiawatha LRT, and the Central Corridor LRT will be the same and free transfers are available. To provide adequate access, the LRT alignment is usually taken through areas where population and employment are densely concentrated. The AA/DEIS and SDEIS examined numerous alignment options that are discussed in Chapter 2 of both documents. The Preferred Alternative includes an alignment that meets the purpose and need most efficiently and minimizes project impacts. All ridership forecasts and other elements associated with forecasts of usage of the Central Corridor LRT were based on Metropolitan Council Regional Model output, which does take into account future development, as noted in local comprehensive plans (FEIS Chapter 6). The importance of feeder and local bus service to the success of the Central Corridor LRT has been noted and a plan for this service is discussed in Chapter 6 of the SDEIS and FEIS. Meeting federal cost effectiveness criteria was an essential part of entering into preliminary engineering and will be an essential criterion for entering into final design; see Chapter 8 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTE-018. Report should discuss difference between LRT and BRT (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0436) PlaTE-29

•Table S.5-1, Goal 3 Transportation and Mobility; and Section 7.2.4: There are likely to be a few more benefits identified in this section for the BRT (especially capacity and intermodal connectivity benefits). We believe it would be helpful to explain the reasoning behind the difference in capacity, and perhaps to define capacity, and intermodal connectivity.

Response PlaTE-018. The Preferred Alternative includes LRT as the selected technology because it best meets the purpose and need of the project, which is described in Section 1.3 of the FEIS. The capacity, modeling and benefits from the BRT and LRT alternatives were determined using methodology approved by the FTA. Additional details on methodology were described in Chapter 2, 6, 7 and the appendices of the AA/DEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-119. LRT is not a flexible choice like buses. Routes cannot be adjusted. (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0225) PlaTP-149

2. It's not flexible. Once you lay the tracks, you are stuck with it, whether you have riders or not.

Response PlaTP-119. Comment noted.

Issue Summary PlaTP-123. Express bus between downtowns is faster than LRT (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0839) PlaTP-158

And as far as convenience, light rail will be going down University Avenue and having the same stoplights to observe as the bus. It will observe the same speed limit as the cars. So the effective operating speed is 15 miles per hour. The express bus, which one speaker mentioned, going between the two downtowns takes 24 minutes according to the schedule between Sixth and Hennepin and Fifth and Cedar.

Response PlaTP-123. Express bus service between the two downtowns, Route 94, will continue to operate in the future to serve the market for which this service has been developed. The Central Corridor LRT is serving a different travel market and will provide stops at multiple locations along the Central Corridor as well as providing a connection to the Hiawatha LRT in Minneapolis.

Issue Summary ProALT-006. Preference for improved local bus service (14)

Comments:

(CCLRP0163) ProALT-058

I believe improving the bus service - better connections with north/south routes, better weekend services, and easier accessible steps would benefit more individuals than light rail transit. The bus would stop at your corner, not a half mile away.

(CCLRP0776) ProALT-140

So for the capital cost of LRT, instead of decreasing the number of vehicles that you're operating you could have added hundreds of buses and for the operating cost of LRT you could have operated those buses because the operating cost of LRT, according to the Environmental Impact Statement, is \$18 million while the cost of operating 34 additional buses is \$4.3 million. Okay. So you could have operated more than 136 additional buses for the operating cost alone of LRT.

(CCLRP0776) ProALT-143

I don't own a car and I'm very pro-transit and I think improving the bus system would be a much better buy for the money. We're looking at a light rail line. It's not a light rail system. It's a line.

(CCLRP0475) ProALT-162

The Central Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Alternatives Analysis dated April 6, 2006 is an impressive body of information and covers many aspects of the proposed project. However, it is flawed because one alternative was not analyzed, the alternative of greatly improved bus service without busway. This alternative would have potentially greater capacity and ridership than LRT or BRT without the negative environmental, neighborhood, business, and mobility impacts of LRT.

(CCLRP0940) ProALT-174

I think the best alternative of the three (rapid bus, LRT, and improving the existing system) is to improve the existing bus service.

(CCLRP0473) ProALT-266

For those who insist a connection between the downtowns be done, I suggest that the express bus service be improved with more buses and frequency of travel, not eliminated as the environmental impact plans intend.

(CCLRP0475) ProALT-295

The alternative of greatly improved bus service was not analyzed and needs to be because it would have more positive impact and less negative impact than light rail transit.

(CCLRP0163) ProALT-360

The bus would stop at your corner, not a half mile away.

(CCLRP0236) ProALT-431

Looking over the Draft EIS, it looks to me like the bus rapid transit line proposed in the same area might be better despite being not as quick as the proposed light rail line. Bus service along University (routes 16 and 50) is adequate as is and ideally I think no changes need to be made. In fact, I think the plan that is chosen (BRT or light rail) shouldn't completely replace current bus service.

(CCLRP0021) ProALT-455

(5) Why spend this huge amount of Money when a small amount is only needed to revamp the bus system?

(CCLRP0021) ProALT-504

(1) I'm totally against light rail, but do favor improved bus system with very little additional cost. Even color code buses for different routes.

(CCLRP0143) ProALT-569

I believe more or bigger buses are needed for University Avenue.

(CCLRP0287) ProALT-629

Better yet, you could accomplish the same desired results by using express buses or (if you want to be ecological or need some earmarked funds somewhere), go with trolley buses.

This has the advantage of not needing expensive special tracks to keep in adjustment - just fix the potholes like what is done on a regular road!

(CCLRP0225) ProALT-633

Light rail is a fad and not needed in this area. Clearly, some people are making a lot of money and these people have ties to politicians. I'd suggest enhancing our bus system. Thanks.

Response ProALT-006. Improved bus service was analyzed in the AA/DEIS under the Baseline Alternative. This alternative served as a basis for comparison to the build alternatives as part of the FTA's New Starts Process. It is also designed to do the "best that can be done" to improve transit service in the Central Corridor LRT Study Area without a major capital investment. Low capital cost infrastructure and bus transit improvements for the Central Corridor included bus operations, intelligent transportation systems (ITS) techniques, travel demand management (TDM), and other system improvements. Bus operation strategies that build upon existing transit services and facilities provide connectivity within the Central Corridor LRT Study Area. ITS uses the latest technology for more effectively managing transportation systems. After publication of the AA/DEIS and completion of the public hearings, the Metropolitan Council adopted the AA/DEIS LPA for the Central Corridor as LRT on University and Washington Avenues. LRT was selected as the Preferred Alternative because it best meets the purpose and need of the project described in Chapter 1 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProALT-029. Favors buses to LRT (11)

Comments:

(CCLRP0878) PlaTE-32

Light rail will also not speed those who want to go strictly from Point A to Point B. In fact, light rail will actually be slower than some of the current bus schedules.

(CCLRP0906) ProALT-179

One is the bus has the advantage of curbside service which the rail would not have or the streetcars did not have

(CCLRP0075) ProALT-214

As someone who lives 1 block from University Avenue, I am quite happy with the current bus service along this route. Stops are close together so you never have to walk very far to catch a bus, and the buses run so frequently that you never really have to check a schedule - you can just wander out to a stop, wait 5 to 10 minutes, and a bus is bound to come along.

(CCLRP0259) ProALT-256

I'm writing in favor of buses over light rail on University Avenue. Hiawatha Avenue is, I'm sure you know, an essentially empty through-road. Light rail moves quickly, as does auto traffic. Businesses are widely spaced; residences are a block or more to the west or east.

(CCLRP0115) ProALT-286

2. Money could be better spent on buses local transportation. Replace bus to 280 Rauox.

(CCLRP0025) ProALT-331

2. Are there any other alternatives to this route or other transportation means such as increase bus lines?

(CCLRP0911) ProALT-334

I saw an article in the paper that Mayor Rybak was very surprised to learn that the current express bus ride is faster than the projected ride on the LRT between the Twin Cities. What then is the romance with LRT?

(CCLRP0180) ProALT-546

Our current bus system would better serve the community and environment if they are built in a more environment, energy and sound efficient manner. In regard to our stops and for the benefit of our riders, I would like to see climate controlled bus shelters.

(CCLRP0406) ProALT-554

Expanded bus service, without LRT or BRT (the 'Baseline' Alternative) has such minimal capacity that it cannot possibly meet the projected transit demands over the next 20 years. Projections of ridership in 2025 show that even articulated buses could not carry all of the demand.

(CCLRP0038) ProALT-555

If the Regional Rail Authority was really concerned about transit, it would expand the bus system regionally so congestion on freeways would be drastically reduced. This single LRT line will cost most than doubling the metro transit bus service. This is an outrageous waste of scarce transit dollars - a true pork barrel project. Why not have electric buses or trolleys on University Ave? There would be little disruption of businesses and neighborhoods, no added congestion, no loss of parking and 1/5th of the cost of LRT. If this is really about transit, bus improvement is the way to go.

(CCLRP0035) ProPURP-037

The 16 and 50 buses are doing fine.

Response ProALT-029. Among the alternatives considered during the AA/DEIS was a No-Build Alternative, in which the existing bus system would remain in its current operating capacity; and a Baseline Alternative which is designed to do the "best that can be done" to improve transit service in the Central Corridor LRT Study Area without a major capital investment. Chapter 2 of the FEIS, "Alternatives Considered," describes the alternatives considered and eliminated leading to the selection of light rail transit as the Preferred Alternative.

Issue Summary ProALT-033. Favors BRT to LRT (11)

Comments:

(CCLRP0911) ProALT-054

I'm not opposed to rapid transit, but BRT can service the needs better, cheaper, and with less environmental impact than LRT. What I really would wish is that the difference in price between LRT and BRT could be used for the real needs of the people: Affordable housing, health care, and education; the basics of life.

(CCLRP0273) ProALT-095

You see, if you don't say the bad word BUS you could actually take a brutally honest look at the two reasons why BRT isn't a better technological, economic development and political solution than LRT - and then seriously look at the half billion reasons why Advanced BRT is in fact the only solution that is the most technologically advanced and the best economic development tool that will serve all the people from all the spectrums. The two reasons why BRT is not viable: 1) the overriding perception (and mostly true) of traditional buses is that they awfully, uncomfortable, diesel belching, smelly and uncool, especially for white collar professionals to ride in the inner city. 2) As noted above there is no political leadership that will look beyond the current technology in vogue, a technology which is paying the most lobbying dollars and costs the most for short term job creation. The half billion reasons why Advanced BRT is viable: 1) If you had rubber tired vehicles that actually looked exactly like, and functioned exactly like the cool LRT vehicles (which any major bus manufacturer can design as you want in a year) 2) Then if you have multiple vehicles in automated guide mode along sleek lanes and stations exactly like LRT (and a whole lot more stations with pass lanes around or over to keep system vehicles moving efficiently) which is current technology - 3) And then you add to this that these vehicles that can go on and off the system - 4) Then you

have "Advanced" BRT, which goes beyond other functionality can exceed any f-LRT. And it is available with a call and order to any bus manufacturer for a half billion less, ant. twice the overall system efficiency. Then you could use that half billion to build housing and start thousands of businesses along the line. 5) An Advanced BRT system will lead to an easy expansion of the open loop, (vehicles on and off) mass transit vehicle system.

(CCLRP0911) ProALT-193

I'm disturbed that this project like so many others has a huge price tag. Many people stand to make money from it yet the project did not arise from the people who are most impacted. At a meeting I went to sponsored by Transit for Livable Communities there was little information on Bus Rapid Transit which has a much smaller price tag and thus impacts the environment much less.

(CCLRP0097) ProALT-194

I would prefer the Bus Rapid Transit alternative.

(CCLRP0236) ProALT-283

To summarize, I am in favor of the less expensive bus rapid transit plan as opposed to the light rail. This is based on the perceived effects on traffic and local business.

(CCLRP0003) ProALT-344

And, finally, to restate, a rapid transit bus service would make more sense for the community along University Ave. Light Rail down I-94.

(CCLRP0472) ProALT-436

If a merely stop-gap measure is desired, the obvious choice is Bus Rapid Transit mode, much cheaper and less destructive and problematical than LRT at grade on University.

(CCLRP0192) ProALT-536

Other suggestions: 1. Use the 94 corridor. Whether on Concordia, or St. Anthony, or in the middle of the interstate, it will be much less of an inconvenience to all the patrons of all the businesses along University. Turn the train into an express that connects with all the buses. 2. Use an elevated rail. Realize the El in Chicago does not impede traffic at all. It's a railroad. Making traffic stop for a train is crazy. I was so glad I wasn't doing anything in Minneapolis when I heard what you did to them with the light rail. Please don't repeat the same mistake. Also, plan ahead, 20 or more years, not simply using traffic patterns right now.

(CCLRP0343) ProALT-576

I'm also concerned that customers & employees riding LRT rather than BRT would have longer to walk because of the increased distance between drop off points. Currently the bus drops off and picks up at either Transfer Road or Vandalia Street, within 1/2 block of our restaurant. The closest proposed stop for LRT is at Raymond Avenue, 5 blocks away. In the dead of winter, this makes a big difference. For this reason, I would not want to see Bus Rapid Transit be REPLACED by Light Rail Transit.

(CCLRP0020) ProALT-615

A voice for busway on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0287) ProPURP-013

For some reason there is a mindset that we 'need' light rail and since there is probably federal ear-marked money for it, someone locally in government thinks it is a 'bright idea' to implement it. Of course, as usual, no one let's "We, The People" actually vote on whether we want it or not (and are willing to pay for it or not). Trolley buses would work just as well, and be just as friendly to the environment and would not need expensive track installation and upkeep.

Response ProALT-033. Two build alternatives were selected for evaluation in the AA/DEIS in addition to a Baseline Alternative. The build alternatives included: University Avenue LRT and University Avenue BRT. After publication of the AA/DEIS and completion of the public hearings, the Metropolitan Council adopted the AA/DEIS LPA for the Central Corridor as LRT on University and Washington Avenues. LRT was selected as the Preferred Alternative because it best meets the purpose and need of the project described in Chapter 1 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProALT-036. Analysis of BRT (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0302) ProALT-001

Last, the DEIS acknowledges that there is a scarcity of research on the difference between the development potential Of BRT in contrast to the well-established effect of LRT. DEIS at 5-10. However, the DEIS then assumes that BRT's potential is the same as LRT for the portion of its route that runs on an exclusive right of way. Without evidence that this assumption is based on the realities of existing BRT routes, it would be more reasonable to assume that the development potential of BRT reflects the difference in ridership realities between BRT and LRT and to discount at least half the development potential of BRT.

Response ProALT-036. Comment noted. LRT was selected as the Preferred Alternative at the conclusion of the AA/DEIS process so that a rigorous analysis of decreased development potential of BRT relative to LRT in either the SDEIS or the FEIS was not warranted.

Issue Summary ProALT-037. BRT and LRT Capacity analysis (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0130) ProALT-048

Third, why does the DEIS continually refer to a "capacity" problem with the baseline and BRT alternatives. There is no realistic reason to believe this would happen with either alternative. The only current bus congestion occurs on local routes (such as the 16) in high-demand locations such as the U of M, and is generally only a minor issue. Moreover, the kinds of changes envisioned in the BRT alternative (reduced local service and off-board fare collection) would make capacity and congestion a non-issue. Recent empirical studies of bus lane capacity, including facilities such as those being contemplated for BRT, show an ability

to carry volumes of 70 to 150 vehicles per hour per lane, providing enough capacity to meet the projected demand of 2,650 passengers per hour per direction, even with standard 40 ft. vehicles. Even if this optimistic forecast proved true, it would not be difficult to sidestep capacity issues by raising peak fares to spread out demand or by improving parallel alternatives (local or express bus service). Ironically, such steps would become necessary if the LRT option were chosen, since at maximum capacity (2 car trains with 160 passengers per car-implying "crush" loads on every trip) LRT would not be able to handle the forecast traffic volumes.

Response ProALT-037. LRT was selected as the Preferred Alternative at the conclusion of the AA/DEIS process as the alternative that best met the Central Corridor project purpose and need. This process included looking at forecast transit ridership and future passenger demand.

Issue Summary ProALT-038. [Advantages of Bus over LRT](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0475) ProALT-141

Technological advantage of bus over LRT: maneuverability. The bus is far more maneuverable than LRT. LRT must travel primarily in straight lines on level ground. It cannot turn at street corners like a bus can. One LRT vehicle cannot pass another, the way one bus can pass another bus. An LRT vehicle cannot swerve to avoid hitting cars, bicycles, or pedestrians. The maneuverability of the bus enables it to offer greater convenience and greater speed than LRT, with less negative environmental impact and with greater ability to adapt to future travel patterns and demand. There is a mistaken notion that LRT runs faster than the bus. That illusion is created by giving LRT 2 dedicated lanes, fewer stops, signal pre-emption, and HONOR SYSTEM fare payment. On University Avenue, LRT will have the same top speed as the bus 35 mph and it is a much heavier vehicle meaning it will be slower to stop and start. So the proposed LRT will have about the same travel time as the bus Route 50, and slower travel time than bus Route 94 which runs on the freeway with top speed of 55 mph and fewer stops than LRT.

Response ProALT-038. Comment noted. At the conclusion of the AA/DEIS the locally preferred alternative (LPA) for the project was adopted by the Metropolitan Council in June 2006, because it was found to be the alternative that best met project purpose and need, including the ability to meet future forecast traffic demand based on acceptable forecasting methodology.

Issue Summary ProALT-039. [Concerns in regard to consideration of BRT](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0482) ProALT-437

2) True improvements in bus service were never considered honestly Los Angeles has implemented what they call Metro Rapid routes, on streets like Wilshire Boulevard. They are limited stop routes with many of the same technology advantages as the Hiawatha LRT. Other cities are adopting this idea. This was never presented to the public as ever being

considered. They never compared BRT with a tunnel under the University and LRT with a tunnel under the U. They never compared BRT without a tunnel and LRT without a tunnel. The BRT route was considerably longer than the LRT route, making it seem like a slower option. The BRT option was not studied with dedicated lanes in downtown Saint Paul, while the LRT had dedicated lanes as well as some closed streets. These differences make the statements about limitations on future BRT ridership growth compared with LRT ridership growth nonsensical.

Response ProALT-039. The AA/DEIS did presume that dedicated lanes for the BRT alternative would not be possible in downtown St. Paul due to the relatively narrower street width in that location. In addition, it would not be able to meet capacity requirements. At the conclusion of the AA/DEIS the locally preferred alternative (LPA) for the project was adopted by the Metropolitan Council in June 2006, because it was found to be the alternative that best met project purpose and need, including the ability to meet future forecast traffic demand based on acceptable forecasting methodology.

Issue Summary ProALT-040. [Concerns in regard to analysis of baseline alternative](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0130) ProALT-478

I'm concerned with the selection process that has led to an apparently strong preference for light rail as the technological alternative for Central Corridor improvements. All official documents and publications relating to the DEIS study process seem to give the impression that LRT is the only feasible alternative. This is clearly not the case. First, why is the baseline alternative being systematically eliminated? The TSM alternative was merged with the no-build alternative, presumably to kill two birds with one stone. The poorly-designed baseline alternative offers riders nothing comparable to the other two "build" alternatives, thus making any comparisons among them useless. An improved bus alternative, including midday and evening limited-stop service on University Ave., would represent a major improvement in Central Corridor service and fill an important niche market. Currently, midday (and evening) travelers wishing to reach destinations along the Central Corridor must use the slow and unappealing Route 16 local bus in order to reach their destination. Clearly something can be done. An additional option to consider is direct road pricing on I-94, which would greatly reduce current congestion levels. Second, most of the alternatives analysis appears to be based on completely unrealistic forecasts. DEIS summary documents claim that trip times on the existing Route 16 will increase to 73 minutes by the year 2020, an astounding increase of 15 minutes per trip. There are many reasons this won't happen, but here are a couple: For one thing, traffic on University Ave. is not really that bad. Even during peak periods, trip speeds do not decline markedly. Furthermore, if they did, travelers would seek out alternative routes or departure times in order to avoid such conditions. Also, households and firms could relocate in order to escape such conditions. Existing travel demand models do not capture these types of effects, and so miss the mark badly when producing long-rang forecasts. Also, the DEIS Forecasts a 31 percent increase in employment in Minneapolis by 2020, an increase of roughly 42,000 to 45,000 jobs. This would be quite a feat for a city that is mostly built out already. Rising land prices in the downtown area will likely act as a check on future employment growth.

Response ProALT-040. During preliminary engineering, the Baseline Alternative was changed based on AA/DEIS comments received and based on input received from FTA. These changes were discussed in the SDEIS and are also summarized in the FEIS. Additionally, the SDEIS did separately analyze the No Build from the Baseline Alternative -- these two alternatives were merged in the AA/DEIS with approval from the FTA.

Issue Summary ProALT-041. Concerns in regard to travel time analysis (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0475) ProALT-526

The illusion that LRT is faster comes partly because of the honor system of payment used on LRT lines. Route 50 travel time should be modeled using honor system of payment to see how much this technique would improve travel time.

Response ProALT-041. The AA/DEIS BRT Alternative included an honor system of payment identical to that considered in the AA/DEIS LRT Alternative. This type of payment system presumes the construction of station platforms including ticket vending machines. The Baseline Alternative, which included enhanced Route 50 service, was developed to provide the best transit service possible without a major capital investment and as such did not include construction of station platforms or the installation of ticket vending machines.

Issue Summary ProALT-042. Favors buses with modified payment options over LRT (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0078) ProALT-586

Expense. The same objective could be met by express buses during rush hours. If all riders were in areas where ALL PREPAID and there was no parking in bus lanes. A fraction of cost of light rail. Done in South America.

Response ProALT-042. Using an honor system of payment for express buses would require installation of ticket vending machines at all express bus stops. This capital investment was not contemplated for the AA/DEIS Baseline Alternative, although it was part of the AA/DEIS BRT Alternative.

Issue Summary ProALT-043. Concerns in regard to analysis of improved bus system (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0776) ProALT-606

The other thing is the Central Corridor Committee asked for special dispensation from the FTA to not have to analyze an improved bus alternative. Despite the exhaustive and detailed very technical work, the document is seriously flawed because the improved bus alternative, which I think is the Transportation System Management, was not even looked at.

Response ProALT-043. Comment noted. The AA/DEIS did analyze a Baseline Alternative, which was defined as the best possible future transit service that could be provided without a major investment in capital infrastructure. There was an agreement between Ramsey County, the project sponsor for the AA/DEIS, and the FTA to combine the No Build and Baseline Alternative. For the SDEIS, these alternatives were analyzed separately.

Issue Summary ProALT-044. [Favors improved baseline alternative](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0130) ProALT-627

In summary, the choice set of alternatives for the Central Corridor needs to be redesigned to provide for low-cost, better-designed alternatives to be compared to the two build options. Major capital investments in this corridor along identified alignment will be costly and disruptive, both during and after construction. I urge reconsideration of an improved baseline alternative that offers services of comparable speed, frequency, and

quality to the two build options under consideration. Only then can a meaningful comparison and choice be made.

Response ProALT-044. Changes were made to the Baseline Alternative, in response to comments received from the FTA and as part of the formal agreement with the FTA for the Central Corridor LRT project to enter preliminary engineering. These changes were summarized in Chapter 2 of the SDEIS and are also described in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProALT-046. [Buses achieve the best coverage area and frequency of service](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0642) ProALT-244

Within Objective 3A, LRT is graded highest for capacity, operating cost, and efficiency, but information on pages 6-11, 12, 26, and 27, show clearly that the capacity of University Avenue will be diminished, not improved, relative to existing and Baseline scenarios and that Central Corridor O and M costs will be highest for LRT and lowest for the Baseline alternative, even though the estimate assigns a disproportionate share of system-wide costs to University Avenue bus service. High efficiency for LRT is invalidly determined by counting all the seats carried relative to expenditure rather than all the actual passengers carried relative to expenditure. Contrary to claims in the DEIS, the APTA and FTA figures on cost per passenger mile show LRT to be the most expensive transit option, rather than the least. And somehow, the LRT within a fixed guideway is better at achieving regional and intermodal connectivity than buses - which obviously can be routed least expensively to achieve greater coverage and frequency of service.

Response ProALT-046. The information on pages 6-11 and 6-12 of the AA/DEIS show that there is a decrease in level of service at some intersections along the corridor, not a decrease in capacity. Page 6-28 of the AA/DEIS notes that "it should be noted that the...BRT Alternative is severely constrained because of the inability to expand service beyond a

6-minute frequency and still provide a high quality service". Estimates of ridership for the various modes were developed from the Metropolitan Council 2030 Regional Travel Demand Model, using a methodology that was approved by the Federal Transit Administration. These estimates were updated during preliminary engineering and are discussed in Chapter 6 of the FEIS. LRT was chosen as the Preferred Alternative because it best meets the purpose and need of the project. See Chapter 1 of the FEIS for further details.

Issue Summary ProPM-007. Favors increasing bus system capacity over LRT (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0475) ProPM-016

p. S-10 LRT does not provide improved mobility. It merely replaces ONE SINGLE BUS ROUTE - Route 50 with an alternative so difficult to route that 12 buildings have to be demolished for it, 11 total parcels of property will be taken, and 114 partial takes of parcels. LRT does not increase mobility because it does not have mobility itself. It is so costly that we could have nearly tripled the Twin Cities bus system for the cost of one LRT line. It provides about the same in-vehicle travel time as the bus route. I looked at the schedule. Also see attachment, Star Tribune article on Central Corridor LRT and bus travel time.

Response ProPM-007. Benefits and impacts of the project are documented in many sections of the AA/DEIS, the SDEIS, and the FEIS, and include increased access to the neighborhoods brought by transit improvements in the University Avenue corridor. The current ridership projection is 42,170 average weekday boardings in 2030. Meeting federal cost effectiveness criteria was an essential part of entering into preliminary engineering and will be an essential criterion for entering into final design. Current estimates of travel time between the central business districts of the two downtowns will be 39.13 minutes, and between St. Paul's Union Depot and Northstar Commuter Rail Multi-modal Station in downtown Minneapolis will be about 40 minutes.

Section: 2.3 - Alignment

Issue Summary PlaTP-013. Concerns in regard to alignment relative to Capitol and U of M (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0184) PlaTP-015

2. Alignment - Capital complex - Light rail service must be fast and frequent. This suggests an alignment that is as direct as possible, unlike the job to the east in the proposed alignment exiting downtown St. Paul. A better alignment would leave downtown St. Paul on Cedar, Wabasha, or St. Peter, loop in front of the Capitol following the old streetcar alignment and then cut diagonally across the block between Park and Rice Streets just south of University Avenue. A station serving the Capital complex could be located in that block, free of car traffic. An alternative would take the alignment closer to the Sears building which would improve the prospects for future TOD at that site. 3. Alignment - Washington Avenue - The U of M would benefit tremendously if Washington Avenue became a bike, ped, and transit

friendly mall with light rail on the surface. If automobile traffic is sufficiently important, MnDOT could build a tunnel for through traffic assuring drivers of faster travel times through that corridor.

(CCLRP0825) ProHLP-068

But another thing I'm concerned about is the Capitol because when they put in 94 they should have put it in back of the Capitol because Downtown St. Paul is an island between the Mississippi River and the Capitol and by putting some rails on this side you might make another piece out of the Capitol. Instead of being an island it will be a bunch of little islands and that's a serious thing to think about when you're making this plan.

Response PlaTP-013. Alternative alignments for LRT and Busway/BRT through the U of M, State Capitol, and downtown St. Paul were suggested during scoping. Project partners including the U of M, St. Paul's Capitol Area Architectural and Planning Board (CAAPB), and the City of St. Paul advocated minor changes in the alignment or affirmed their preference for specific alignments. Additional analysis was undertaken to satisfy concerns and to respond to comments received. Through the scoping process, alignments and alternatives that were not prudent or reasonable and did not satisfy requirements of the purpose and need were not carried forward for additional analysis in the AA/DEIS. Scoping results are included in the Scoping Summary Report (December 7, 2001). Two build alternatives were selected for evaluation in the AA/DEIS in addition to a Baseline Alternative. The build alternatives included: University Avenue LRT and University Avenue BRT. The SDEIS evaluated engineering modifications to the alignment along University Avenue and Robert Street directly adjacent to the Capitol Area. Evaluation of these modifications to the AA/DEIS LPA was necessary to accommodate several new Capitol Area structures and grade constraints along University Avenue. The station at Rice Street has been modified to respond to roadway geometry and concerns about access and optimized bus connections. The SDEIS evaluated an at-grade LRT alignment on Washington Avenue running from the Washington Avenue Bridge to Oak Street, which would function as a transit mall. This alternative would change the operation of this segment by excluding automobile traffic. Enhancements would be made to pedestrian and other transit facilities operating in this segment. Emergency vehicle access would be maintained. The Stadium Village Station would be located at the proposed U of M multi-modal center. The East Bank Station would be located on Washington Avenue at Union Street.

Issue Summary PlaTP-031. [Suggest changes in downtown St. Paul alignment](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) ProHLP-019

To 2-8, Figure 2.3-2 and Figure 5-2-18, add consideration of using a downtown routing on Cedar to Kellogg Plaza, following 2nd Street alignment to existing tracks over Sibley and Jackson and directly on to the train platform. There are two mutually exclusive station locations/route alternatives in downtown: Cutting diagonally through the Athletic Club Block, or extending the line down Cedar to Kellogg Plaza, and then turning east down 2nd Street, and eventually onto the platform of the Union Depot. The first alternative has the potential for consolidation of two downtown stations at 6th & Cedar and at 4th & Robert on

to the Athletic Club block (bounded by 5th, Cedar, 4th and Minnesota Streets)... The second alternative uses the 2nd Street alignment, merging with the existing tracks over Sibley and Jackson, and proceeding directly on to the Union Depot train platform. ... Both alternatives should be studied in Preliminary Engineering.

Response PlaTP-031. The SDEIS evaluated using the Athletic Club block (see Chapter 2 and Figure 2-8), and the 2nd Street option was studied in early preliminary engineering. The 2nd Street option was dismissed because it is not cost effective.

Issue Summary PlaTP-054. Downtown St. Paul route should be over the Robert St. Bridge (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0048) PlaTP-219

I am concerned, however, with the LRT alignment in Downtown St. Paul. I believe the alignment overlooks the long-term option to extend a 2-mile segment over the Robert St. Bridge would be much more feasible. Also, by remaining on Robert Street, the alignment would be more direct through downtown, and therefore faster. The circuitous option outlined in the DEIS will increase travel time for thousands of riders, and will increase "wear-and-tear" maintenance costs due the two additional tight turns (as well as the accompanying "wheel-squeal"). For these reasons, the Downtown St. Paul alignment is not the best option. Please take these thoughts into consideration and reconsider a more-direct route through downtown. The alignment selected will be the one we will have to live with for a very long time. Please do not do this disservice to St. Paul. Thank you.

(CCLRP0714) ProHLP-053

Our concerns are so great that our preference is that the downtown route be established east or west of Cedar Street.

Response PlaTP-054. The planned route for the line on Cedar Street in downtown St. Paul was first selected in the mid-1980s. After six alternatives were evaluated, it was reaffirmed by multiple public bodies in the 1990s, 2002, 2006 and 2008. The City of St. Paul, Ramsey County, the Metropolitan Council and the St. Paul business community all agree this is the best route. It provides transit service along a street in the heart of downtown that has the highest ridership potential, has a wide bridge crossing over I-94, and that carries less traffic than alternatives such as Minnesota, Wabasha, Robert or Jackson streets. The right angle turn was eliminated with introduction of a diagonal crossing at 4th and Cedar Streets. The Preferred Alternative meets the purpose and need most efficiently and minimizes project impacts.

Issue Summary PlaTP-077. Connection of LRT to Union Depot (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) PlaTP-055

Beginning on p6-37 is a discussion of railroad facilities. As might be expected in Saint Paul, there is minimal impact of LRT on railroads. The only area of note is the potential

connection of LRT directly to the rail platform at Union Depot. The design will be detailed during Preliminary Engineering.

(CCLRP0753) ProALT-439

I also believe that instead of the Union Depot being the last stop I think Kellogg should be the last stop right where that park-and-ride is because it would open the corridor up for possible extension east.

Response PlaTP-077. The Central Corridor Project Office worked closely with Ramsey County Regional Railroad during preliminary engineering to accommodate a potential future connection of LRT to Union Depot concourse and associated multi-modal connections planned by the County, as noted in this comment. The Preferred Alternative does provide for the future ability to serve the Union Depot concourse with commuter rail operations that will not conflict with LRT operations.

Issue Summary PlaTP-117. [Avoid the right angle turns to increase train speed](#) (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0067) PlaTP-144

The right angle turns planned in downtown St. Paul should be reworked and avoided if at all possible. They just slow things down too much. What's the point of riding the train if it isn't fast?

(CCLRP0154) PlaTP-162

To reduce both noise and travel time, the route should be as straight as possible. The current proposal with four 90-degree turning movements in downtown St. Paul is overly circuitous.

Response PlaTP-117. The AA/DEIS and SDEIS examined numerous alignment options discussed in Chapter 2 of both documents. The Preferred Alternative includes an alignment that meets the purpose and need most efficiently and minimizes project impacts. The right angle turn at 4th and Cedar Streets was eliminated with introduction of a diagonal crossing.

Issue Summary PlaTP-118. [Increase ridership by avoiding residential neighborhoods](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0643) PlaTP-146

More people will Ride the rail if it didn't go through the neighborhoods.

Response PlaTP-118. In order to provide adequate access, the LRT alignment is usually taken through areas where population and employment are densely concentrated.

Issue Summary ProALT-021. [LRT alignment and selection issues](#) (7)

Comments:

(CCLRP0734) NR-12

I definitely support the Central Corridor light rail line down University Avenue BUT ONLY IF it includes a station at Prior Avenue in St. Paul.

(CCLRP0178) ProALT-031

2. Transit Connectors - Cross-street transfers/circulators/shuttles/concurrent bus transit service.

E. The system should connect at or near Union Depot in downtown St. Paul as the link to the planned intermodal transit hub for East Metro.

(CCLRP0754) ProALT-247

First of all, failure of BRT to respond to the transportation needs after 2020 in my opinion is unacceptable. We need to have a long-term planning horizon here as they did when they built the interstate highway systems. Their plan was a 50-year life span and any major transportation system should have at least a 50-year span as well.

(CCLRP0167) ProALT-278

The reopening and \$50 million renovation of the union Depot would help make St. Paul a center of rail traffic for the East Metro region.

(CCLRP0003) ProALT-498

To start, I think St. Paul does need a dedicated transit line to downtown Minneapolis. I'm not sure light rail down the center of University Avenue is the answer.

(CCLRP0630) ProALT-630

Maybe have two lines one to Union depot and one to Xcel also in Mpls to Convention Ctr and WH district. IN Mpls run to CONVENTION CENTER

(CCLRP0195) ProPOL-25

I sincerely hope that any LRT or Bus Transit will bypass University Avenue S.E., between Bedford & the East Bank U campus. The transit line could swing north just after it crosses 280, such as on Berry Street, run parallel to, on, or near the U of M. Transitway and cuts down to the U of M East Bank campus around 27th or 25th Avenue S.E.

Response ProALT-021. The AA/DEIS and SDEIS examined numerous alignment options that are discussed in Chapter 2 of both documents. The adopted Preferred Alternative includes an alignment that meets the purpose and need most efficiently and minimizes project impacts. As shown on Figure 2-1 of the FEIS, the Preferred Alternative is an at-grade light rail transit line that is 11 miles in length, of which 9.8 miles consists of new alignment and 1.2 miles use the existing Hiawatha LRT alignment in downtown Minneapolis. The current design of the Preferred Alternative is discussed in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProHLP-009. Not in favor of proposed alignment (30)

Comments:

(CCLRP0005) ProALT-250

The light rail could be put in another place.

(CCLRP0825) ProALT-336

I think that light rail should be on rail, not on University Avenue. If there's any train tracks someplace, I think that's better.

(CCLRP0918) ProALT-638

I really think this is a mistake. I made that comment that I think we should be looking at a larger -- much, much larger regional transit light rail transit system I'm talking about a line that would go, let's say, from Hastings down to Rochester, to St. Cloud, from Belle Plaine up to Hinckley. We have to really do it up right. We have to be looking at a larger metro -- not metro-wide, region-wide system.

(CCLRP0540) ProHLP-003

We believe there are other routings that should be considered that would have a minimal impact on District Energy. Routing LRT down Minnesota Street instead of Cedar would significantly reduce the conflicts with District Energy's systems. Likewise, shifting the routing from Fourth Street to Fifth, Kellogg or Second Street, would also significantly reduce the impact to the distribution systems.

(CCLRP0525) ProHLP-005

Alternative Routings: We believe there are other routings that should be considered that would minimize the impact on District Energy and its customers. Routing LRT on Minnesota or Wabasha instead of Cedar would significantly reduce the conflicts with District Energy's systems. Likewise, shifting the routing from Fourth Street to Fifth, Kellogg or Second Street, too would significantly reduce the impact to our systems. Another routing from the Capitol Complex to Union Depot that would eliminate nearly all of the conflicts with our systems is a Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr Blvd, John Ireland Blvd, and Kellogg Blvd routing. Reconsidering a Fourth Street routing also makes sense given the development of a multimodal transportation facility at Union Depot.

(CCLRP0551) ProHLP-006

Likewise shifting the routing from Fourth Street to Fifth, Kellogg, or Second Street, would also significantly reduce the impact to the distribution systems.

(CCLRP0038) ProHLP-008

It seems to us that this LRT line is not about transit but about encouraging big business development along the line. If this was not the case, this LRT line would have been built on the existing tracks north or south of University or along the I94 corridor like it was planned in 1991. Actually seeing a train whizzing by the side of the freeway would encourage more motorists to take light rail rather than using the freeway during rush hour.

(CCLRP0471) ProHLP-009

Put LRT along the I-94 service drives where it will cause the least disruption to our businesses and lives. Otherwise, don't build it at all. We can live without the higher taxes, increased traffic congestion near stations, increased noise, and decreased bus service that LRT would bring to University Avenue and nearby blocks.

(CCLRP0154) ProHLP-013

A Jackson Street alignment, with a one-block walk to the Union Depot, would have just one turning movement at University Avenue and that would be obtuse. The same would apply to a Robert Street alignment, although a two-block walk to the Union Depot would be necessary.

(CCLRP0271) ProHLP-014

An LRT alignment, utilizing the existing section of Central Corridor transitway, could be built with less expense, less disruption, and in less time than the proposed alignment University and Washington Avenues. And, LRT in the corridor north of University Avenue would move much faster than the proposed 45-minute, 11-mile trip down University and Washington Avenues.

(CCLRP0922) ProHLP-017

Take it to Pierce Butler. I'm not against it. Elevate it. Take it down Summit Avenue. My land, babies, take it down 94. That was already displacement. Spend some extra money and put it down there. Then it does not inconvenience anybody.

(CCLRP0549) ProHLP-031

If required in order to meet the Cost-Effectiveness Index requirements, we would favor one or more of the following trade-offs: b. Reduce travel time by straightening the alignment of the line in downtown Saint Paul or keeping the train on University Avenue in Minneapolis between 29th Avenue SE and Washington Avenue.

(CCLRP0480) ProHLP-033

In this document, I describe my suggestion in words, which will only make sense to one quite familiar with the area in question. Thus I refer you to <http://www.rrts.us/rail> for a graphic depiction of the proposed alternate route. In words, however: I suggest that the Central Corridor LRT split off from the Hiawatha line at the Metrodome station, as per the DEIS proposal. However, it should then turn northward to parallel Chicago Ave, passing through what are now parking lots. At the parking lot of the new Guthrie Theater (perhaps a location for another station), it turns east and follows an abandoned rail bed, which has not yet been built over, and passes under existing bridges for 35W and Cedar Ave. There it turns slightly southward, then north again to cross the river on the old Bridge #9, which is now a pedestrian bridge. This brings it to the East Bank Here it can either immediately join University Avenue, if that is indeed where the Saint Paul segment is decided to run, or it can turn east again and continue to follow a very wide rail corridor (only two lines of which seem active, the rest used by U of M shop employees to drive their trucks, and again, bridges are already

all built over it) around the north end of campus. Staying at the south side of the rail corridor, it avoids the large railroad switchyard on the north end of campus, and turns southeast to join the U of M transit way. From this point it follows the existing LRT plan.

(CCLRP0428) ProHLP-056

7) Although stakeholder meetings are referred to as assisting in the development of the alternate routings in St. Paul, it is not clear from the DEIS, why Alternative route 5, Section 2, Figure 2.2-4, was abandoned. Since it appears to better serve this community and accomplish the purported goals of the project (e.g. more directly serving the new Xcc1 Center Arena, Minnesota Science Museum, RiverCenter Convention Hall, and the stated largest transit ridership origin/destination, Regions Hospital), without some of the proposed route noise and congestion issues, it would be appropriate for the FEIS to provide the public with an explanation of what factors from stakeholder meetings and other considerations led to or favor the Locally Preferred Alternative decision.

(CCLRP0938) ProHLP-059

Well then put it on Summit Avenue or Grand. Put it in another area. There is Minnehaha, there are streets all over.

(CCLRP0470) ProHLP-063

At the I-94/Snelling intersection, the line can be routed directly into the Midway Shopping Centers, offering a chance for a world-class transit hub at the site of the former bus barn. If LRT is meant to spark development, this site has the most potential to become a major destination for shopping and entertainment. At the same time, the residents who live north of University Avenue will be able to easily access this development because there won't be an LRT barrier in the middle of University. There is room to accommodate lots of parking in the development, which will take the pressure off neighborhood streets to provide commuter parking.

(CCLRP0809) ProHLP-067

The speed of delivering passengers from Downtown Minneapolis to the University, to the Midway, or to the final destination, Downtown St. Paul, could be done...in less than half that time if you had exclusive right-of-way along the Burlington Northern routes and had those four principal stops: Midway, University, and Downtown Minneapolis and St. Paul.

(CCLRP0914) ProHLP-073

If they want light rail really look at Transfer Road, coming up University to Transfer Road which is Amtrak. Dogleg it north or south to the freeway or to Pierce Butler. You are impacting our community, you are devaluing our community and I think you need to re-look at this and come up with another direction.

(CCLRP0003) ProHLP-075

I think light rail should probably go in along I-94, and be used similarly to the express buses because light rail really is in effect a movement of people from one downtown to the other.

(CCLRP0470) ProHLP-078

I-94 is a major barrier between the two sections of the historic Rondo neighborhood. Business disruption, as well as limiting the free flow of traffic across University, are the main reasons that the Community's preferred alternative, which was chosen by people who actually live in the Corridor, was to put LRT on I-94. While the center median won't work, LRT or BRT can be routed down the I-94 service drives between Marion St. and Prior Ave. and the stations built on widened bridges. Somewhere around Prior Ave., the line can swing north and then onto that portion of University Avenue that doesn't have residences close by.

(CCLRP0823) ProHLP-080

The second recommendation: Corridor alignment. The route of the corridor around the Capitol and into downtown is confusing. The corridor changes to different streets. Many times there are several 90-degree turns, which we understand are more expensive and noisy. Our recommendation is to examine the current alignment and propose sound mitigation measures and infrastructure changes to address our concerns. The city should address how the non-served districts like the river and the entertainment district of downtown will be connected to LRT.

(CCLRP0809) ProHLP-081

First of all, why was the Burlington Northern route rejected? In your Draft Environmental Impact Statement you have one sentence that says, "The Burlington Northern line was rejected." That's all there is in the Environmental Impact Statement. I'm puzzled by that.

(CCLRP0092) ProHLP-083

Leave University Avenue alone.

(CCLRP0930) ProHLP-088

...And then too, to end it at the Depot, a dead-end part of town, is kind of dumb too. It should be closer to where commerce and trade is going on. I realize we are trying to get a little more interest in the lowertown area, but I don't think transit is going to do the job because you are looking for people that are coming in to their jobs,

(CCLRP0874) ProHLP-105

I think the light rail would better serve the University community if it ran up the middle of the freeway, Freeway 94.

(CCLRP0467) ProHLP-112

He would like to see stops at half mile intervals; he thinks the alignment should be straightened out in Downtown Saint Paul, and that it's a mistake to have four turns downtown. Regarding 4th Street and the entertainment district, he feels ridership would be more properly assigned to the Riverview Corridor when that's built. He said he would like to see the routes straightened in Minneapolis between 19th Avenue Southeast and Washington. There is another jog over to the U of M transit-way. He noted in Chapter 6 there is a description of the tunnel with the eastern portal at Oak and Washington which is different from what the map shows. That would save about three or four blocks of tunnel and would be a significant cost savings.

(CCLRP0271) ProHLP-116

At the center of the Central Corridor, where Minneapolis meets St. Paul, University Ave. runs in front of KSTP and a bus shuttle service connecting 2 huge surface parking lots runs behind KSTP, on an already built section of Central Corridor transitway. A major section of Central Corridor transitway, which connects both the Minneapolis and St. Paul U of M campuses, is already built. The DEIS is inadequate because the alternative LRT alignment utilizing the existing section of Central Corridor transitway was never considered.

(CCLRP0866) ProHLP-120

I'm also vice president of the St. Paul branch of the NAACP and one of the things that we've been monitoring at the Legislature is eminent domain. And so what we're concerned about right now, with our project at Pilgrim Baptist Church, we're starting an expansion project. We bought property going up to the corner of St. Albans and we're getting ready to have -- I see the 30 seconds right now. It seems like others have been up here longer than me, but right now we're considering whether or not we should move ahead with this project because as I understand the Central Corridor, this is like a first phase. It comes all the way back to the freeway. And if you come back to the freeway we've got some historic now, this Central Corridor, the lines go back. The line is going down University but the corridor in itself goes to the freeway. Am I correct?

(CCLRP0939) ProHLP-123

I don't understand why the corridor has to be University. It seems like I-94 is where most of the commuter traffic is. Then if it is going to be an alternative to that traffic, then it should be down on I-94.

(CCLRP0406) ProHLP-124

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Council requests that the Ramsey County Regional Rail Authority only include consideration of University Avenue in their study of the Central Corridor and

Response ProHLP-009. During the AA/DEIS, several alignment alternatives were evaluated based on the results of several earlier studies. After publication of the AA/DEIS and completion of the public hearings, the Metropolitan Council adopted the AA/DEIS LPA for the Central Corridor. The AA/DEIS LPA was 11 miles in length, of which 9.8 miles consisted of new alignment and 1.2 miles using the existing Hiawatha LRT alignment in downtown Minneapolis. The AA/DEIS LPA was at-grade along most of the alignment with the exception of a tunnel through the U of M's East Bank. Subsequent to the completion of the AA/DEIS for the Central Corridor LRT Project, several unresolved policy questions and design element options arose which required additional study. These unresolved issues and design changes resulted in the completion of the SDEIS. After the publication of the SDEIS, the Metropolitan Council adopted a Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is defined as LRT operating at-grade on Washington and University Avenues, passing north of the State Capitol and turning south on Robert Street, turning west at 12th Street to Cedar Street, and then continuing south on Cedar Street into downtown St. Paul turning diagonally at 4th Street, and continuing east to end at St. Paul's Union Depot with tail track leading to an operations and maintenance facility farther east (Metropolitan Council Resolution

No. 2008-26). A more detailed description of the Preferred Alternative is included in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PubPI-018. Concerns over how the LRT route was selected (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0899) PubPI-033

One of the things that we would first of all like to understand is why weren't we involved in the discussion early on about a selection of sites?

(CCLRP0063) PubPI-070

It appears that the decision about the Central Corridor light rail to run along University Avenue was made long ago, as evidenced by all the new construction going up along University Avenue. I have no real objection to this decision except to the manner in which it was made. There was very little meaningful public input about the choice of University Avenue over other paths. That said, I am hoping for more meaningful public discussion about the decision to be made now.

Response PubPI-018. The CCPO made every effort to engage the public on even the most highly technical of issues related to project development. A comprehensive plan for public involvement was developed as part of preliminary engineering and is summarized in Chapter 11 of the FEIS. This plan includes outreach to all communities along the corridor and also included hiring Community Outreach Coordinators whose sole responsibility is to interface with residents, business owners and other stakeholders in the process. Presentations on every key issue affecting the Central Corridor were made to the CAC, the BAC and to the public. See Appendix F for a list of all the meetings and presentations that have occurred.

Section: 2.3 - Stops

Issue Summary PlaTE-027. LRT stops and bus service (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0372) PlaTE-16

"The Federation would like light rail to stop at a minimum of six-block increments and that bus service not be curtailed."

Response PlaTE-027. The Preferred Alternative is described in Chapter 2 of the FEIS. The Preferred Alternative includes station stops that vary between 1/2 mile and 1 mile. Station spacing and selection is discussed in Chapter 1 of the FEIS. The frequency of bus Route 16 would be reduced, and bus route 50 service would be eliminated. Additional circulator buses and north-south bus service will be added to ensure mobility and access for all users in the corridor. Impacts and changes to the bus service are discussed in Section 6.3 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-032. Consider rail stops and/or feeder buses at Victoria, Hamline, and Fairview (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0941) PlaTP-039

Unless there are rail stops at Victoria, Hamline, and Fairview, local businesses and local residents will not benefit at all from the light rail, unless there are feeder north/south buses running on those same streets and on Lexington Avenue.

Response PlaTP-032. The SDEIS evaluated 3 additional stations at Hamline Avenue, Victoria Street and Western Avenue which would result in approximately half-mile station spacing through much of the Central Corridor. The project as proposed in the FEIS includes below grade infrastructure to allow for station construction at a future date. The Preferred Alternative also includes feeder bus service on Lexington Parkway, Hamline Avenue, and Victoria Street providing connections to the LRT station at that location.

Issue Summary PlaTP-050. Concerns about number of stops and impact on traffic (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0867) PlaTP-215

Also, how many stops will this train make? And all the traffic that will be slowed down because of the stops they will make. How many stations will they have?

Response PlaTP-050. The Preferred Alternative includes a total of 20 stations. Of these stations, 15 are exclusive to Central Corridor and five will be shared with the Hiawatha Line. Below-ground infrastructure for future infill stations at Hamline Avenue, Victoria Street, and Western Avenue are also included. Chapter 2 of the FEIS includes further station details. Information about the Preferred Alternative and the effects on roadways is included in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-067. LRT should stop at intersections (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0114) PlaTP-251

I truly think it needs to stop at all stops for pick up on every corner.

Response PlaTP-067. Stopping at all intersections would drastically increase travel times. LRT stops were strategically chosen in order to capture maximum ridership and optimize passenger walking times.

Issue Summary ProHLP-006. In favor of more stops along University Avenue and fewer in downtown St. Paul (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0829) ProHLP-060

One, increase the number of stops along University Avenue and reduce the number of stops in Downtown St. Paul.

(CCLRP0002) ProHLP-114

I don't know how to do this - more stops near University in exchange for fewer downtown;

Response ProHLP-006. The SDEIS evaluated 3 additional future stations at Hamline, Victoria and Western. Costs to install all required infrastructure below ground are part of the Central Corridor project, as well as associated street and intersection improvements. The Preferred Alternative does consolidate the two stations, as noted in the AA/DEIS into one station on the diagonal block of 4th, 5th and Minnesota streets in downtown St. Paul. The Preferred Alternative has shifted the Capitol East station to Robert Street. The Preferred Alternative does have the station at Snelling and University avenues as a split-side platform station. The Preferred Alternative has a Union Depot station on 4th Street in front of the historic Depot head house.

Issue Summary ProHLP-031. There are not enough stops to benefit elderly persons, working poor, and others (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0259) ProHLP-041

University Avenue, on the other hand, is a miles-long neighborhood of small businesses, shopping centers/retail and residences. Many of the residences on and near the Avenue are inhabited by elderly persons who need bus service to get around, by the working poor who need to get to jobs on University and in Minneapolis, and by University of Minnesota students. Since light rail is planned for speed and for the convenience of those traveling between the two downtowns, it will stop only once every mile. All the groups I mention in the above paragraph would need to transfer from the train to a bus to finish a ride that is to end somewhere between two stops. Such a requirement -- especially in the winter when it may be cold or icy -- would constitute real hardship for many people. At other times of the year, low-income workers could be exposed to more street crime as they walk from train stops to catch buses or stand on corners waiting for buses after dark.

Response ProHLP-031. Comment noted. The mobility of transit-dependent populations is a priority for the project, with a stated goal of the project intended to enhance mobility and access to the corridor and other regions of the Twin Cities metropolitan region. Contained in SDEIS Chapter 6, Section 6.1 is a discussion of proposed bus circulator routes within the Central Corridor LRT project area to help with both access to the line and mobility in the corridor. Additionally, Chapter 3, Section 3.7 outlines the safety and security issues associated with the project.

Section: 2.3 - Cost Effectiveness

Issue Summary PlaPla-006. Concerned that project may not be cost justified (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0472) PlaPla-7

Officials admit that the proposed University Avenue grade level line will provide a rate of transit only comparable to the present No. 50 limited stop buses. In other words, whether the train stops at every red light, or else has priority at some intersections and snarls traffic, it will merely amount to a fancy trolley line. And what about safety at grade level? Can You Justify This Level of Expenditure for a Trolley?

Response PlaPla-006. Comment noted. Meeting the federal cost effectiveness criteria was an essential part of entering into preliminary engineering and will be an essential criterion for entering into final design.

Issue Summary PlaTP-012. Commute times are [not] improved sufficiently to justify LRT project cost (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0905) PlaTP-014

I don't like the route that they have picked. I am a regular rider of the buses that go from my home to Downtown Minneapolis where I work and back. I would like to see a faster commute for the amount of money we are spending. The current commute that I have using the Route 50 is three minutes faster. I don't think it's worth the money. I can get downtown ten minutes faster taking the 94.

Response PlaTP-012. The Route 94 bus will continue operating during peak hours in the future for those riders making a direct connection between the two downtowns. Route 50 service would be eliminated, but would essentially be replaced and enhanced with Central corridor LRT operations.

Issue Summary ProALT-016. Project cost effectiveness (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0038) ProALT-264

3. The absolute lack of cost effectiveness when comparing LRT to improved bus service.

(CCLRP0003) ProALT-468

I think a rapid bus transit system would be much more effective for the residents and commuters from / to downtown St. Paul/Mpls. It would have less impact on current transit users and still supply the faster needs of commuting between the 2 cities. It would still allow less rapid buses to service the community allowing commuters/residents to still access shopping along the route.

Response ProALT-016. Meeting the federal cost effectiveness criteria was an essential part of entering into preliminary engineering and will be an essential criterion for entering into final design.

Issue Summary ProPM-012. Concern about the cost effectiveness calculations (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0482) ProPM-252

3) The cost-effectiveness calculations are suspect. They probably do not take into account the time lost to those who are forced to switch from the 94 express buses to the lrt. They almost certainly ignore the huge increases in delays to vehicles along the route, which include buses. The intersection delay predictions forecast an increase in delay at intersections between baseline and build of 1,830 vehicle-hours in just the peak p.m. hour. When this is doubled to account for the a.m. peak hour, and then expanded to the other peak hours and the rest of the day, the time lost due to the lrt will almost certainly exceed the projected time savings of lrt riders.

Response ProPM-012. Meeting the federal cost effectiveness criteria was an essential part of entering into preliminary engineering and will be an essential criterion for entering into final design.

Section: 2.3 - Other Corridors

Issue Summary NR-022. Priority should be given instead to city-suburban corridors (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0082) NR-5

Priority should be given instead to city-suburban corridors, where significant impacts might be made upon the worst congestion.

Response NR-022. The Central Corridor LRT would act as an anchor to the regional public transportation infrastructure. Contained in FEIS Chapter 1, Section 1.4 "Planning Context," is a full description of the project's connectivity with other current or planned transit corridors in the region.

Issue Summary ProHLP-025. Should include discussion of the "Northeast Diagonal" (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0457) ProHLP-064

Chapter 1- Purpose and Need: • Page 1-13 (Section 1.4): Transit System Linkages Other Projects should include the "Northeast Diagonal".

Response ProHLP-025. All transportation projects included in the 2030 Regional Transportation Policy Plan are included in the analysis for the Preferred Alternative

described in the FEIS. Transportation projects included in the Build and No-Build alternatives are described in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProHLP-026. When will St. Cloud and Rochester-Duluth be connected to the LRT system? (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0077) ProHLP-091

When will you hook up with St. Cloud and Rochester-Duluth?

Response ProHLP-026. The Central Corridor LRT will connect to the Northstar Commuter Line at the Downtown Minneapolis Ballpark Station (intermodal station). Currently the Northstar Commuter Line will end at Big Lake when it begins operations in 2009. The line may be extended to St. Cloud at a later date.

Issue Summary ProHLP-028. Should show the Rush Line Corridor in the maps in the EIS (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0029) ProHLP-118

I know that the Rush Line Corridor is a tier II development in the Met Council's 2030 Transportation Policy Plan, but why haven't any proposed Central Corridor Design maps included links to this corridor?

Response ProHLP-028. All transportation projects included in the 2030 Regional Transportation Policy Plan are included in the analysis for the Preferred Alternative described in the FEIS. Transportation projects included in the Build and No-Build alternatives are described in Chapter 2 of the FEIS. The Central Corridor eastern terminus is at the Union Depot in St. Paul. Any potential connection to the Central Corridor LRT from the Rush Line will be determined as part of the Rush Line project.

Section: 2.3 - Miscellaneous

Issue Summary NR-013. Analyze additional train types (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0478) NR-53

1. Why is it not possible to have a "train" (essentially the same as that proposed for LRT) with the same dedicated path as LRT, essentially the same transportation "vessel" (i.e. car) as LRT, the same power supply (electricity), but run on tires instead of a rail, hereby saving hundreds of millions of dollars in construction costs? The DEIS does not discuss this. 2. A related question: What new bus designs are currently in process that are relevant to bus capacity?

(CCLRP0273) ProPM-244

First - I strongly support the Central Corridor project using the absolute best technologically advanced mass transit development.

(CCLRP0894) ProPM-276

Let's build a 21st Century transit system linking the region's largest traffic generators: The City of St. Paul, the Midway area, U of M, and Minneapolis. Let's enable us to compete regionally and nationally.

Response NR-013. Through the scoping process, modes, alignments, and alternatives that were not prudent or reasonable and did not satisfy requirements of the purpose and need were not carried forward for additional analysis in the AA/DEIS. Scoping results are included in the Scoping Summary Report (December 7, 2001).

Issue Summary ProALT-007. Preference for a mode not analyzed in the AA/DEIS (12)

Comments:

(CCLRP0271) ProALT-047

Imagine 3 modes of transit in the Central Corridor. 1) Buses on I-94 provide a fast connection between the 2 downtowns. 2) Smaller, cleaner and more energy-efficient jitney-like vehicles (perhaps produced locally at the Ford plant and sponsored by University Avenue business associations) provide frequent and affordable service (more info. (at <http://i2i.org/article.aspx?ID=93>)). 3) LRT along the existing rail corridors extends service all the way to the Maplewood Mall area. A Union Depot link to the rail corridor serves Regions Hospital, the State Capitol complex and the rest of Downtown St. Paul.

(CCLRP0746) ProALT-188

What I would suggest is that we look again at a different mode, Personal Rapid Transit, where you can get 70 to 80 miles of transportation for the same 800 million.

(CCLRP0917) ProALT-288

Folks, you're being sold a bill of goods and I have some hope here. There is another choice, another option, a better option. It's called Personal Rapid Transit. Personal Rapid Transit is an elevated guideway system that allows thousands of three-person cars to take people from the point of their boarding to their destination with no stops in between. Only one fare charged for three people. I hear about the environment. Stations cost. How about the environment? Five hundred Btu's per person for BRT, 2500 Btu's per person for LRT. No emissions except at the energy plant. Solar, wind, other renewable sources can generate electricity for PRT. How about stations? Where is it going to be? How about every half-mile? Every half-mile 16 feet up away from your cars, away from your buses that are still going down University Avenue. Away from your -- connected to your businesses if you want, not bothering your businesses because it's a three foot by three foot like a light pole every wherever the light poles are, three foot by three foot, 16 foot up on a pylon that only weighs about 160 pounds. It's great anyway. I don't have all that. Handicapped accessible in stations, on the cars, open and operated 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year. How about cost? Eight hundred million boondoggle that will take you 11 miles in one line or

\$800 million investment that gives you 50 to 60 miles, folks, miles of public transportation. All your feeder lines could have this. We're talking the Twin Cities and the suburbs. PRT is cheaper to build, easier to build with no disruption to businesses or communities. Go to Taxi2000 or prt on Google.

(CCLRP0755) ProALT-402

Instead I propose a robotic transportation system. We're now in the 21st Century. We're in the 21st Century. The computers are coming along. By the time this is completed, four more generations. Doubling of the computer size and capacity and speed will be achieved. Robotic vehicles can travel between the two cities at 100 miles an hour. They can travel to Rochester 200 miles an hour. They can be made to connect every home and every business in the state. They can be put on tracks that are much cheaper than the light rail tracks and serve everybody in the state; young, old, and handicapped. I have my proposal here. away right away. I'd like to leave it here and you can throw it (Laughter)

(CCLRP0486) ProALT-403

As opposed to either LRT or an express busway, Personal Rapid Transit (PRT) holds the unique advantage of not having to in any way take up space on the roadway itself, nor to necessitate tunneling or widening of the right-of-way. It shortens all trips due to its non-stop nature, and can easily and cheaply have extensions added to key destinations such as the Amtrak station and various locations on the Capitol grounds and around downtown St. Paul or Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0209) ProALT-487

There is another option that is far superior to Bus Rapid Transit, Light Rail, and the status quo. It is Personal Rapid Transit (PRT). In reviewing the Central Corridor summary document, S. 2 Purpose and Need for Action and the three Goals, only PRT meets the specifications. Traffic congestion will not be eased by the other alternatives, as admitted by Met Council Commissioner Peter Bell. Safety continues to be a vast problem for buses and trains (and all ground transport). Even buses on a dedicated busway have reliability problems and spew noxious diesel and other fumes. Only PRT has a less damaging impact on the environment, be it a small footprint on the landscape, no vehicular emissions, or the capacity for renewable energy at the central power source. Only PRT has the capacity to "facilitate the preservation and enhancement of neighborhoods" because it is based on elevated rails and posts, rather than on the fixed routes for buses and trains, which have extensive (and expensive) infrastructural needs. PRT systems and design exist now, not just in the future. All the components and systems are in use in other applications today. Minnesota has the potential to lead the world in this brilliant new strategy for transportation if we will only take the initiative. Ultra is building a PRT circulator system at Heathrow in London. Vectus is building a track in Uppsala, Sweden. We could have the industry based here in Minnesota if we are only proactive, visionary, ... and courageous. Please check out the various PRT websites, such as cppt.org, www.skywebexpress.com, www.faculty.washington.edu/~jbs.itrans, the ATRA site, or any number of other sites.

(CCLRP0282) ProALT-492

This seems like a perfect application for a personal rapid transit system. There would be less disruption to the existing transportation system along University Ave, the cost may be less than light rail, and the Twin Cities would have bragging rights as an innovative community.

(CCLRP0561) ProALT-497

It is with great urgency that I implore you to look at the true light rail known as PRT (Personal Rapid Transit). You may Google or use the web to search out various modalities, but PRT is one third the cost of traditional light rail to build, carries more passengers, is available always at the station when the commuter wants to travel, uses one third the energy. PRT also uses one third the space along a corridor. This because the PRT vehicles don't need a hallway in each car like LRT. What is truly light about a 216,000 pound light rail vehicle. Who's kidding who here? Professor J. Edward Anderson, of the University of Minnesota has championed the effort of PRT. PRT can be made in individual cars designed from 2-6 person cars using an elevated mono-rail. No parking spaces are taken from the central corridor. Commuters do not have to wait for a car like they do in Minneapolis. The cars can be fitted with smoke detectors and emergency buttons as well as GPS systems to let the central controllers control the system. The PRT is driverless and fully automated. The system could use credit cards or MN Drivers License to track unruly users and suspend Transit Privileges. Gone are the days of LRT. PRT is the only way to go. St Paul could be the model and the first city in America to go PRT. This would create more jobs and create focus on our city as a green city with efficient mass transit. PRT rides have no unwanted stops and take you directly to your programmed destination. PRT also has no cracks in the rail like MPLS LRT. St Paul's PRT would ride on a monorail and ride seamlessly smooth. PRT is wheelchair and bike accessible just like LRT. Why would we really do anything else.

(CCLRP0746) ProALT-584

Personal Rapid Transit or PRT is an elevated monorail system with many three-person driverless electric vehicles. PRT provides nonstop no-wait 30-mile-per-hour service. This is your service, you know, straight from Downtown St. Paul all the way to Downtown Minneapolis either by yourself or with two others. Straight. No stopping. Vehicles travel aboveground on 16-foot elevated guideways. Stations are located near building entrances every half-mile. Many stations are situated along the route to minimize walking once the trip ends. Vehicles travel nonstop to their destination along the main guideway at 30 miles per hour, speeding at twice the errant speed of autos or buses on congested streets below. Stations are not located on the main guideway. Instead stations are located on a separate station guideway that branches off from the main guideway, thus the stations are described as off-line meaning not on the main line. Passengers travel alone or with people of their choosing. They travel 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year on LRT. I think we need to start looking again at Personal Rapid Transit. Thank you.

(CCLRP0477) ProALT-590

I wish to enter the following proposal:

I propose a transportation system that will move people (1) at high speeds, (2) very safely, (3) with maximum flexibility to all locations that roads go to (4) using much less fuel. This

system will require (1) anew kind of roadway, (2) new, lighter, more economical vehicle, (3) highly developed computer controls, both hardware and software. It will reduce time required for moving people, reduce traffic congestion, reduce pollution by reducing exhausts and noise, be useful to the very young, the elderly, and the handicapped, and allow the passenger to do other things other than drive the vehicle while being transported. It will reduce cost of road and parking lot construction and stop the paving of America. This technology will not be dependent on the development of new fuels, but will be able to utilize new fuels if they are successfully developed. This transportation system will require commitment of the government and much input by private enterprise and can be completely sustained by user fees. Start-up costs and initial research must be funded by government. In [mal form it would be run as a public utility paying taxes and not requiring taxpayer support. (I) Roadways: Vehicles will travel over tracks, raised 1 - 2 feet above ground level, supported by very stable pilings about 10 feet apart. Tracks will be several inches wide and be constructed of a strong, durable and somewhat flexible synthetic material. Tracks will be able to adjust to contraction and expansion due to heat and cold without buckling at each joint on each piling. The elevation of tracks will be maintained on each piling automatically by computer. Tracks will have lips to help keep vehicle on them. Traffic will be designed to flow without the need to speed up or slow down. Traffic will merge without change in speed. Tracks will have a powerful electro-magnetic guidance system to keep the tires of the vehicles on them. Roadways will be laid out for efficient movement of vehicles with few and gentle curves. Different roadways will be designed for (1) slow traffic, approximately 20 mph in residential areas, (2) moderate traffic speeds as feeder lines to the (3) high speed lines for longer distances that will have special merging tracks. All tracks will have merging tracks to get the vehicles up to speed. Merging will be computer controlled. This form of roadway will not require paved roadways and be cheaper to construct and maintain. Parking can be done by computer in stacked berths rather than in huge parking lots, again reducing paving. Tracks would be minimally influenced by rain or snow. Roadways would eventually be made to all homes and destinations in Minnesota, but should cost less than present roads. High speed roadways would need quality fencing. Neighborhood roadways would not require fencing since vehicles would travel very slowly in residential areas. Roadways would not be raised in residential areas. Tracks would lie near ground level. Tracks would go right into the garage or parking area. Tracks would completely supplant roads as we know them. Roads as we know them would disappear. We could plant grass in present roads. Pedestrians could walk over tracks in pedestrian areas. (II) Vehicles, of various sizes, will have four wheels with tires, similar to those presently used, but modified to travel and stay on the tracks of the roadway quietly, securely and at high speed. Each vehicle will have a small efficient motor, because larger motors will be unnecessary because acceleration will be very gradual and will be done much less often. Vehicles will not require the heavy suspension systems now used because the roadway will be smooth and gentle and tight turns will be avoided. Vehicles will be designed for minimal wind resistance and will travel in convoys without abrupt changes in speed or direction. Vehicles will be entirely computer driven. Vehicles will be stored at user's place of residence. Prior to travel the user will log in on the central computer which will determine traffic density to destination(s) and give user a time to leave and arrive. User must be in vehicle and ready to leave when the allotted time is given. Since the vehicle will be driven by computer the user does not have to have a driver's license, therefore users can be almost any age and any physical or mental condition. Family and friends of the user would be able

to ascertain the vehicles location and success in taking the user to the designated location. All beginning locations and destinations would have an address. Vehicles could be owned by user or rented. Vehicles could be sent to various locations by computer for user when needed. (III) Computer Guidance will be utilized. Computers will, in advance, prior to leaving the starting point, determine if and when a vehicle can be brought onto each roadway desired by the passenger to get the passenger to where he/she wants to go. All roadways will be controlled by a central computer which will handle the number of vehicles using the system and all requests for transport as they come in. Individual computers in each vehicle and on the roadway to give traffic proper flow and maintain vehicles in the proper location and speed and position on the tracks in conjunction with the central computer. Driving is presently very haphazard and depending upon drivers making decisions at the time which is very dependent on driver judgment, therefore slow, inefficient, inflexible, and dangerous. Vehicles will need to travel in convoys to permit sufficient space between vehicles for merging. By traveling in convoys with vehicles close to each other, wind resistance will be reduced and improved fuel efficiency and reduced noise levels will occur. Distance between vehicles would be strictly maintained by computers and sensors. Research should be done using wind tunnels. Quality control will be very important. Not only will the engineering for this, next generation transport system, need to be extremely rigorous, but the construction of all components will have to be extremely high level of tolerance. Nothing less will do. High standards similar or possibly higher than airlines use will have to be in place throughout the system. Research on new materials will be very important. Undoubtedly the roadway and vehicles will require development of new materials. The computer hardware and software will have to be thoroughly debugged or disaster will result. This will require the highest level of computer science and engineering. There are presently models for this high level engineering in the space program. Development would need to be done in phases. I would suggest that the system could be started between the airport and hotels. Over time needed components of the system could be developed and implemented. As users become accustomed to the system, acceptance would develop because of increased speed, lower costs and other obvious advantages. User fees would be based on the actual costs and determined electronically and deducted from the users account at the time of use. It will be important to maintain user flexibility, providing maximum opportunity to travel where and when the user wants or user acceptance will be very low as it is now on the bus and light rail. The University of Minnesota should do the initial research. The State of Minnesota should take a lead in the development of this new technology. It would add to our economic welfare and the University prestige. Initially it might be difficult to convince the legislature and the governor. Initial research needs to be done first. If the idea has traction, graduate students and the Minnesota State Department of Transportation could become involved and then a proposal could be made to the politicians. The world cannot go on using the present outmoded transportation system. Something new needs to be done. Speed, flexibility, safety should be prime considerations. After all we have entered the 21st century. If we don't do something somebody else will.

(CCLRP0476) ProALT-601

Enclosed is a page from Popular Science, May 2006. Notice that five manufacturers have plans for (nearly) autonomous automobiles. Soon, they will be constructing fully autonomous automobiles. These automobiles will be capable of transporting people and their luggage to and from the airport to hotels, business, the Mall of America or the Convention Center. Soon they will probably be transporting commuters on special tracks at high speeds. the Met Council should prepare for this day.

(CCLRP0456) ProALT-604

I think that by the time it is finished we will wish we had started developing robotic vehicles. I am opposed for the following reasons: (1) It will serve very few (about 20%) of the travelers. Robotic vehicles will serve 100% of all travelers; young, old, and handicapped; rich and poor. Robotic vehicles can be made to serve all homes and all businesses, all over the state. (2) Too costly. Robotic vehicles will move people at far less cost, using far less fuel. They can be made cheaper to construct and operate. (3) Too slow. Robotic vehicles, built on specially constructed lanes, will move people much faster (up to 200 mph). They can be timed so that they will not have to stop at any time, portal to portal. (4) Too dangerous. Robotic vehicles, using computer controls, will be incredibly safe, since they will be timed to avoid all crossings and people will not have to wait outside where they are vulnerable to attack. They will run 24 hours a day 7 days a week. (5) Light Rail is not environmentally friendly: Robotics vehicles will use less fuel (any fuel), will not require lighting, will be noiseless, and will eliminate the need for automobiles as we know them today. Robotic vehicles will require modification of roads and highways, but can use our present roads and highways in the early stages of development. Roadways suitable for robotic vehicles should be built to eliminate the need for snow removal, without intersections, and be made stable on all soil types, and should eliminate the need for paving the earth's surface. A survey of high school students showed that a majority thought the automobile would be completely out of date in 10 years. Some community, somewhere in the world will develop robotic vehicles. It should be us. The billion dollars it takes to develop the light rail would go a long way in this regard. Minnesota has the plant to construct them (Ford Plant) with expertise in robotics. Undoubtedly, there will be a transition time like there was when the car replaced the horse in 1912, at the time the Ford Plant was built. Minnesota could become the world's center for the construction and development of this technology. We could regain leadership in high tech like we had in the days of Control Data and Cray Research.

Response ProALT-007. Through the scoping process, transportation technologies that were not prudent or reasonable and did not satisfy requirements of the purpose and need were not carried forward for additional analysis in the AA/DEIS. Scoping results are included in the Scoping Summary Report (December 7, 2001). Two build alternatives were selected for evaluation in the AA/DEIS in addition to a Baseline Alternative. The build alternatives included: University Avenue LRT and University Avenue BRT.

Issue Summary ProALT-028. Concerns that project goals are not met (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0785) ProALT-139

To substantiate this conclusion one need to look no further than the Draft EIS submitted ostensibly to support approval of the project. In Chapter 7, Evaluation of Alternatives, the case is stated for LRT rather than BRT or some variation of existing bus service as strongly supporting three key goals. Fulfillment of these goals is measured according to a list of criteria for which the LRT option is almost always given the highest grade and extension of existing service, the baseline option, is given the lowest. However, these conclusions are contradicted by the very information contained within the DEIS itself. With an objective 3C on page 721, travel time savings are graded best for LRT and worst for the baseline. However, two pages earlier, Table 724 clearly shows that existing and baseline travel times are considerably shorter than LRT. In fact, the travel time for existing 50 express buses on University Avenue which stops about as often as the LRT takes less than half the time proposed for the LRT, 32 as compared to 75 minutes.

(CCLRP0475) ProALT-578

The University Avenue LRT alternative does not fulfill Central Corridor project goals and objectives, and has more negative than positive impacts. It especially violates environmental justice considerations.

Response ProALT-028. Chapter 10 of both the SDEIS and the FEIS include an evaluation of the Central Corridor LRT in relation to the project goals and objectives. Construction of the Central Corridor LRT would result in several major and minor impacts to adjacent communities. The Environmental Justice analysis discussed in Section 3.8 of the FEIS describes actions that may adversely impact these neighborhoods. All impacts that occur in these neighborhoods are fully mitigated. The analysis shows that no project impacts would be disproportionately borne by minority or low-income communities. As discussed in Chapter 11 of the FEIS, extensive outreach activities were conducted as a part of the AA/DEIS and SDEIS to inform area residents and businesses about the project and to listen to their concerns. This has allowed the public to provide input on the proposed alignment and alternatives, station locations, environmental issues, future development implications, the project planning process, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative.

Issue Summary ProHLP-015. General comments in regard to Twin Cities and mass transit (7)

Comments:

(CCLRP0135) ProHLP-043

Hire local construction firms

(CCLRP0919) ProHLP-044

I take the express buses daily between the downtowns and I'm very happy with the service. However, there is room for improvement. And I think there wouldn't be anything wrong with

just putting this on hold for a while. I've just heard a lot of opinions here tonight from a lot of different viewpoints that I haven't read in the papers and just maybe put this on hold for another couple years and addressing the needs of all the people that I've heard tonight.

(CCLRP0915) ProHLP-057

First priority is economic opportunity and investment, second priority is communities and environment, and the third is transportation and mobility.

(CCLRP0252) ProHLP-069

We would like to see light rail eventually go to the airport from St. Paul.

(CCLRP0082) ProHLP-072

P.S. If the future of Metropolitan transit is as badly designed as this form (the 'fold' lines make no sense), we will be in serious trouble.

(CCLRP0248) ProHLP-106

Please vote for the introduction of light rail to Saint Paul with a connection to Minneapolis and the western suburbs.

(CCLRP0432) ProHLP-121

I live in the SW metro, Shakopee. We need public transport out in the burbs hardcore. Raise the taxes to the roof, it's better than paying the gas hogs my money.

Response ProHLP-015. Comment noted

Issue Summary ProHLP-024. Should consider "ONE" track system (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0430) ProHLP-029

I have an alternative proposal for the Light Rail issue on University Avenue. Let's give serious consideration to a ONE track system, with dual tracks only at the stations. With today's computer possibilities for managing the system, it should be possible to design and operate with only ONE set of tracks between stations. The transit time would not be as fast, but that should only be a slight inconvenience in comparison to the disruption caused by two sets of tracks along the entire university Avenue. One possibility would be to have the trains stop only at alternate stations, thus a sort of A train and B train or some other such designation. Please have the engineers consider this option.

Response ProHLP-024. After publication of the AA/DEIS and completion of the public hearings, the Metropolitan Council adopted the AA/DEIS LPA, LRT, for the Central Corridor (June 28, 2006, Metropolitan Council Resolution No. 2006-15). Subsequently, an SDEIS was completed to document changes to the AA/DEIS LPA (August 2008). As shown on Figure 2-1 of the FEIS, the current Preferred Alternative is an at-grade light rail transit line that is 11 miles in length (double-tracked), of which 9.8 miles consists of new alignment and 1.2 miles use the existing Hiawatha LRT alignment in downtown Minneapolis. The current design of the Preferred Alternative is discussed in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

Section: 2.0 - Report Corrections Needed

Issue Summary ProPM-017. **Report corrections needed** (4)

Comments:

(CCLRP0457) ProPM-095

Page 2-11: EIS Alignment Table 2.3-2 is located in section 2.3.3. Move up to section 2.3.2.

(CCLRP0457) ProPM-246

Document organization: Add a project description section, with detailed maps and descriptions of the alignment and station areas.

(CCLRP0457) ProPM-292

Chapter 2 - Alternatives Considered: • Page 2-6: EIS Alignment Table 2.3-1 is located in section 2.3.2. Move up to section 2.3.1.

(CCLRP0457) ProPM-302

New information: Much of the background information is dated (e.g. 1999 Fortune 500 rankings) and has been "overtaken by events" (Guthrie and Downtown Minneapolis Library have been constructed and Twins and Gopher Stadium proposals have recently been approved by the Legislature). This can color the reviewer's impression of the value of the substance of the report. The background information needs to be updated.

Response ProPM-017. All chapters and sections of the AA/DEIS have been updated since publication of the AA/DEIS and selection of the AA/DEIS LPA. The Metropolitan Council has conducted and published an SDEIS to assess the impacts of necessary changes to key elements of the AA/DEIS LPA and the subsequent selection of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is fully described in Chapter 2 of the FEIS, and all chapters and sections assess the potential beneficial and adverse impacts of the Preferred Alternative and present mitigation strategies. The FEIS utilizes the latest information and analysis methods available for each section. It uses the most current data, studies, community plans, model outputs, and assumptions, and is based on the current design and engineering studies for the Central Corridor LRT.

Section: 3.1 - Land Use and Socio-Economics

Issue Summary EngEng-001. **Geodetic control monuments information source provided** (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0442) EngEng-11

All available geodetic control information about horizontal and vertical geodetic control

monuments in the subject area is contained on the National Geodetic Survey's home page at the following Internet World Wide Web address: <http://www.ngs.noaa.gov> After entering the this home page, please access the topic "Products and Services" and then access the menu item "Data Sheet." This menu item will allow you to directly access geodetic control monument information from the National Geodetic Survey data base for the subject area project. This information should be reviewed for identifying the location and designation of any geodetic control monuments that may be affected by the proposed project.

Response EngEng-001. Comment Noted

Issue Summary ProPM-013. Concern that the project is meeting design goals for University Avenue (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0485) ProPM-245

In addition, the DEIS fails to consider whether the goals of the Project are met by the construction of the LRT down University Avenue. In the view of the Equity Coalition, the stated goals are not achieved by the construction of the LRT down University Avenue as the project is presently conceived. Goal I: Objective A of the Project is to "Support investments in infrastructure, business, and community that sustain the heart of the region." Goal 2: Objective A of the Project is to "facilitate the preservation and enhancement of neighborhoods in the Central Corridor" and Objective B is to "acknowledge the individual character and aspirations of each place served, and of the region as a whole." Goal 3: Objective C of the Project is to "enhance the existing transportation infrastructure to serve the high number of transit dependent persons in the Central Corridor." See DEIS, p. 7-1 & p. 7-2.

Response ProPM-013. The Preferred Alternative adopted after preparation of the SDEIS is consistent with local planning efforts in the Twin Cities. Further, the Metropolitan Council is working with the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis in the development of plans to achieve specific neighborhood goals around stations. These plans are documented in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, and Chapters 5 and 6 of the FEIS. For example, St. Paul has undertaken planning efforts in the vicinity of planned stations with adoption of the Central Corridor Development Strategy (October 2007).

Issue Summary ProPOL-006. Transit oriented development (9)

Comments:

(CCLRP0856) ProPURP-118

Data from other light rail systems shows that light rail often attracts more residential, office, and commercial development along the route.

(CCLRP0178) SocLU-008

Land use issues as the affect transit system. The DCC recognizes the importance of transit-oriented development on the viability, vitality, and aesthetics of the Corridor, and thus recommends consideration of high-density commercial uses that integrate well with

pedestrians, bus, and light rail commuters. Development must be appropriate to each setting and not overwhelm nearby residential and commercial patterns.

(CCLRP0871) SocLU-012

It will also foster housing improvement behind the commercial corridors and encourage newer higher density housing.

(CCLRP0108) SocLU-017

3. New housing developed along the Central Corridor must meet the standard of 30% affordable (the HUD definition)

(CCLRP0457) SocLU-018

Station area planning for all station along the route needs to occur to encourage transit oriented developments. Better planning will result in more efficient land use zoning, which will result in higher ridership along the line.

(CCLRP0862) SocLU-028

Other metropolitan areas similar to our own have gone far past us in supporting transit-friendly lifestyles. Because we've largely been on the sidelines, we've got, instead of group transit, lots more urban sprawl.

(CCLRP0869) SocLU-032

The City of St. Paul has accepted to take on the responsibility of doing the detailed land use planning in the corridor so that development along University Avenue both complements and is complemented by a regional transit system. Through our planning commission and in partnership with our community we intend to take full advantage of this important investment and we would like to thank you and, again, let you know that we support LRT on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0458) SocLU-033

Mr. Schweigert outlined nine issues, concerns, or potential benefits raised by the district councils, in consultation with each other and their constituents, that have to be addressed or included in this project: ...8) attention to land use issues that affect the transit system; and,...

(CCLRP0099) SocNC-115

I also strongly support the accompanying development that is likely to occur along University Ave. I live 50 feet from University Ave and believe that LRT will bring substantial benefit to our neighborhood.

Response ProPOL-006. Saint Paul adopted the Central Corridor Development Strategy in October 2007. The Development Strategy includes Transit Opportunity Zone overlay districts (TOZ) that would guide new development. In addition, the Development Strategy contains an Inclusive Housing strategy that is intended to mitigate the potential displacement of low-income individuals and families from the corridor as property values rise. Further, specific strategies are identified for home ownership assistance. The Central Corridor Development Strategy is referenced in the FEIS in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 and Chapter 5.

Issue Summary ProProjBdj-004. Compensate residents and businesses for economic losses (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0899) ProProjBdj-007

And what we would like to see is some kind of compensation placed on the table in the form of at least at the very minimum a \$50 or \$60 million fund that would help compensate residents and businesses for any inconvenience or economic losses that they may have.

(CCLRP0766) ProProjBdj-020

I think what could happen -- and I heard it just in comments -- it would be nice or useful to local businesses if some of this \$800 million could be disbursed to local businesses along that line and a real effort was made towards that. That would help us out a lot, and that's my comments.

Response ProProjBdj-004. Project mitigation commitments are noted in each section of the FEIS. The commitments do not include a general community compensation fund, rather commitments are targeted at specific impacts attributable to the Central Corridor project. The Central Corridor Partnership was established as a voice for and an entity to interface with local area businesses along the Central Corridor. Acquisition of real property is guided by federal statute. See FEIS Section 3.3.

Issue Summary SocLU-001. Include proper planning and design for housing and greenspace along corridor (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0545) SocLU-003

That development along the Corridor is transit-oriented, maximizing the use of space while optimizing greenspace. We must have development along the Corridor that includes mixed-use buildings; recognizes that residents walk, bike and use transit, as well as drive cars to access businesses; minimizes surface parking; and provides an array of job opportunities for residents. Innovative means to increase green space should also be included in all development along the Corridor.

(CCLRP0786) SocLU-011

I also wanted to say a little bit about smart development. It is important to us that density and mixed use are strong considerations. I think we're learning this in the few development projects that are being considered right now for University Avenue vision for design. I encourage planners to use a long-term look at University Avenue right now and what I see is a gray corridor. I want to see it turned into a green corridor, long-term sustainable.

(CCLRP0284) SocLU-029

LRT will bring continuity to University Avenue and eliminate waste. When you travel down University Avenue, it is a disjointed conglomeration of one-story cinderblock buildings, deteriorating storefronts, empty parking lots, and big box retailers. LRT will, hopefully, result in denser development and the elimination of under-utilized space. This development will provide more business, residential, and entertainment options, as well as increase our tax base.

(CCLRP0154) SocLU-030

We strongly agree with the goal of providing a reliable transit system that allows an efficient, effective land use development pattern, minimizes parking demand, and facilitates the best use of adjacent properties.

(CCLRP0842) SocLU-037

...I think that we can also be accommodating about it and make sure that with the increased high density that someone brought up in the last couple speakers that we also accommodate affordable housing along that area, too, along that corridor so that, you know, this thing is for everybody and people aren't pushed out that are already there and then we consolidate the corridor and the controversy

Response SocLU-001. Since the publication of the AA/DEIS, two new plans have been adopted by the City of St. Paul: The Fitzgerald Park Precinct Plan (Area Plan) and the Central Corridor Development Strategy that was adopted by the St. Paul City Council as a chapter of the City's Comprehensive Plan. The Central Corridor Development Strategy creates a set of guidelines for the development of the light rail line and surrounding areas. The City has also conducted more detailed planning for the areas approximately 1/4-mile around the seven planned LRT stations on University Avenue, and similar planning efforts for other St. Paul stations, including the three additional stations, will be completed in 2009. The recommended strategy includes establishing location-specific Transit Opportunity Zone overlay districts (TOZ) along the corridor. In addition, the City of Minneapolis is updating its comprehensive plan, The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth, which recognizes the importance of strategic infrastructure investments along transportation corridors, the vitality of its downtown neighborhoods, and its relationship to important institutions such as the U of M. These plans, in addition to the SEMI Lands Plan, were cited in the SDEIS and have been carried into the FEIS (Section 3.1).

Issue Summary SocLU-015. Need to include "North Quadrant" as major activity area
(1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) SocLU-031

There is also a discussion of major activity areas along the corridor. The City believes that the North Quadrant, a new residential neighborhood, should be included.

Response SocLU-015. North Quadrant is noted in Section 3.2 of the FEIS.

Section: 3.1 - Coordinate with Other Community Plans

Issue Summary PlaTP-115. Update small area plans (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0435) PlaTP-141

Small Area Plans. The FEIS should update the list of small area plans. For example, the FEIS should add the Southeast Minneapolis Industrial/Bridal Veil Area Plan (SEMI plan) as a small area plan for Minneapolis. ... It would also be helpful if the FEIS indicated (with indents, numbering etc.) which small area plans are adopted as part of Minneapolis and St. Paul's comprehensive plans and which area plans standalone. Plans that have been included in a city's comprehensive plan will have more potential impact to Central Corridor implementation as a city's zoning and other ordinances must be consistent with the city's comprehensive plan.

Response PlaTP-115. The list of small area plans was updated and they are described in detail in Section 3.1 of the FEIS. In addition, coordination and outreach with all jurisdictions was undertaken during the planning process for the SDEIS and FEIS.

Issue Summary PubPI-034. Concern about the effect that Minneapolis and St. Paul's comprehensive plans will have on the Central Corridor LRT (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0435) PubPI-063

The FEIS should note the specific provisions in the regional System Statements for Minneapolis and St. Paul that affect transit planning. In September 2005 all cities in the region were issued custom documents called System Statements. These System Statements informed each community how it is affected by the Metropolitan Council's policy plans. Receipt of these system statements triggers the community's obligation to review and modify their comprehensive plans, due to the Council for review in 2008. The FEIS should note that these plans may have new policies which will affect the implementation of the Central Corridor.

Response PubPI-034. The Minneapolis and St. Paul System Statements included the Central Corridor LRT project. The City of St. Paul submitted a comprehensive plan amendment to reflect its Development Strategy which was found consistent with the regional system statements. Further information is available in Section 3.1, Section 3.2, and Chapter 5 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PubPI-045. Concern about understanding the technical aspects of the project and AA/DEIS (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0171) PubPI-085

One of the biggest deterrents to effective community input is that much of the work to be done going forward is highly technical. For example, the computer-generated calculation of the critical Cost/Effectiveness Index is awesomely complicated. We're told the required Cost/Effectiveness Index must be met to be considered for federal funding, but how can ordinary citizens grapple with the pluses and minuses of adding or moving a station, for example, when only a highly skilled travel modeling expert can determine how it would affect the overall viability of the project?

Response PubPI-045. The CCPO made every effort to engage the public on even the most highly technical of issues related to project development, including the CEI calculations done on various alternative scenarios and ridership and cost estimating methodology. Presentations on every key issue affecting the Central Corridor were made to the CAC, the BAC and to the public.

Section: 3.1 - Land Use

Issue Summary PlaTE-016. Concerns in regard to development along corridor (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0042) PlaTE-183

As this LRT investment moves forward, as it should, a moratorium on development along the line should be imposed providing time to develop an appropriate investment framework that includes affordable housing, open space sensitivity, mixed use land use, and opportunity for worker mobility.

Response PlaTE-016. Development along the corridor in St. Paul will be guided by the City's Central Corridor development strategy. Visit www.stpaul.gov for further details.

Issue Summary PlaTP-006. Update report content in regard to station area land use impacts (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) PlaTP-006

Beginning on p5-30 is an analysis of stations' impacts on surrounding land uses. The Draft EIS indicates a "moderate [negative] impact" at the Fairview Station. However, by moving the station to a center platform arrangement totally west of Fairview mitigates most of the impacts listed. The remaining negative impact is that access to Episcopal Homes would be only from the eastbound lanes via right in/right out movements. The analysis of the Snelling Station should be adjusted to reflect moving the station to the east in the text and on Figure 5.2-10. The analysis of the Capitol East Station and Figure 5.2-14 should be adjusted to reflect moving the station to Robert Street just north of 12 Street. Note that impacts of the 6th and 4th Street Stations could be mitigated by combining the stations into one within the interior of the Athletic Club block.

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-040

To 2-8, Figure 2.3-2, Figure 5.2-16 and Figure 5.2-17, add consideration of consolidating two adjacent stations into the Athletic Club block, and show alignment option that cuts diagonally through the Athletic Club block:

Response PlaTP-006. The Preferred Alternative combines stations in St. Paul diagonally at 4th and Cedar. Land use impacts were revised in the preparation of the SDEIS. Please refer to Chapter 3 and Chapter 5 in the SDEIS and FEIS for an analysis of station area land use impacts and development potential.

Issue Summary SocLU-003. General comments in regard to social and land use conditions (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0007) ProPM-005

We have no Community Center...our taxes do not support our neighborhood, children have no where to play.

(CCLRP0042) ProPOL-12

The Central Corridor project requires an investment framework to guide its growth and development. The Investment framework must be broader than the LRT line itself.

(CCLRP0756) SocLU-002

And third, light rail, by attracting the greatest ridership and accompanying new development to the corridor, will strengthen our urban core and offer an alternative to suburban sprawl. Combined with the growing system of transit and transportation options throughout the Twin Cities, LRT in the Central Corridor will help provide the greatest access for its riders to jobs, housing, education, and recreation in an efficient manner throughout the metro area.

(CCLRP0407) SocLU-005

Section 3.3.2 outlines impacts related to neighborhoods, and beginning on p3-22 discusses impacts on Saint Paul neighborhoods. Although some of the points are debatable in their precise wording, the Draft EIS is fair in its overall assessments of social and land use conditions.

(CCLRP0185) SocLU-022

Furthermore, ROW is largely available to replicate the configuration used in other cities where light-rail is implemented along freeway corridors: I-84 in Portland, OR, I-25 in Denver, CO, etc.

Response SocLU-003. Comment noted.

Issue Summary SocLU-007. Update report based on land development changes (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) SocLU-009

The Draft EIS states that stations along University Avenue would impact 83 parcels and displace 3 structures, in the Capitol Area would displace two buildings and impact a parking lot, and in downtown impact two parcels. This analysis needs to be updated given changes since the Draft EIS was completed.

(CCLRP0443) SocLU-010

Section/page/table is 3.3.2 and 3.3.3, Development Patterns: Figures should be modified to show the correct locations of the West Bank, East Bank and Stadium Village Station, as well as several omitted high density housing developments and the planned on campus football Stadium.

Response SocLU-007. The right of way (ROW) and property acquisition data have been updated for the FEIS (Section 3.3). The proposed acquisitions, relocations, and displacements were identified using preliminary engineering (PE) design information and approximate ROW requirements.

Issue Summary SocLU-014. [Update land use policy per Minneapolis comprehensive plan](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0457) SocLU-023

Page 3-8: Comprehensive and Small Area Plans. The DEIS needs to include more detail on the land use policy features from the Minneapolis comprehensive plan. University Avenue SE and Cedar Avenue are designated Community Corridors meaning that higher-density mixed-use development would be supported in conjunction with transit along those corridors. The University of Minnesota/SEMI area and Downtown Minneapolis are designated Growth Centers in terms of both population and employment. The SEMI area is a designated Industrial Business Park Opportunity Area, an area that the city seeks to redevelop for uses which provide high-paying jobs and greater job density. Stadium Village and Cedar-Riverside are designated "Activity Centers" meaning they have a higher intensity of mixed-use, are heavily pedestrian-oriented, and offer a range of activities that extend from the day into the evening. University Avenue SE & Bedford Street SE is a designated Neighborhood Commercial Node which provides small-scale, neighborhood-serving retail oriented to the pedestrian.

Response SocLU-014. These land use policy features have been added to the text of Section 3.1 of the FEIS.

Section: 3.1 - Zoning

Issue Summary PlaPla-003. [Concerns in regard to St. Paul's existing zoning codes along University Avenue](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0154) PlaPla-4

The MPCC does not recognize St. Paul's existing zoning codes along University as "very conducive" to transit oriented development as stated in the D-EIS. TOD is a well-defined concept, easily quantifiable in terms of floor area ratio, housing and job densities, building design and situations, parking requirements, block size, and streetscape. The zoning code is lacking in this regard and while suburban style, automobile oriented developments proceed in conformity with the code, true TOD might require several variances.

Response PlaPla-003. The St. Paul City Council adopted the Central Corridor Development Strategy (October 2007). The plan addresses development in the Central Corridor and recommends a strategy for regulating future growth and development in the corridor. The Development Strategy includes Transit Opportunity Zone overlay districts (TOZ), which, generally, would be established to preserve and protect underlying zoning while, at the same time, promoting and facilitating a desired change or improvement through redevelopment and rehabilitation activities. The Development Strategy is described in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocLU-010. Concerned that much of the Central Corridor is governed by outmoded zoning categories (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0280) SocLU-015

Zoning and TOD. Much of the Central Corridor is still governed by outmoded zoning categories that take no recognition of its role as a major public transit artery. Along much of the Corridor, the city has adopted a TOD framework in its comprehensive plan, and yet has failed to implement that plan in terms of zoning. As we have learned, unfortunately, in our own district, the TOD framework has no teeth without TN zoning, and without appropriate zoning it is nearly impossible to bring in the kind of development that the Corridor needs. This is an issue of great urgency as we move to expand the capacity of public transit along the Corridor. With several key parcels currently or soon to be vacant in the Corridor, there is a danger that a major rush of development will occur before appropriate zoning is in place, resulting in the loss of a critical opportunity for TOD development just when it is most needed. We recommend a limited development moratorium in concert with an expedited process for installing TOD principles in Central Corridor zoning.

Response SocLU-010. Zoning regulations are developed and implemented by the cities. Zoning regulations for each segment of the Central Corridor LRT are discussed in Section 3.2 of the FEIS, including the proposed Transit Opportunity Zone overlay districts (TOZ) regulations developed as part of the City of St. Paul's Central Corridor Development Strategy.

Section: 3.1 - Stations

Issue Summary PlaTP-048. **The City of Saint Paul commits to doing station-area plans at Western, Victoria, and Hamline** (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-212

The City of Saint Paul commits to doing station-area plans at Western, Victoria and Hamline, regardless of whether stations are built during the first phase of LRT construction.

Response PlaTP-048. All planning associated with these stations is discussed in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProHLP-014. **Effects of the proposed station locations** (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) ProHLP-054

The Draft EIS lays out the station locations in detail. And adding a station highlights the basic tradeoffs of additional local service versus additional travel time. Analyses regarding adding stations generally states that ridership attracted to a new station will draw patrons from adjacent stations and, generally, will discourage some patrons elsewhere in the corridor due to increased travel times. Because of such sensitivities, each decision on stations must take into account both the localized benefits as well as impact to the entire line.

(CCLRP0185) ProHLP-070

Transit generally impacts microeconomics by providing a dedicated facility with some level of service that development can subsequently be considered economically viable by resulting pedestrian traffic, hence localized pockets of densification and neighborhood [re-establishment]. These lines draw diversified development and activity in; conversely automobile-based development tends to push said development out. University Avenue is, indeed, "pushed out", hence the tendency by the Central Corridor decision-makers to implement a transit solution that somehow rectifies this situation (as this spread has created a bit of a chasm between neighborhoods, so it is argued). I believe that this attempt is folly or, at very least, a gamble. And to add up the cost of the line approaching \$1B, that's a significant gamble not to be taken.

(CCLRP0406) ProHLP-101

The potential Western Station could be sited within the University Avenue right-of-way. Potential TOD within 1/4 mile could be developed as part of the City's Development Strategy planning process as well as be considered as part of Preliminary Engineering. Preliminary analysis, done for the Central Corridor Coordinating Committee for a station at Western, shows that LRT ridership may suffer along the route to some degree, and may outstrip the ridership gained at the station. However, the potential for TOD at the potential Western station, and its associated increased in ridership, were not considered in this preliminary analysis. No such analysis has been done for a Victoria Station or a Hamline Station. Such analyses should be included as part of Preliminary Engineering.

Response ProHLP-014. The cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis are working with the Metropolitan Council in the development of plans to achieve specific neighborhood goals around stations. These plans are documented in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, and Chapters 5 and 6 of the FEIS. The Preferred Alternative adopted after preparation of the SDEIS is consistent with local planning efforts in the Twin Cities. For example, St. Paul has undertaken planning efforts in the vicinity of Central Corridor LRT stations.

Section: 3.1 - Impact

Issue Summary ProHLP-022. Report clarifications of plans shown on pages 3-7 through 3-10 (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0435) ProHLP-034

General comments. The FEIS should organize the plans listed on pages 3-7 through 3-10 by impact/significance and provide a general summary of the nature/authority of the plan. For example, the Metropolitan Council's Framework and Policy Plans, and the comprehensive plans of Minneapolis and St. Paul have requirements and/or mechanisms called for by state statute. Other plans may be advisory only.

Response ProHLP-022. Plans are listed according to jurisdiction in Section 3.1 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProPM-008. Concerned that [not] all impacts are discussed (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0485) ProPM-300

The DEIS does not sufficiently identify the impacts of the project and/or effects of the preferred alternative, and the DEIS fails to propose sufficient mitigation alternatives. The DEIS fails to sufficiently identify all impacts of the proposed Project. Among those impacts that are identified in the DEIS, not all impacts are accurately described in character or scope. Further, mitigation alternatives are lacking with respect to both unidentified and identified impacts. In general, the DEIS sees the Project as an improvement in the transportation infrastructure and an economic stimulant for the impacted area. The DEIS fails to sufficiently consider whether this transportation project and attendant economic development will "facilitate the preservation and enhancement of neighborhoods in the Central Corridor" and "acknowledge the individual character and aspirations of each place served, and of the region as a whole." These goals are all but ignored by the Agency in the DEIS. In this section, the Equity Coalition presents impacts that are either not identified or are inaccurately identified. The Coalition also presents mitigation alternatives that will serve the Project's stated goal of improving the Central Corridor while maintaining the existing communities' character and identity.

Response ProPM-008. Since publication of the AA/DEIS, the City of St. Paul developed the Central Corridor Development Strategy (a chapter of the City's Comprehensive Plan). In addition to other important elements, the Development Strategy contains a set of guidelines

for development at and around station locations including parks, connections to the neighborhoods, building mass and design, and other guidelines to honor and enhance neighborhood character. This plan has been taken into consideration and is described in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProPM-009. Concerns about the LRT design and construction impacts
(1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0167) ProPM-255

In order for LRT to succeed, the city needs to push for the best designed system. The LRT should encourage as much nonauto usage as possible. This includes pedestrian, bike, etc. In addition, the LRT should be built in a way that causes as little disruption as possible to the existing businesses. In order for LRT to be successful, it needs to enhance, not destroy, the businesses that already operate along its proposed path.

Response ProPM-009. As discussed in Chapter 11 of the FEIS, extensive outreach activities were conducted as a part of the AA/DEIS, SDEIS, and FEIS to inform area residents and businesses about the project and to listen to their concerns. These activities have allowed the businesses to provide input on the proposed alignment and alternatives, station locations, environmental issues, future development implications, the project planning process, the selection of the Preferred Alternative, and mitigation strategies.

Issue Summary ProPOL-005. Impacts on property taxes and rents (13)

Comments:

(CCLRP0836) ProPOL-5

... the land values will increase within probably a quarter of a mile of those transit stops and so we should tax very significantly the windfall profits. That is, the increase in the value of that land over and above of what the general value of land would be beyond a quarter of a mile.

(CCLRP0150) ProPOL-7

2. Taxes.

(CCLRP0280) ProPOL-11

6. Private Property Impacts. Rising property values are already creating financial stress for low-income residents of the Corridor, and this pressure will increase with LRT construction. Programs must be created to help low-income residents stay in their homes.

(CCLRP0901) ProPOL-13

One, no-cost business planning services and no-interest or low-interest loans for small independent businesses located on the line who wish to remain open during construction; and, two, a short-term moratorium on residential property tax increases, for example, for homeowners within three blocks of the light rail for three years during and after construction.

(CCLRP0182) ProPOL-16

Opponents of the light rail have cited concerns that the line will drive up property taxes for residents in the area. I would support a freeze on property taxes for low-income residents, in order to allow the benefits of this project to reach everyone. The neighborhoods along the line worry about development which may occur along the line and a change in the feel of their neighborhoods. While I respect these worries, I do believe that many changes will actually revitalize these neighborhoods and provide them with a wonderful link to the rest of the city.

(CCLRP0485) ProPOL-17

Mitigation alternatives can include: 5. Property tax freezes: institute a permanent tax freeze for current EJ home or business owners in harms way of gentrification and displacement to help them remain in the area.

(CCLRP0485) ProPOL-18

Mitigation alternatives can include: 2. Rent/tax increase and displacement assistance: provide financial assistance to help EJ business owners and renters/homeowners who are at risk of being priced out of the area to either currently buy properties in the area before prices escalate (a business or home dwelling) and/or offer financial assistance to help them buy into newer affordable developments and have first right of refusal to locate back in the area if at risk of being economically displaced out. Provide financial support to help with temporary or long-term relocation support for those who get economically displaced from the area.

(CCLRP0531) ProPOL-19

The City of St. Paul take all necessary action to prevent property tax increases in nearby residential areas that would force home owners to leave their homes. This may include decisions not to rezone from single family to multiple families in those residential areas.

(CCLRP0137) ProPOL-28

2. Issue of property taxes - that increased property values will be borne by residents who can't afford increased taxes. (sic)

(CCLRP0047) ProPOL-29

As for residents, the city needs to plan controls on property tax inflation so that current residents aren't taxed out of a formerly affordable home.

(CCLRP0001) ProPOL-38

I am appalled that property taxes (mine) will increase. Why should I pay more for something I don't even want in the first place?

(CCLRP0545) ProPOL-43

A tax overlay district should be considered, or tax structures that allow long-term residents to maintain current tax rates while imposing higher rates on new developments. Large nationally-based corporations should be taxed at higher rates than locally owned small businesses.

(CCLRP0108) ProPOL-44

1. It must include a plan for property tax relief for current homeowners within a least 4 blocks on either side of the line.

Response ProPOL-005. Property tax rates and rent controls, though important to many corridor neighborhoods, are not within the scope of this EIS. However, the City of St. Paul adopted the Central Corridor Development Strategy in October 2007, which attempts to minimize the effects of market forces in vulnerable neighborhoods through a set of guidelines for the development of the Central Corridor LRT and surrounding neighborhoods.. The Development Strategy contains an Inclusive Housing strategy that is intended to mitigate the potential displacement of low-income individuals and families from the corridor as property values rise. Further, specific strategies are identified for home ownership assistance. The Central Corridor Development Strategy is referenced in the FEIS in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 and Chapter 5.

Issue Summary SocLU-012. Concerns about property impacts (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0343) ProPM-145

My husband and I own the SUBWAY restaurant at 2121 University Ave West, St. Paul. We would NOT be in favor of Light Rail Transit if it negatively impacted our restaurant.

(CCLRP0922) SocLU-019

My family's home was taken with the UniDale Mall. So we've had two moves already and now they're talking about moving this. And University is my back door. I have a big problem with it. And my main street of transportation to get into the other part of the neighborhood because it's already divided is Victoria. Okay. And you're talking about bringing something through here. I have a big problem with that.

Response SocLU-012. Right of way and property acquisition data are discussed in Section 3.3 of the FEIS. This information was revised and updated using detailed design completed during development of the FEIS. The Uniform Relocations and Real Property Assistance Act of 1970, as amended, is the federal regulation under which residential and business property would be acquired and replacement for this project. Relocation assistance will follow the guidelines set forth in Title 49, Part 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations (49 CFR Part 24 and FTA Circular 5010.1C dated October 1, 1998, as amended).

Section: 3.1 - Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections

Issue Summary PlaTE-014. Acknowledge in report that Hiawatha LRT is in operation (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0435) PlaTE-169

Page 3-5, Downtown Minneapolis. The FEIS should acknowledge that the Hiawatha LRT is now in operation. It would be appropriate to note some LRT facts such as how many stations there are downtown and where and/or how the Hiawatha LRT line has affected land use in the area.

Response PlaTE-014. The FEIS has been updated to include the current operation of the Hiawatha LRT in downtown Minneapolis. The effects of the Hiawatha Line on land use is not in the scope of this FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-116. Report should specifically note the large student population that relies on transit and where it uses it (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-143

1.2.2 Pg 1-3 GROWING ISSUES IN THE CORRIDOR, Demographics - In identifying the area as one with a high percent of the population that depends on public transit for mobility, the DEIS should specifically note the large student population that relies on transit.

Response PlaTP-116. Section 3.1 of the FEIS identifies and describes populations located along the Preferred Alternative, the sources of the data, and in many cases, the methods used to calculate the data.

Issue Summary SocLU-005. EIS needs to reference Minneapolis master plans (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0435) ProHLP-035

Section 3.2.6: Mitigation Measures Related to Land Use• Page 3-14. Revise the paragraph as follows: "The City of Minneapolis and City of St. Paul may find it necessary to revise their comprehensive plans in response to the proposed implementation of either Central Corridor build alternative. Metropolitan area cities, including Minneapolis and St. Paul, are required by state law to update the Comprehensive Plans by 2008. These updated plans may revise policy for land use, transportation and/or other plan elements and could both respond to and affect the implementation of the Central Corridor."

(CCLRP0457) SocLU-007

Page 3-13: Consistency with Local Plans and Impacts Related to Land Use. The DEIS does not include how the Central Corridor project is consistent and/or inconsistent with the Southeast Minneapolis Industrial (SEMI) Refined Master Plan (adopted in 2001) or the Downtown East/North Loop Master Plan (adopted 2003).

(CCLRP0457) SocLU-024

Page 3-8 - 3-9: Comprehensive and Small Area Plans. The DEIS needs to reference the Southeast Minneapolis Industrial (SEMI) Refined Master Plan (adopted in 2001) and the Downtown East/North Loop Master Plan (adopted 2003).

Response SocLU-005. The SEMI plan was included in the SDEIS and is carried into the FEIS-see Section 3.1 for a full description. The Downtown East/North Loop Master Plan is also described in the FEIS in Section 3.1.

Issue Summary SocLU-008. Need to include the University of Minnesota's proposed Gopher stadium in list of Major Activity Centers (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0435) SocLU-013

Page 3-5 and 3-6, University of Minnesota. In describing general land use patterns at the University, the FEIS should mention the cluster of sport-related uses at the eastern edge of the campus. This area is also the site of the very recently funded Gopher Football stadium.

(CCLRP0457) SocLU-025

Page 3-12: Major Activity Centers. The University of Minnesota's proposed Gopher stadium needs to be added to the list of Major Activity Centers.

Response SocLU-008. The TCF Bank Stadium and Williams and Mariucci arenas are discussed in various sections of Chapter 3 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocLU-009. All University of Minnesota activity centers must be included in the EIS Major Activity Center List (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) SocLU-014

Section/page/table is 3.2.4, page 3-12, MAJOR ACTIVITY CENTERS, The University of Minnesota Twin Cities Campus is the largest in the State system and 2nd largest in the country, with 51,175 students and over 16,200 staff and faculty. The Twin Cities campus includes 22 million gross square feet of space. Over 400,000 people each year visit the outpatient health clinics alone. In addition to the 14,000 seat Williams arena and the 10,000 Mariucci Arena, the list of bullet points should include our 3 performing arts facilities and the planned 50,000 seat on-campus football stadium.

Response SocLU-009. The three performing arts facilities have been added to U of M campus descriptions in the FEIS in Sections 3.1 and 3.2.

Issue Summary SocLU-016. EIS must address impacts of new on-campus football stadium, expansion of the University's biomedical research facilities, and new public/private research park and remove the Vikings from on-campus stadium discussion (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) SocLU-016

Section/page/table is 5.2.2, page 5-15. TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT (TOD) ANALYSIS. East Bank Station and Stadium Village Station Planned Development: Planned development that will impact the East Bank and Stadium Village stations include a new on-

campus football stadium (2009 opening), as well as the expansion of the University's biomedical research facilities, and the development of a public/private research park. The DEIS references University interest in working with the Vikings on a stadium. The recently approved stadium will serve the University only; the statement regarding the Vikings should be removed.

(CCLRP0443) SocLU-035

Section/page/table is 3.2.1, page 3-5, LAND USE, University of Minnesota, Current land use plans by the University are to develop an on-campus football stadium and research facilities north of University Avenue to the proposed Granary Road and east of Oak Street.

Response SocLU-016. These plans and facilities are included in Chapter 3 and Chapter 9 of the FEIS. The FEIS addresses the public/private research park in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 - University/Prospect Park segment descriptions and in Chapter 9 - Indirect and Cumulative Impacts. No mention of the Vikings use of the TCF Bank Stadium exists in the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocLU-017. Year 2000 Census data significantly underestimates the population in and around the University of Minnesota (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) SocLU-027

Section/page/table is 3.1.1, page 3-2, POPULATION, Year 2000 Census data significantly underestimates the population in and around the University of Minnesota. Students historically are underrepresented. The University neighborhood includes the following types of housing: Residence halls (6,300 beds), fraternities/sororities, and private student developments such as Argyle, Grand Marc, Melrose, Jefferson Court, etc. Current estimates for the total student population in these types of housing alone are 9,510 on the East bank and 1,320 on the West bank.

(CCLRP0443) SocLU-034

Section/page/table is 3.3.1, page 3-16, NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS, University of Minnesota - Paragraph 3, Although the University remains a large commuter campus, a growing number of students live on campus or just off campus in the surrounding neighborhoods. Year 2000 Census data significantly underestimates the population in and around the University of Minnesota. Students historically are underrepresented. The University neighborhood includes the following types of housing: Residence halls (6,300 beds), fraternities/sororities, and private student developments such as Argyle, Grand Marc, Melrose, Jefferson Court, etc. Current estimates for the total student population in these types of housing alone are 9,510 on the East bank and 1,320 on the West Bank.

Response SocLU-017. The latest population data available have been used for analyses in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the FEIS.

Section: 3.2 - Community Cohesion

Issue Summary EngRW-016. Concerns in regard to maintaining community cohesion (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0154) SocSS-60

The MPCC recommends semaphore controlled, at grade crossings at quarter-mile intervals or less to maintain community cohesion and mobility for alternative modes. Striping along the mainline transit right of way is sufficient protection and we would discourage the placement of physical barriers or fencing.

Response EngRW-016. Preserving and enhancing community character through public infrastructure investment is a key consideration of the Metropolitan Council, the Central Corridor LRT project, and the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul. FEIS Chapter 3 provides a detailed discussion of the existing corridor environment and how the project intends to improve upon existing conditions. Construction of the LRT will improve the existing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure along University Avenue—this will be important because the current configuration of University Avenue poses a barrier to pedestrians. The development of the LRT will channel pedestrian movements to crossing locations at intersecting streets, where curb improvements and pedestrian islands within the street will shield pedestrians and bicyclists from both LRT vehicles and automobile traffic. Crossings will be available throughout the corridor, at both signalized and non-signalized intersections. Landscaping enhancements along the line including trees and public furniture will also help improve the appearance of the corridor and the appeal of local businesses. Section 6.3 of the FEIS reports that the Central Corridor LRT uses a fixed-guideway with semi-exclusive rights-of-way allowing vehicular cross street traffic at signalized intersections only (approximately every 1/4 mile). Nonsignalized intersections are provided between the signalized intersections to maintain as much as possible existing legal pedestrian crossings throughout the Central Corridor. Further details are described in Section 2.2 and Section 6.2 of the FEIS. Community cohesion is addressed in Section 3.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTE-020. Concerned about impact to Pilgrim Baptist Church (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0005) PlaTE-38

As a long time (member) of Pilgrim Baptist Church, which is just two blocks off University Ave, I am very concerned about our church building project in the near future, and the forceful influence it will have on the membership.

Response PlaTE-020. Impacts to neighborhoods, community services, and community cohesion are discussed in Section 3.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTE-022. LRT will have negative impact on communities (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0466) PlaTE-48

said she believes there are legitimate transit concerns in the Central Corridor but she does not believe that light rail is the answer to those concerns. She believes that LRT on University Avenue would be invasive, divisive, and detrimental to the residential and commercial communities.

Response PlaTE-022. The construction of the LRT would not create a physical or social barrier., Construction of the LRT would not require the acquisition of any buildings or structures. The capital investment is expected to help infuse much needed funds to neighborhoods along the corridor. A discussion of neighborhood and community cohesion issues identified with the development of the Central Corridor LRT is provided in FEIS Sections 3.2 and 3.8. A discussion of investment potential and economics is provided in FEIS Chapter 5.

Issue Summary PlaTE-024. Concerns about project impacts to communities and public transportation (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0878) PlaTE-61

Light rail will also not meet the needs of those in the affected communities. Stops are too far apart and will not be pedestrian friendly for those with limited mobility and further will cause additional congestion where you are no longer able to make the turns that you currently make.

(CCLRP0478) PlaTE-99

How have you measured the decrease in the quality of public transportation for those people who will be adversely affected?

Response PlaTE-024. Impacts to neighborhoods and environmental justice communities are discussed in sections 3.2 and 3.8 of the FEIS, respectively. Traffic impacts and the methods approved by the Federal Transit Administration used to measure them are discussed in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTE-025. Must ensure that LRT is not barrier separating communities (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0288) PlaTE-4

Light rail should not be a barrier, separating the North side of University with the South. To prevent this, we need to ensure that pedestrians can cross the street at frequent locations - at least every two blocks

(CCLRP0878) PlaTE-60

It will also have a divisive effect on the community. I believe that many of those in the community will choose to shop in areas that will not involve crossing light rail or having to intersect with it in any capacity.

(CCLRP0545) PlaTE-67

7) That access to local businesses and to neighborhoods south of our own is maintained. We do not want the new transit line to act as a physical barrier between our neighborhood and our neighbors south of the avenue or between us and the businesses in the Midway district. Pedestrian crossings over University Avenue should be placed no more than two blocks apart and placement of fences or concrete barriers along the center of the avenue should be minimized. Such barriers should only be included if absolutely necessary to ensure pedestrian safety.

Response PlaTE-025. Impacts to neighborhoods, community services, and community cohesion are discussed in Section 3.2 of the FEIS. Pedestrians will be allowed to cross University Avenue at all signalized intersections and most unsignalized intersections, which is generally at 1/8 mile intervals, or nearly every block. Safety barriers will be put in places where required to meet all applicable safety standards.

Issue Summary PlaTP-060. Concern about a separation of neighborhoods with LRT alignment (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0020) PlaTP-231

1. LRT will create a separation of neighborhoods to University Ave w/LRT barriers preventing crossing the Avenue.

Response PlaTP-060. Construction of the LRT will improve the existing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure along University Avenue. The development of the LRT will channel pedestrian movements to crossing locations at intersecting streets, where curb improvements and pedestrian islands within the street will shield pedestrians and bicyclists from both LRT vehicles and automobile traffic. These islands will not block pedestrians from crossing the street. Pedestrian crossings will be available throughout the corridor at signalized and non-signalized intersections.

Issue Summary SocNC-001. Project must give special consideration to community cohesion (25)

Comments:

(CCLRP0489) SocNC-002

It goes without saying that this issue has several implications for the well being of our communities. Anxieties abound as many fear that the development of light rail will usher in construction or economically related displacement. Already rising land cost associated with light rail reinforces this concern according to yesterday's Pioneer Press article, In grip of a land rush: Property prices on St. Paul's University Avenue are skyrocketing with the prospect

of light-rail, a Pioneer Press survey finds. But not everyone is pleased. Wanting to ensure most of all that revitalization does not lead to adverse effects and ultimately displacement, we are expecting that this time around, policy makers will not

sacrifice the well being of impacted communities. Remember, urban renewal policies of the past have shown us what that could lead to.

(CCLRP0003) SocNC-003

I'm concerned if light rail is put in down University Ave, the quality of affordable life may decline.

(CCLRP0485) SocNC-005

Although the DEIS indicates that transit oriented development is going to occur along University Avenue, it fails to address the full range of impacts that such development will entail. Instead, the DEIS assumes without analysis that any development is an economic value. On the contrary, this development can, if unchecked, result in a project that fails to achieve its stated goal of preserving community cohesion and identity.

(CCLRP0260) SocNC-007

As an urban planner and landscape architect with an office in Minneapolis and a residence in St. Paul, and as a five-year member of the Livable Communities Advisory Committee of the Met Council, I am acutely aware of the importance of an integrated transit system to the livability of communities within the Twin Cities. To be truly successful, such a system should include a variety of transit options working in concert: commuter rail, light rail, buses both on-street and in dedicated corridors, state-of-the-art streetcars, circulators within neighborhoods, as well as accommodations for bicycles and pedestrian options. Together, these systems will promote a healthier population (air quality, more exercise), less dependent on the automobile.

(CCLRP0904) SocNC-010

We've heard lots of talk about connecting the two downtowns, but this is going to go through communities that have suffered for a long time because of development being done to them and not for them. So I want this construction to look at taking those into consideration of those most impacted communities.

(CCLRP0781) SocNC-019

In closing, TLC asks Ramsey and Hennepin County and the Metropolitan Council to consider the following items: and strive to balance the opportunity for development with the need to preserve the uniqueness and other characteristics of the corridor.

(CCLRP0002) SocNC-020

Please figure out how to preserve neighborhoods. I dislike seeing a Starbucks going up alongside new condominiums at Franklin and Nicollet in Minneapolis. The character of "eat street" will be gone if that continues. I don't want that to happen to Frogtown.

(CCLRP0040) SocNC-021

A. Preserving the diverse character of the neighborhood and businesses. I was not an urban planner, so I can't advise on the exact strategy - businesses, low income homeowners, and renters need to be buffered from the initial spike in real estate values. I chose my neighborhood because I can get Vietnamese, Korean, Ethiopian, Turkish and Somali food within walking distance and see all shapes, sizes, colors, and ages of people while traveling there.

(CCLRP0447) SocNC-028

As creative thinkers we believe in clean safe efficient transportation, however we have not heard the positive benefits that this project will bring to the hearts of our communities. Is this billion-dollar project more about increasing the tax base of the city, to realize more gentrification, or to show the power and heavy handedness of our elected officials? This project would increase the property taxes of the surrounding neighborhoods affected and force businesses and over time homeowners out, if this project moves forward as planned.

(CCLRP0340) SocNC-032

This also includes surrounding development. It would be good to encourage high density apartments, walkable shops, post office, and banks, and more attractive storefronts than we have now. Try to discourage any more car dealers, car repair shops, or 'adult' stores. large box type shopping centers (like Super Target) are also a blight unless they promise to situate their stores in a way that is pedestrian friendly rather than car friendly. When you are carrying bags from the store to the light rail or bus stop, a one block long walk from the door to the stop through a parking lot is very frustrating.

(CCLRP0407) SocNC-049

The City of Saint Paul recommends that in Preliminary Engineering, as well as in the City's Development Strategy work, special consideration be given to community cohesion issues throughout the Central Corridor, and particularly the neighborhoods east of Lexington Avenue.

(CCLRP0930) SocNC-061

We are once again going to have dilapidated homes, the prostitutes and the drug dealers rolling through there.

(CCLRP0447) SocNC-103

The University Corridor is Not Hiawatha from Snelling to Rice Street. These are our communities where we live, work and have our business's that lesson any burden on our gov't and share in the idea of being self sufficient and reliant.

(CCLRP0470) SocNC-153

The LRT alternative does not do anything to preserve or enhance my neighborhood, nor does it provide anything to further its aspirations. My neighborhood, Hamline Midway, is a traditional, predominantly single-family community that values our history. Most people who purchase homes in Hamline Midway do so because of the overwhelmingly single-family character, and our aspiration is to keep it that way. In fact, Hamline Midway is the largest

contiguous single-family neighborhood along the entire University Avenue Corridor.

(CCLRP0047) SocNC-156

However, I believe strongly that stability of existing businesses and residents should be carefully addressed.

(CCLRP0002) SocNC-166

Maintaining the existing vibrant communities along the light rail is also crucial to maintaining the quality, livability, and economic vitality of the Twin Cities.

(CCLRP0007) SocNC-172

I feel that the people in S.U. along Aurora, Fuller Avenue, Central, and St. Anthony are being put in a bad position.

(CCLRP0910) SocNC-174

My concern has to do with what's happening between one end of the corridor and the other. We're in the middle. Ninety-three percent of the people who stood up to speak were from one end of the city or the other -- one end of the corridor or the other, mostly from Minneapolis. It needs to be noted that most of the support came from the business people either in the City of Minneapolis or the City of St. Paul, but nothing about the people living in the middle.

(CCLRP0856) SocNC-191

On a more personal level, my daughter Mara owns a home on Sherburne, one block north of University Avenue. She and her neighbors have invested heavily in their homes and want to see the area prosper. My hope is that light rail can give my daughter and her neighbors a shot in the arm.

(CCLRP0938) SocNC-198

It is almost extermination of my area, the area I grew up in, and my people.

(CCLRP0900) SocNC-211

My concerns include the impact to my neighborhoods, current makeup of single-family homes, and any negative impacts parking would have on my neighborhood. I don't want to see single family homes turned into duplexes or razed for multiunit apartments or condos in my neighborhood or others, but - and, finally, if this is built I hope that the project holds travel time savings as its core goal.

(CCLRP0296) SocNC-217

Minnesota Youth Symphonies has housed their business office and rehearsed at Highland High School in St. Paul for the past 17 of our 34 year history. We are thrilled to see the corridor being developed and know how positively it can grow the community. I hope the arts are being considered in the planning so the community can continue to be enriched and enlightened by what the arts have to offer. I would like to ask that all consideration be given to promoting and giving arts organizations and individual artists the opportunity to live and thrive along the proposed University Avenue light rail corridor. I feel it is essential to the community to have affordable rental and purchase options for arts organizations and

individual artists. The arts are an economic boon to any community. Many arts organizations already call this area their home and it would be a huge mistake to lose their contribution to the community by forcing them to move elsewhere or disband altogether. If the idea of light rail and development of the corridor is to bring people together, what better way to do it than through the arts.

(CCLRP0141) SocNC-224

I have lived at the largest P.H.A. hi-rise in St. Paul (280 Ravoux) 3 blocks South of University Ave for 20 years and I absolutely do not think this project is in the best interests of the community along University Ave

(CCLRP0406) SocSoc-002

The recent track record of LRT development in the U.S. has focused on building the project on time and within budget. And although these are laudable objectives, to honor these above all other objectives ignores the fact that such transit projects are to serve communities through which they run, and not just move people.

(CCLRP0478) SocSoc-003

I have a number of concerns regarding the impact of LRT on quality of life. Quality of life aspects should be considered separately for the (somewhat overlapping and non-inclusive) categories: 1. residents; 2. bus riders, 3. automobile users, 4. LRT users, 5. pedestrians, 6. bikers, 7. elderly, 8. handicapped.

Response SocNC-001. Many concerns have been expressed about the effect of the Central Corridor LRT on the adjacent neighborhoods, communities, and the quality of life for individuals and families living in them. Many of these concerns such as zoning, development review, and business incentives are not within the purview of the Metropolitan Council and the Central Corridor LRT Project, but are within the jurisdiction of the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis. In anticipation of these concerns, since the publication of the AA/DEIS, two new plans have been adopted by the City of St. Paul: The Fitzgerald Park Precinct Plan (Area Plan) and the Central Corridor Development Strategy that was adopted by the St. Paul City Council as a chapter of the City's Comprehensive Plan. The Central Corridor Development Strategy creates a set of guidelines for the development of the light rail line and surrounding areas to help stabilize the effects of market forces in the neighborhoods. The City has also conducted more detailed planning for the areas approximately 1/4-mile around the seven planned LRT stations on University Avenue, and similar planning efforts for other St. Paul stations, including the three future infill stations, will be completed in 2009-10. The recommended strategy includes establishing location-specific Transit Opportunity Zones (TOZs) along the corridor. The City of Minneapolis is updating its comprehensive plan, The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth, which recognizes the importance of strategic infrastructure investments along transportation corridors, the vitality of its downtown neighborhoods, and its relationship to important institutions such as the U of M. These plans have been taken into consideration and are cited in the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocNC-002. Concerns over community cohesion by having effective "fence" down middle of street (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0192) SocNC-009

2. The flavor of the neighborhood will change drastically with a fence down the middle of the street. You know what fences do to these places--turn them into slums. I like being able to cross the street at any intersection. I also like seeing the businesses across from wherever I am, and knowing how to get to them.

(CCLRP0407) SocNC-017

The area of concern in this section relates to community cohesion, whereby pedestrian and vehicular crossing of University Avenue will be more limited after completion of LRT construction. Limiting pedestrian crossing potentials may erode community cohesion disproportionately in those areas where percentage of transit-dependent populations are high and those areas where culturally people walk more than drive. In addition, in areas for which Rondo Avenue displacement is still a painful memory, considerations of community cohesion is particularly significant.

Response SocNC-002. Community cohesion—maintaining the physical, emotional, and cultural connections of individual neighborhoods—is a key consideration of the Metropolitan Council. The development of the LRT will channel pedestrian movements to crossing locations at intersecting streets, where curb improvements and pedestrian islands within the street will shield pedestrians and bicyclists from both LRT vehicles and automobile traffic. These islands will not prevent pedestrians from crossing the street. Pedestrian crossings will be available throughout the corridor—signalized and non-signalized—at almost every intersection. Each of these design elements would improve pedestrian safety.

Section: 3.2 - Community Involvement

Issue Summary NR-024. Project should benefit all along corridor (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0177) NR-4

I sincerely hope for an approved plan that is highly equitable and advances the interest of all along the corridor - especially those most often excluded or harmed by inequitable development.

(CCLRP0154) PlaTE-21

Merriam park Community Plan Policy 2 calls for new mixed-use and located along transit routes, Policy 7 calls for mixed-use development along University Avenue, and Policy 26 state the LRT should contribute to the neighborhood rather than just shuttle people through.

(CCLRP0406) SocNC-139

Through months of study and community discussion, culminating with a public hearing before the Council last week, we, like you, have identified a series of issues to be addressed during the preliminary engineering phase of the project. We look forward to working with

our colleagues in our partner agencies-and with the community-to address these issues and ensure that the construction of LRT represents a benefit to all those who live, work and visit in the corridor. The City of Saint Paul has accepted the responsibility of doing the detailed land use planning in the corridor so that development along University Avenue both complements and is complemented by the regional transit system. Through our Planning Commission, and in partnership with our community, we intend to take full advantage of this important public investment.

Response NR-024. The increased access to the neighborhoods brought by transit improvements and the siting of LRT stations may act as a catalyst for new investment along the University Avenue corridor. Many of the proposed stations would be considered community amenities that would add to the stature of the adjacent neighborhoods and serve as focal points of daily activity. The City of St. Paul adopted the Central Corridor Development Strategy in October 2007—a plan intended to address development issues along the Central Corridor and make recommendations for regulating future growth and development in the corridor. This plan is discussed in FEIS Chapter 3, Sections 3.1 and 3.2, and Chapter 5, Section 5.2. Furthermore, the Metropolitan Council has established the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) program in order to utilize the skills and services of those businesses considered socially or economically disadvantaged.

Issue Summary PlaTP-090. Commit (formally) to community involvement in the planning process (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0171) PlaTP-085

That said, my fear is that some of the original goals for the Central Corridor transit line will get lost in the scramble to secure federal funding and build the light rail line. When we move into Preliminary Engineering, the job of the Met Council, MNDOT and the Central Corridor Management Committee will be to complete a detailed transit plan that meets FTA requirements and enables us to secure federal funding for a light rail in the Central Corridor. It has been suggested that there should be a Citizen's Advisory Committee, but so far there has been no formal commitment to ongoing community involvement in the planning process.

Response PlaTP-090. Planning for the Central Corridor LRT included the formation of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). Chapter 11 of the SDEIS and the FEIS detail the membership of the CAC and its activities.

Issue Summary ProPOL-004. Community benefit agreements (4)

Comments:

(CCLRP0136) EngCI-51

Community Benefit Agreements should be part of this project to be sure (1) local businesses are able to continue during construction,

(CCLRP0135) ProPOL-27

Community benefit agreement should be included in the planning process.

(CCLRP0901) ProPOL-31

Many of the burdens, however, would be short-term and localized. So I urge the project plan to include specific community support costs.

(CCLRP0136) ProPOL-33

Community Benefit Agreements should be part of this project

Response ProPOL-004. Although community benefits agreements appear to be important to the neighborhoods along the Central Corridor LRT alignment and the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis, they are not within the scope of this FEIS. The City of Saint Paul, however, adopted the Central Corridor Development Strategy (October 2007). The Development Strategy includes Transit Opportunity Zone overlay districts (TOZ) that would guide new development. Within that process, it may be possible for elements of a community benefits agreement to be addressed. The Central Corridor Development Strategy is referenced in the FEIS in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 and Chapter 5.

Issue Summary ProPURP-005. Work with communities to ensure project improves quality of life in communities (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0177) ProPURP-091

A Transit-Oriented Development plan slated to cost approximately \$840 million deserves and requires ample consideration of alternatives. While I applaud the significant amount of work that has gone into the consideration of alternatives and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I strongly urge you to work in partnership with potentially affected constituencies to ensure that the approach taken improves rather than erodes their quality of life.

Response ProPURP-005. The community outreach staff's responsibility is to engage the public in the preliminary engineering process and share their concerns with project engineers to explore how to resolve potential negative impacts. As the project progresses into construction, the outreach staff will be key in notifying businesses and residents of construction plans, road closures and bus re-routes, as well as being a point of contact for construction related emergencies such as power outages. More detail about the public involvement process and the Metropolitan Council's Central Corridor LRT project outreach staff can be found in FEIS Chapter 11.

Issue Summary PubPI-011. Concerns about public and community involvement with the project. (7)

Comments:

(CCLRP0460) PubPI-015

[name withheld] said a common theme is that communication about this project has been spotty at best and misleading or non-existent at worst. People want to know their concerns are heard and addressed. Their group suggests that residents don't want to hear the engineering details but want to hear how the project is going to affect them personally.

(CCLRP0407) PubPI-020

The City supports a Preliminary Engineering process that fully engages the community.

(CCLRP0897) PubPI-037

My question is who will go? I don't seem to think that there's a whole lot of other issues being addressed. Who will step up? Will the city council members that are here step up and talk to the people in the communities as to how to better serve them? Will people have a place to air their grievances other than a few select meetings and get to understand what this could and would and should be to their community? I'm really concerned that for all the riders that you will get on the LRT -- and there should be many -- there will be many people who will still not understand it, still not want to participate and feel bad about it because it was done to them.

(CCLRP0462) PubPI-047

They emphasize the importance of assuring that community voices be heard and have influence throughout the planning, design and construction project.

(CCLRP0915) PubPI-060

So I encourage you to keep the community involved to a greater extent and to seek input from the people who are really affected by light rail.

(CCLRP0171) PubPI-067

If local neighborhoods have no voice in decision-making, the needs of people who live and work along the corridor may well be overlooked in the drive to complete the project. If the people most directly affected by the light rail are not involved in the planning process, they will feel this new transit system is being imposed on them, as was the case when Route 94 was built through the middle of the Rondo neighborhood in the 50s.

(CCLRP0829) PubPI-081

...provide the greatest possible opportunity for public comment and public educational process.

Response PubPI-011. A comprehensive plan for public involvement was developed as part of preliminary engineering and is summarized in Chapter 11 of the FEIS. This plan did include outreach to all communities along the corridor and also included hiring Community Outreach Coordinators whose sole responsibility is to interface with residents, business owners and other stakeholders in the process. In addition, a Manager of Communications was hired whose sole responsibility is to get information in various media about the details of the project out to the public.

Issue Summary PubPI-013. [Community Advisory Committee effectiveness and construction information availability](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0178) PubPI-021

Citizens/Community Advisory Function - ongoing mechanism, input, funding. A. The DCC insists that, from the outset of mode selection, a Citizens' Advisory Committee with strong community representation be established to work in partnership with the Met Council and the Central Corridor Coordinating Committee for the duration of the project. This means a representative Citizens Advisory Committee with real power to influence the decisions and outcomes on this transit system. B.

Essential to any public project is transparency throughout the planning and construction processes, in this case to ensure that the Central Corridor system provides all possible benefits for the people it serves along the Corridor, from downtown to downtown. C. A 24-hour construction hotline should operate in multiple languages for residents and businesses, along with regular dissemination of information through multiple media outlets, include public service announcements, an active website and meetings with neighborhood organizations and district councils.

Response PubPI-013. A Community Advisory Committee was formed in early preliminary engineering as a means of engaging community representatives and leaders in the process. The CAC will continue to meet throughout advanced preliminary engineering, final design, and construction of the Central Corridor LRT. The CAC was constituted to intentionally represent all geographic, neighborhood, ethnic, and cultural interests along the corridor. The outreach staff will develop an outreach program for construction. Construction impacts are discussed in Chapters 3, 4, and 6 of the FEIS, and public outreach, is discussed in Chapter 11 of the FEIS. Suggestions noted.

Issue Summary PubPI-016. Community Advisory Committee must keep the public informed (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0171) PubPI-031

The CAC should be responsible for informing the public about plans for building light rail and mitigating impacts, and for bringing community concerns to the CCMC to be addressed. The agencies overseeing planning for the Central Corridor should be required to respond to all substantive issues raised by the community during Preliminary Engineering, and to develop strategies to meet the concerns of the CAC.

Response PubPI-016. The Community Advisory Committee was constituted to intentionally represent all geographic, neighborhood, ethnic, and cultural interests along the corridor. Each member of the CAC is charged with interfacing with the community he or she represents and bringing forward those voices to the CAC. At each monthly CCMC meeting (made up of locally elected officials and agency representatives) there is a CAC report to update that group on the CAC's business. Issues raised by the community through public meetings, public input and comments on the AA/DEIS were addressed during early stages of preliminary engineering through the development of Issues Teams charged with resolving major outstanding issues. This process is discussed in Chapter 11 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PubPI-019. Concern about community involvement in the LRT development and construction process (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0779) PubPI-038

How will these communities prominent at the east end of the corridor be given a voice that will be heard in the development process? What will be done to ensure significant participation of people of color in the construction of the light rail line?

Response PubPI-019. In preliminary engineering a comprehensive public involvement program was created, as discussed in Chapter 11 of the FEIS. This included hiring Community Outreach Coordinators fluent in the languages most commonly spoken by area residents and business owners, including an Outreach Coordinator fluent in Hmong. A Community Advisory Committee was also a means of community outreach. The CAC was constituted to intentionally represent all geographic, neighborhood, ethnic, and cultural interests along the corridor.

Issue Summary PubPI-020. Concerns about the involvement of small businesses in the planning process (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0278) PubPI-039

My only concern regarding the development of the LRT is that more concerned small business operators are involved in the conceptual planning. I sincerely hope the LRT is built and planned in such a way that it benefits the citizens.

(CCLRP0039) PubPI-042

I am concerned that small businesses several blocks off the corridor are not being considered in terms of impact. My business is on Hamline and Thomas and will definitely feel this project as my customers travel across University on Snelling or Lex. Please make more of an effort to keep us informed also. Borealis Yarns, 1430 Thomas Ave, 55106

(CCLRP0934) PubPI-078

So, I am very concerned about it. I am a taxpayer and I want to make sure that our voices are heard. If somebody could maybe get back to me or let us know what is going on, and what the project is going to be, and how the impact is going to be for the small businesses in the area here. I would appreciate it. Otherwise, I am very disappointed that the Central Corridor transit project has not included lots of businesses, including my business, and I am very concerned about that. I would like for the Central Corridor transit project committee to do a little bit more extensive research into what the impact will be for the businesses and share those results with the local businesses before proceeding with the project. As business owners, we have not received any of that data or research to support that this will be a successful project for this area. I would very much like to see that happen first before this project starts or this project is approved for the near future.

Response PubPI-020. A Business Advisory Council was formed early in the preliminary engineering process. This group is co-chaired by the executive director of the Midway Chamber of Commerce and the executive director of the Metropolitan Consortium of Community Developers (MCCD). The BAC meets monthly to receive updates about issues from project staff, to give input on the project and to discuss issues as they affect local businesses. The Metropolitan Council also works with the Central Corridor Partnership, a business-led coalition providing a collective voice for the St. Paul, Midway and Minneapolis business communities regarding the Central Corridor project.

Issue Summary PubPI-024. Concern about communication between the government and community during the planning and construction process (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0545) PubPI-046

Finally, we want assurances that the governmental authorities involved in this process will maintain extensive communication with business owners, residents, institutions and the District Council throughout the planning and construction process. We recommend that these authorities look to processes followed in other cities, particularly Portland, Oregon and Salt Lake City, Utah, for how to communicate effectively and allow for neighborhood buy-in to the project.

(CCLRP0171) SocNC-213

There are a number of other cities where Citizens Advisory Committees have played a major role in ensuring that construction impacts are minimized and that light rail benefits business owners and residents along the corridor. It is important that the Twin Cities research how such committees have been structured and funded in other cities, so that the broadest possible community engagement can be assured for the Central Corridor project. Salt Lake City provides a good example of a light rail project where the corridor community was actively involved in developing plans to mitigate construction impacts.

As a result, no businesses were forced to close and there was a high level of satisfaction with the project amongst corridor residents and businesses.

Response PubPI-024. A comprehensive plan for public involvement was developed as part of preliminary engineering and is summarized in Chapter 11 of the FEIS. The plan was developed after researching outreach programs of other projects around the country. This plan did include outreach to all communities along the corridor and also included hiring Community Outreach Coordinators whose sole responsibility is to interface with residents, business owners and other stakeholders in the process. In addition, a Manager of Communications was hired whose sole responsibility is to provide information in a variety of media formats to the public.

Issue Summary PubPI-026. Concern about neighborhood input in the project (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0086) PubPI-049

St. Paul has viable neighborhood planning councils. Did the Central Corridor planning committee solicit input from the neighborhood districts that about University Ave.?

Response PubPI-026. A Community Advisory Committee (CAC) was formed in early preliminary engineering as a means of engaging community representatives and leaders in the process. The CAC will continue to meet throughout advanced preliminary engineering, final design, and construction of the Central Corridor LRT. The CAC includes representatives from District 6, District 7, Capitol River Council, District 13, the District Councils Collaborative Summit University Avenue Planning Council, and many other community councils. Chapter 11 of the FEIS provides an outline of the CAC's function and the public involvement plan for the Central Corridor.

Issue Summary PubPI-028. Concern about community input in the project and Merriam Park (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0787) PubPI-051

Finally, the Merriam Park Community Council emphasizes the importance of ensuring that community voices be heard and have influence throughout the planning, design, and construction of the Central Corridor Project. A strong citizens advisory committee should be created at the beginning of preliminary engineering to serve for the duration of the project. This is essential to ensure that the Central Corridor transit system meets the needs of the people it serves from downtown to downtown and all along the corridor.

Response PubPI-028. A Community Advisory Committee was formed in early preliminary engineering as a means of engaging community representatives and leaders in the process. The CAC will continue to meet throughout advanced preliminary engineering, final design, and construction of the Central Corridor LRT. The CAC was constituted to intentionally represent all geographic, neighborhood, ethnic, and cultural interests along the corridor and includes a representative from Merriam Park.

Issue Summary PubPI-029. Concern about community input in the project for preliminary engineering (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) PubPI-054

Development of Preliminary Engineering must include community participation in a meaningful way, not just a conduit to inform the community as to how the project should be built according to project managers.

Response PubPI-029. The public involvement plan developed to guide the preliminary engineering phase of the project was summarized and discussed in Chapter 11 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PubPI-030. Comment regarding the formation of a Community Advisory Committee (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0043) PubPI-056

By ensuring the early creation of a Community Advisory Committee along the Central Corridor

Response PubPI-030. A CAC was established early in preliminary engineering and will be ongoing through advanced preliminary engineering, final design, and construction of the Central Corridor LRT.

Issue Summary PubPI-032. Concern about neighborhoods having input in the project decision making (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0459) PubPI-059

Her fear is that some of the original goals for the Central Corridor Transit Line will get lost in trying to secure federal funding. ... She asked where in the process it is made sure that the neighborhoods have a voice in decision-making.

Response PubPI-032. A comprehensive plan for public involvement was developed as part of preliminary engineering and is summarized in Chapter 11 of the FEIS. This plan did include outreach to all communities along the corridor and also included hiring Community Outreach Coordinators whose sole responsibility is to interface with residents, business owners and other stakeholders in the process. A key component of the outreach program is the CAC, which has representatives of the district councils, planning districts and neighborhoods. The community has had a significant voice in making project decisions such as the placement of the Snelling Avenue station.

Issue Summary PubPI-035. Concerns about community involvement in the project for LEP populations (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0523) PubPI-064

FULL AND COMPLETE PARTICIPATION BY PEOPLE FROM THE AFFECTED NEIGHBORHOODS IN ALL PHASES OF PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION. In order to rebuild the trust of many neighborhood residents, both long-time and recent immigrants, it is essential that decisions be made by a negotiating process which includes but not limited to: communities of color, low-income people, immigrants, workers, engaged residents, business owners, developers, people with specific expertise, city of Saint Paul staff and elected officials. Full transparency, full accountability and full participation must be the hallmarks of a successful and fair project.

Response PubPI-035. A comprehensive plan for public involvement was developed as part of preliminary engineering and is summarized in Chapter 11 of the FEIS. This plan did include outreach to all communities along the corridor and also included hiring Community Outreach Coordinators whose sole responsibility is to interface with residents, business owners and other stakeholders in the process. The Community Outreach Coordinator team is multilingual, including Spanish, Thai, Vietnamese, Hmong, French, and American Sign Language. The plan included a component to reach out to limited English proficiency and other sectors of the community who may be typically underrepresented in the planning and public involvement process.

Issue Summary PubPI-036. Concerns about community involvement and public benefit agreements (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0524) PubPI-068

MICAH is a religious (faith) based organization of over 150 congregations representing Christian, Islamic, and Jewish perspectives. Our purpose is to take our common religious injunction for social justice for the poor seriously. (MICAH 8. 6.) Specifically, the stated goal of this chapter is to: • Encourage a post DEIS citizen input process (Community Benefits Agreements) where community based criteria as opposed to engineering criteria, shape transportation and economic policies. Such a process has been used elsewhere with outstanding proven results, but is ignored by the DEIS.

(CCLRP0280) PubPI-080

9. Public Participation. Central Corridor Transit planning and construction should be conducted with maximum transparency and public participation. In addition, we urge controlling government authorities and elected officials to show their commitment to public accountability by entering into good faith negotiations with community organizations and other interested parties on the creation of a legally-binding community benefits agreement governing LRT construction and transit-related development.

Response PubPI-036. A comprehensive plan for public involvement was developed as part of preliminary engineering and is summarized in Chapter 11 of the FEIS. This plan did include outreach to all communities along the corridor and also included hiring Community Outreach Coordinators whose sole responsibility is to interface with residents, business owners and other stakeholders in the process. In addition, a Manager of Communications was hired whose sole responsibility is to get information in various media about the details of the project out to the public. There are no plans for nor is the Council legally able to enter into a Community Benefits Agreement as requested in this comment.

Issue Summary PubPI-042. Concern about community involvement in the project (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0228) PubPI-076

However, I believe there must be better communications with the folks living in the

Frogtown and Western Ave areas to thoroughly explain the benefits to them and others living near this University Ave. corridor. From the public hearing that I attended, it appears that many folks living in this area are concerned this rail system will not benefit them in their public transportation needs. In fact, they seem to think this light-rail system will disrupt their neighborhood much like the I-94 construction did when it cut up their neighborhood. I believe an extensive communications campaign should be initiated, directed at the folks living in this neighborhood, in order to insure they thoroughly understand the benefits and buy into the approach.

Response PubPI-042. In preliminary engineering a comprehensive public involvement program was created, as discussed in Chapter 11 of the FEIS. This included hiring Community Outreach Coordinators fluent in the languages most commonly spoken by area residents and business owners, including an Outreach Coordinator fluent in Hmong.

Issue Summary PubPI-046. Concern about community involvement (District 7) in the planning of the project (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0532) PubPI-017

A taskforce to include District 7 residents must be set up to look at the opportunities and challenges that improved transit systems, like light rail, will have on University Avenue and District 7.

Response PubPI-046. A Community Advisory Committee was formed in early preliminary engineering as a means of engaging community representatives and leaders in the process. The CAC will continue to meet throughout advanced preliminary engineering, final design, and construction of the Central Corridor LRT. District 7 has a representative on the CAC.

Issue Summary SocNC-003. Project needs community participation approach (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0788) SocNC-011

We must also assure protection of housing in neighborhoods to deal with the possibility and likelihood of tax increases and assure preservation of affordable housing; and, lastly, we must assure that there be a broad-based community participation approach that will be available for all the segments of the community on a regular basis.

Response SocNC-003. In February 2007, the Metropolitan Council prepared the Central Corridor LRT Communication and Public Involvement Strategic Plan. To promote the broadest range of opportunity for public involvement, meetings and open houses were held in geographically varied locations and at varied times of the day and week. Printed materials were translated into multiple languages. Details are listed and described in Chapter 11 of the FEIS. Since publication of the AA/DEIS, two plans have been adopted by the City of St. Paul: The Fitzgerald Park Precinct Plan (Area Plan) and the Central Corridor Development Strategy (a chapter of the City's Comprehensive Plan). The Development Strategy contains an Inclusive Housing strategy that is intended to limit the potential

displacement of low-income individuals and families from the corridor as property values rise. Further, specific strategies are identified for home ownership assistance. In addition, Minneapolis is updating the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth, which recognizes the importance of strategic infrastructure investments along transportation corridors, the vitality of its downtown neighborhoods, and its relationship to important institutions. These plans have been taken into consideration and are described in the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocNC-007. Project should address all of the concerns of the community (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0935) SocNC-023

Also, if you could share some information about the long-term impact for the businesses here that will even be helpful in terms of having the business community support. As I look at the light rail proposal right now, it doesn't really address all of the concerns that the community, as well as the business community here has. So I am very concerned at this point and I am going to need to have somebody from the corridor contact me as soon as possible to let us know what is going on because I am not happy about this at all.

Response SocNC-007. In February 2007, the Metropolitan Council prepared the Central Corridor LRT Communication and Public Involvement Strategic Plan. The neighborhoods adjacent to the Central Corridor LRT alignment in Minneapolis and St. Paul are composed of numerous minority and ethnic groups, civic organizations, and business groups that have a history of active involvement in the community. To promote the broadest range of opportunity for public involvement, informational meetings and open houses were held in geographically varied locations and at varied times of the day and week. Printed materials were translated into multiple languages to facilitate communication with immigrant communities within the Central Corridor LRT Study Area. Details are listed and described in Chapter 11 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocNC-021. Community benefit agreements must be in place to govern development that will occur along line (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0109) SocNC-080

Community benefit agreements must be in place to govern development that will occur along line.

Response SocNC-021. Although community benefits agreements appear to be important to the neighborhoods along the Central Corridor LRT alignment and the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis, they are not within the scope of this FEIS. The City of Saint Paul, however, adopted the Central Corridor Development Strategy (October 2007). The Development Strategy includes Transit Opportunity Zone overlay districts (TOZ) that would guide new development. Within that process, it may be possible for elements of a community benefits agreement to be addressed. The Central Corridor Development Strategy is referenced in the FEIS in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 and Chapter 5.

Section: 3.2 - Impact and Mitigation for Community Businesses

Issue Summary EcoEE-014. Growth of small businesses (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0447) EcoEE-98

University Avenue could move in the direction of eclectic mix of unique shops, Artisan and restaurants similar to Minneapolis, Central Avenue N.E. Corridor. This would continue the possibility of owning a small business and inspire entrepreneurship to live out their share of the American Dream.

Response EcoEE-014. Saint Paul adopted the Central Corridor Development Strategy in October 2007. The Development Strategy includes Transit Opportunity Zone overlay districts (TOZ) that would guide new development. The Central Corridor Development Strategy is referenced in the FEIS in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 and Chapter 5.

Issue Summary EngCI-001. Impacts to businesses along route (38)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) EngCI-1

In addition, as has been done along other corridors, there will likely be assistance for businesses during construction. ... Small business assistance strategies should also include consideration of enlisting help from the local colleges and universities. In Portland, for example, local business schools 'adopted' small businesses to help them develop business plans and contingency strategies to thrive during and after construction. That model may work well for the Central Corridor and should be explored.

(CCLRP0714) EngCI-14

Our concerns with a Cedar Street route fall into three principal areas: vibration, sound, and disruption during construction. If it is not possible to change the route so that it does not run down Cedar, these concerns will have to be addressed during the planning and construction.

(CCLRP0655) EngCI-16

My primary concern is the disruption of traffic and the noise created on University Avenue during construction and afterwards. I am an owner of Great River Healing Arts Center, located on the southwest corner of Raymond and University. We have nine practitioners who see clients for many services, including massage and counseling. I am concerned about the impact of the noise on sessions; at times, the current traffic noise is louder than we anticipated, especially with trucks. Construction noise at all hours will be extremely disruptive.

(CCLRP0779) EngCI-18

What will be done to protect the investment of the businesses at the east end of the corridor during construction?

(CCLRP0836) EngCI-19

The takings part is more easily understood and that is that businesses are going to be hurt during construction through no fault of their own. I know there's a construction mitigation task force. I hope that they come up with a program that can compensate businesses for their lost income.

(CCLRP0905) EngCI-2

The last thing that I'm concerned about is that the small businesses along University Avenue are supported during the construction so that they may survive to profit from any action taken on the corridor line because I think that it will prove successful overall as the Hiawatha Line has, but it does no good for the line to be successful for a business if it's no longer there.

(CCLRP0406) EngCI-20

The City of Saint Paul recommends that Preliminary Engineering include extensive, block group-by-block group (2-4 blocks) arrangements with local property owners and businesses to determine actual construction phasing and mitigation. The City also recommends that the project hire a public relations firm and that an emergency response plan be developed. Finally, the City recommends that local colleges and universities be encouraged to partner with individual small businesses to support them during and after construction.

(CCLRP0018) EngCI-24

I am very concerned about making arrangements for businesses during construction. I want to make sure that existing businesses are not hurt by this process.

(CCLRP0132) EngCI-25

5. I'm also concerned for the small businesses and various social organizations along University considering the long-time construction. It certainly will be most difficult to reach them.

(CCLRP0655) EngCI-26

I would hope that construction could be done in phases, rather than tearing up University Avenue for a long period of time. The success of the Midway area is due in large part to small businesses, and we cannot afford to have clients turned away by construction for any extended period of time.

(CCLRP0004) EngCI-27

Small segments of construction should be done at a time so that the impact on residents and business are minimized.

(CCLRP0457) EngCI-28

Disruption to businesses along University Avenue and Washington Avenue must be minimized and mitigated, particularly through Stadium Village.

(CCLRP0780) EngCI-29

Lastly, I'd just like to say as has already been pointed out, when we do get into construction

we need to be respectful of the many small business owners, many of them right on this street here, who have put a lot of blood, sweat, and tears into their business.

(CCLRP0163) EngCI-3

Construction of light rail transit system would be much more disruptive to the established businesses along University Avenue and to auto and pedestrian traffic during the period.

(CCLRP0208) EngCI-30

Although there will be negative impacts to businesses and residents along the corridor during the construction, these impacts can be mitigated through thoughtful construction process and continued public input.

(CCLRP0545) EngCI-32

Primary concerns of Hamline Midway residents are the following: 1) That negative effects on current businesses due to construction be mitigated. We suggest that the authorities look to Salt Lake City for a process to engage businesses and to limit the time during which they are directly affected by construction.

(CCLRP0088) EngCI-33

3. Businesses along the corridor need to be offered some level of compensation for loss of revenue during construction.

(CCLRP0171) EngCI-34

Mitigating project impacts must be an integral part of the construction planning process and must be considered a budget line item in cost projections for the project. An official impact mitigation structure must be set up, with adequate financing to provide the technical and outreach staffing and expenses. Staff and expenses should also be provided for a PR campaign to encourage the public to continue patronizing businesses on the corridor during construction. Public outreach contract requirements should have equal weight with other contract requirements. An interlocal agreement should be established between stakeholders and contractors to ensure that major construction is staged into four-block segments, two lanes of traffic are maintained in each direction during working hours, forty-eight hour notice is provided to businesses and residents before any utility interruptions, access to businesses is guaranteed at all times during working hours, and a 24-hour "construction hotline" is maintained by the contractor to respond to all calls. The CAC budget should include funding for corridor streetscape enhancements, to provide contractor incentives such as bonuses for effective implementation of community outreach and mitigation requirements, and for a major promotional and marketing campaign during construction, including radio and print advertising, media events, and "Open for Business" signage.

(CCLRP0826) EngCI-35

We want to address business representation during preliminary engineering, a viability plan for businesses to survive construction, and actual construction mitigation.

(CCLRP0859) EngCI-36

The chamber board is well aware that the area businesses have concerns of surviving construction so we've worked very hard to create a plan in partnership and support of the Central Corridor Partnership, the Met Council, the city and county government to create a business advisory council who will address business representation during the preliminary engineering, a viability plan for businesses to survive construction, and construction mitigation.

(CCLRP0551) EngCI-38

We are also concerned with the service disruptions and impact prolonged construction will have on the operations of the entities.

(CCLRP0025) EngCI-39

1. How are business owners along University Avenue compensated for the loss of their business during construction?

(CCLRP0212) EngCI-40

3.) The environmental impacts as identified in the Draft EIS are to be reasonably expected with this type of project. I see construction related impacts as the most significant impact of all. My work address, Piper Jaffray Plaza, 444 Cedar Street, is directly on the alignment and just 1/2 blocks from the proposed 6th Street Station. In front of our building Cedar Street is only 40 feet from curb face to curb face. I have no doubt that Cedar Street will be largely unavailable for use by the public during construction and expect that during construction I along with the other employees at TKDA will experience considerable difficulties getting around in Downtown St. Paul. However, I am prepared to accept the inconveniences that go with construction to eventually benefit from this long overdue project.

(CCLRP0406) EngCI-41

Planning during Preliminary Engineering needs to carefully consider, in conjunction with businesses and residents, customized construction phasing to best meet their needs.

(CCLRP0140) EngCI-42

Plans should include protection (mitigation) for small businesses during construction to preserve the unique cultural character and promote minority business development.

(CCLRP0793) EngCI-43

Number two, of course, when the construction it will disrupt the business during the time of construction of the light rail;

(CCLRP0799) EngCI-44

Yes, there are certain concerns that need to be addressed and yes, the construction period will not be an easy one, but I do believe that if these businesses plan ahead of time and are given enough resources they really can benefit from the system.

(CCLRP0406) EngCI-45

The most significant issue for the community with respect to construction impacts appears to be access during construction. Coordination of road closures and traffic detours are extremely important, especially to businesses on the Avenue and in downtown. It is extremely important that the agreements emerging from Preliminary Engineering be in conjunction with business needs on a "block group"-by-"block group" basis throughout the Corridor.

(CCLRP0542) EngCI-47

We see construction related impacts as the most significant impact of all. As a firm located immediately adjacent to the alignment (444 Cedar Street) we are prepared to accept the inconveniences that go with construction to eventually benefit from this long overdue project.

(CCLRP0185) EngCI-49

If there exists a chasm to be mended, the Council ought look no further than ~1/2 mile south along the I-94 alignment. I would encourage the Council, and future engineering efforts, to more significantly examine an alignment along I-94 between, say, SH 280 [Westgate station] and Rice St, as a means to mitigate significant impacts during construction and during operations along University Avenue itself thereby more sufficiently accomplishing all goals (enhancing economic opportunity and investment, communities and environment, and transportation and mobility) already identified in the DEIS. Providing opportunity for TOD to effectively tie communities and neighborhoods together separated nearly a half-century ago by I-94 would go much further in insuring the system's success and promote similar development in future lines.

(CCLRP0115) EngCI-50

1. I don't want to lose any of the businesses due to construction.

(CCLRP0109) EngCI-53

Businesses currently located on University Ave must be protected during construction.

(CCLRP0867) EngCI-54

I have many concerns so -- and I live in the Frogtown area and one of my concerns is how do we get from the lower side over to the south side during the building time in order to get to our church or other services that we have on that side?

(CCLRP0078) EngCI-55

Would have negative impact on businesses along University Avenue, at Least during construction.

(CCLRP0808) EngCI-56

One concern is the disruption that will happen during the construction period and I think the efforts to develop a construction mitigation task force will do a lot to solve the issues of the businesses in the area,

(CCLRP0540) EngCI-57

We are also concerned with the service interruptions and impact prolonged construction will have on downtown businesses.

(CCLRP0003) EngEng-5

I'm concerned that small businesses would be negatively impacted during construction because of traffic diversion, parking problems, and may also be negatively impacted after construction because of traffic routes, turnings, obstructions from the light rail.

(CCLRP0407) EngEng-9

These construction impacts are all significant issues that must be detailed out in Preliminary Engineering. Generally, of most concern to the community are issues related to access and distribution of traffic as well as construction phasing. Both of these issues must be detailed on a "block group"-by-"block group" basis and agreed to by the City of Saint Paul.

Response EngCI-001. Short-term impacts would be minimized by using standard construction BMPs. These BMPs would include dust control, erosion control, proper mufflers on equipment, and restricted times for construction; maintenance of traffic and sequencing of construction would be planned and scheduled so as to minimize traffic delays and inconvenience; access to all businesses would be maintained throughout the construction period; adequate notice would be given about construction plans and phasing; access to bus stops would be maintained; and the public would be alerted to detours. The outreach team continues and will continue to engage businesses in the preliminary engineering process into construction. The outreach staff will be key in notifying businesses and residents of construction plans, road closures and bus re-routes as well as being a point of contact for construction related emergencies such as power outages. The outreach program provides many avenues for people to submit comments and concerns, which are forwarded to the planners and engineers. In addition, The Central Corridor Partnership, an alliance of St. Paul and Midway area business leaders, will be providing assistance to help businesses with marketing strategies and business planning to survive the construction process and let their customers know they are still open. The partnership is developing a business management plan and seeking funding sources. The Central Corridor LRT Project will be handling construction, which includes providing information about detours, signage, etc. These issues are discussed in Section 6.3 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngCI-003. [Business preservation and access](#) (7)

Comments:

(CCLRP0796) EcoEE-120

I'm worried about some of the businesses that may have to close down if this is done. Isn't there a better way to connect the Twin Cities by light rail rather than have it around University Avenue?

(CCLRP0178) EngCI-5

5. Business preservation and access ... A. The DCC insists that no business along the Central Corridor close or suffer for the decision to install a transit system. Minimizing the impact of construction, in particular, must be a priority for all agencies involved.

(CCLRP0781) EngCI-37

In closing, TLC asks Ramsey and Hennepin County and the Metropolitan Council to consider the following items: provide assistance for businesses along the corridor before, during, and after construction;

(CCLRP0770) EngCI-46

We need to make sure that during the construction period those businesses that are here already are taken care of, but we know from other cities that that's possible, that you can protect those existing businesses; that, in fact, having light rail on University will actually be a boon to many of them.

(CCLRP0829) ProPOL-1

Four, provide assistance for existing businesses along University Avenue before, during, and after construction.

(CCLRP0180) ProPOL-14

Given our large number of small immigrant businesses between Rice Street and Lexington Avenue, we need remuneration dollars during construction. A plan needs to be assembled that will assist small business owners in developing business plans. These plans could be developed by creating relationships with local colleges and their economic, business, and public policy departments. Partnerships with Chambers of Commerce and Corporate outreach would allow businesses to reach out to a new corporate and customer base while continuing to thrive while under construction. It is important that new construction store front to store front. (sic) The community has expressed it wants business and housing development along Central Corridor, not park-n-rides.

(CCLRP0788) ProPOL-4

So following changes are definitely needed. One, we must see some protection of businesses. There must be some development of a mitigation fund for businesses that already exist.

Response EngCI-003. Short-term impacts would be minimized by using standard construction BMPs. These BMPs would include dust control, erosion control, proper mufflers on equipment, and restricted times for construction; maintenance of traffic and sequencing of construction would be planned and scheduled so as to minimize traffic delays and inconvenience; access to all businesses would be maintained throughout the construction period; adequate notice would be given about construction plans and phasing; access to bus stops would be maintained; and the public would be alerted to detours. The outreach team continues and will continue to engage businesses in the preliminary engineering process into construction. The outreach staff will be key in notifying businesses and residents of construction plans, road closures and bus re-routes as well as being a point of contact for

construction related emergencies such as power outages. The outreach program provides many avenues for people to submit comments and concerns, which are forwarded to the planners and engineers. In addition, The Central Corridor Partnership, an alliance of St. Paul and Midway area business leaders, will be providing assistance to help businesses with marketing strategies and business planning to survive the construction process and let their customers know they are still open. The partnership is developing a business management plan and seeking funding sources. Long-term effects such as changes in land use and development potential along the Central Corridor LRT, particularly in station areas, are being addressed by both cities and these plans are discussed in Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 5.2 of the FEIS. The Central Corridor LRT Project will be handling construction, which includes providing information about detours, signage, etc. These issues are being addressed by both cities and these plans are discussed in Section 6.3 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngCI-005. Project benefit is worth challenges construction period will cause (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0766) EngCI-21

I can say not all businesses are in support of it, but I think it's more of a concern of the construction in itself and some of the problems that happened on the Hiawatha. Me in particular, I'm all right with that. I think we can deal with it and overcome it.

(CCLRP0754) EngCI-22

The construction impacts will be those that impact me most; and I feel that those can be mitigated properly; and personally I'm ready to put up with a little inconvenience during construction in order to bring this long overdue project into being.

Response EngCI-005. Comment Noted

Issue Summary EngCI-010. Impact on MPR (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0714) EngEng-2

3) Disruption during construction / Continuity of Operations: 24/7 Operation. We are concerned about the effect of construction on our daily operations. MPR operates three full-time live radio services - 24 hours a day, seven days a week. We produce news and music programs throughout the day and night. We serve our own regional network of 37 radio stations - serving 800,000 listeners weekly and a national network of 700 stations - serving more than 14 million listeners weekly. Disruption of our operations will have wide repercussions.

Response EngCI-010. The construction processes for the Central Corridor LRT project that are expected to generate the highest vibration levels include pile driving, demolition using jackhammers and hoe rams, and operation of heavy tracked equipment such as bulldozers and backhoes. The best approach for minimizing the impact from construction vibration is to limit the use of high-vibration procedures such as impact pile driving and include vibration

limits in the construction specifications that the contractor is not allowed to exceed. The recommended vibration mitigation measures are:

Pre-Construction Survey: A standard pre-construction survey should be performed to document the existing condition of all structures in the vicinity of sites where major construction will be performed.

Vibration Limits: Three sets of vibration limits are recommended. The first is to minimize the potential for damage to buildings. The second is to reduce potential for intrusive vibration at sensitive receptors such as residences, schools and theatres. The final set of vibration limits is to limit potential intrusion to use of the MPR studios. The recommended limits in terms of Peak Particle Velocity (PPV) are:

- Damage to normal buildings: 0.5 in/sec
- Annoyance at office space, schools, churches, and other institutional land: 0.022 in/sec

Vibration Monitoring: When construction activities such as pile driving that create high vibration levels will be used near residences, schools or other vibration-sensitive locations, the contractor should be required to monitor vibration to verify that no construction activities exceed the vibration limits. Frequent pile driving is not expected to be necessary during construction of Central Corridor LRT.

Coordinating Construction Schedule: The impact thresholds for the MPR recording studios and the Fitzgerald Theater are very low and it may not be feasible to achieve these limits during construction. As a result, it may not be feasible to have vibration producing construction activities going on concurrently with research using vibration-sensitive equipment, with audio recording, or with theater performances. Therefore, whenever construction would be performed near the MPR studios or the Fitzgerald Theater, the stakeholders should be consulted and notified of the schedule in advance.

Alternative Construction Procedures: Where feasible and cost effective, low vibration construction procedures should be required. For example, in some cases it is feasible to use hydraulic pile drivers in place of impact pile drivers. If hydraulic pile driving is either impractical or cost prohibitive, the adverse vibration effects can be minimized by placing piles in pre-drilled holes and limiting use of impact pile driving to setting the piles.

Further details are described in Section 4.6 and 4.7 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngRW-001. Concerns about negative impacts to small businesses before and after construction (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0038) EngRW-1

9. Negative impacts on small business during construction and after construction. (Who wants to drive near the Hiawatha line? The University Ave. line will be much worse.)

Response EngRW-001. Short-term impacts would be minimized by using standard construction BMPs. These BMPs would include dust control, erosion control, proper mufflers on equipment, and restricted times for construction; maintenance of traffic and sequencing of construction would be planned and scheduled so as to minimize traffic delays and inconvenience; access to all businesses would be maintained throughout the construction period; adequate notice would be given about construction plans and phasing; access to bus stops would be maintained; and the public would be alerted to detours. The outreach team continues and will continue to engage businesses in the preliminary engineering process into construction. The outreach program provides many avenues for people to submit comments and concerns, which are forwarded to the planners and engineers. In addition, The Central Corridor Partnership, an alliance of St. Paul and Midway area business leaders, will be providing assistance to help businesses with marketing strategies and business planning to survive the construction process and let their customers know they are still open. The partnership is developing a business management plan and seeking funding sources. The Central Corridor LRT Project will be handling construction, which includes providing information about detours, signage, etc. These issues are also being addressed by both cities and these plans are discussed in Section 6.3 of the FEIS. Long-term economic effects are discussed in Chapter 5 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary NR-023. Worried about new business that will open that will not be compatible with community (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0784) NR-17

I don't want to see businesses that have come along here and built up -- because I was here when there wasn't any businesses here. We had after-hour houses or places like that here and they've come in and built this up.

Response NR-023. Land development and zoning policies, which control the types and locations of businesses, are principally the responsibility of the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul. Both cities have adopted comprehensive land use and development strategies or are updating plans and policies to reflect projected land use development changes with the construction and operation of the Central Corridor LRT project—The St. Paul Central Corridor Development Strategy, and the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth. Land use changes are a function of market changes and these plans attempt to mitigate the market forces. These plans are discussed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. The Central Corridor Development Strategy and the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth are referenced in the FEIS in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 and Chapter 5.

Issue Summary NR-025. Worried about impacts on businesses but supportive of project
(1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0883) NR-30

Thirdly, I am a small business attorney in St. Paul by day and I represent a dozen businesses that are on the Central Corridor and they have a universal fear of the Central Corridor and the actions that are in front of them, but there's another universal thought is that they think it's worth it, that it's worth the risk and it's worth the potential harm for light rail. That's a universal thought amongst them. A lot of them couldn't be here tonight because they're mom and pop operations that work all hours of the day, but they were universal in their support for light rail and the risks and the benefits that it brings them.

Response NR-025. The increased access to the neighborhoods brought by transit improvements and the siting of LRT stations may act as a catalyst for new investment and business opportunities along the University Avenue corridor. The City of St. Paul adopted the Central Corridor Development Strategy in October 2007, and the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth are plans intended to address development issues. Both plans make recommendations for regulating future growth and development in the corridor. These plans are discussed in Capters 3 and 5 of the FEIS.. Additionally, the Metropolitan Council established the Central Corridor Business Advisory Council to address the concerns of businesses regarding the LRT during construction and operation of the line. Furthermore, the Metropolitan Council has established the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) program in order to utilize the skills and services of those businesses considered socially or economically disadvantaged.

Issue Summary PlaTE-008. Concerns about negative impact to local businesses (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0330) PlaTE-3

It will disrupt business and mess everything up both while being built, and then obstruct access after it is place.

(CCLRP0236) PlaTE-120

Another concern I have is how the project (especially the light rail) would affect access to businesses along University. The problem would be that the multiple family run businesses might be adversely affected by changes in transit along the Central Corridor.

Response PlaTE-008. Roadway operations and parking, access to businesses, public utility services, pedestrian access, along with short-term impacts to air quality, noise, and vibration are likely to be the most significant impacts experienced by the people and businesses located adjacent to or near the construction zones. Maintenance of traffic and sequencing of construction would be planned and scheduled so as to minimize traffic delays and inconvenience. Access to all businesses would be maintained throughout the construction period. The Central Corridor Project Office surveyed businesses and conducted an analysis of on-street parking impacts. An inventory of University Avenue parking supply and impacts

is summarized in Chapter 6 of the FEIS and included in Appendices. The City of St. Paul is considering several strategies to manage parking for local businesses and minimize impacts to residential areas. These strategies include posting time limits or metering the remaining on-street parking on University Avenue to encourage turnover and discourage all-day parking, signing or metering the parking along the cross streets one block north and south of University Avenue, creating parking improvement districts and encouraging shared parking of vacant or underutilized existing parking lots. Additional information regarding anticipated changes in development around stations is shown discussed in Section 5.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-099. Maintain easy access to businesses (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0137) PlaTP-105

Easy access to businesses and residences on both sides of University Ave.

Response PlaTP-099. The Metropolitan Council plans to maintain access to all businesses during the construction phase. Chapter 6 of the FEIS describes the construction impacts and construction staging. As discussed in Chapter 11 of the FEIS, extensive outreach activities were conducted as a part of the AA/DEIS and SDEIS to inform area residents and businesses about the project and to listen to their concerns. These activities have allowed the businesses to provide input on the proposed alignment and alternatives, station locations, environmental issues, future development implications, the project planning process, the selection of the Preferred Alternative, and mitigation strategies. -----

Issue Summary PubPI-014. Concern about businesses being informed during the planning process (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0935) PubPI-023

First of all, there has not been much engagement from the business community here and I am a business owner here and I did not hear about this until I read somewhere about it. It was very disheartening that the Central Corridor transit committee did not put in any effort to making sure that the community was fully engaged in this process. That is a very, very disappointing thing to let this happen.

Response PubPI-014. As discussed in Chapter 11 of the FEIS, extensive outreach activities were conducted as a part of the AA/DEIS and SDEIS to inform area residents and businesses about the project and to listen to their concerns. These activities have allowed the businesses to provide input on the proposed alignment and alternatives, station locations, environmental issues, future development implications, the project planning process, the selection of the Preferred Alternative, and mitigation strategies. In addition to the Community Advisory Committee, a Business Advisory Council was formed early in the preliminary engineering process. This group is chaired by a local area business owner and meets monthly to receive updates about issues from project staff, to give input into the project and to discuss issues as they affect local businesses. The Central Corridor Partnership is a business-led coalition providing a collective voice for the St. Paul, Midway, and Minneapolis business communities

regarding the Central Corridor project.

Issue Summary SocNC-010. Need to maintain the distinct small businesses and not become a big box Mecca (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0004) SocNC-205

Businesses should be protected. We need to maintain the distinct small businesses and not become a big box Mecca.

Response SocNC-010. Although Metropolitan Council is very concerned about preserving and enhancing community character through this public infrastructure investment, the commenter's concern for the development of big box stores is in the purview of the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis, which are responsible for the zoning and approvals of developments in the Central Corridor. Much of the expected development in the Central Corridor is expected to take the form of transit oriented development (TOD). To address desirable aspects, as well as the concerns and undesired effects, of TOD, both cities have developed plans. St. Paul, for example, adopted the Central Corridor Development Strategy (October 2007). As noted in the FEIS (Chapters 3 and 5), the Development Strategy sets the stage for establishing Transit Opportunity Zone overlay districts (TOZ), which, generally, promote and facilitate desired changes and improvements through redevelopment and rehabilitation activities, including those of private developers. Minneapolis is updating the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth, which recognizes the importance of strategic infrastructure investments along transportation corridors and the vitality of its downtown neighborhoods.

Section: 3.2 - U of M

Issue Summary PlaTP-025. Concerns in regard to impact on proposed U of M Stadium project (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-028

Stadium Village Station: The DEIS alignment is in direct conflict with the planned on-campus football stadium and the East Gateway District development goals, which includes a multi-modal transit station with a revised LRT alignment.

(CCLRP0457) PlaTP-035

Placement of the Stadium Village Station and LRT alignment needs to be re-evaluated now that funding for the University of Minnesota Stadium has been approved by the legislature. The City of Minneapolis supports a station that provides convenient and safe access to both the new stadium and to Stadium Village.

(CCLRP0435) PlaTP-120

Section 2.3.4: Major Activity Centers - • Page 3-12. The FEIS should acknowledge and summarize plans for the new football stadium at the University of Minnesota campus and the new Twins baseball park in downtown Minneapolis, both located on the Central Corridor and both proposed since the draft EIS was written. The FEIS should note that the need to coordinate with the cities, counties and other agencies involved in these projects. It should also note the Central Corridor route and station locations may be affected by the planned football stadium.

(CCLRP0807) PlaTP-127

...PPERRIA strongly encourages the Central Corridor Coordinating Committee to work closely with the Stadium Area Advisory Group to maximize the synergy between light rail and the new U of M stadium in order to minimize the traffic impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods.

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-236

Section/page/table is S.4.4 page S-20 - TRANSPORTATION EFFECTS - Roadway Operations: Station Area Traffic Impacts: The University intends to develop a multi-modal transit facility at the Stadium Village Station, which may attract riders.

Response Pla. The Preferred Alternative adopted after preparation of the SDEIS will not conflict with the TCF Bank Stadium at the U of M, the construction and operation of the new stadium, and other plans for development at the U of M.

Issue Summary PlaTP-092. [Must work closely with U of M Stadium Project](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0539) PlaTP-087

PPERRIA strongly encourages the Central Corridor Coordinating Committee to work closely with the Stadium Area Advisory Group to maximize the synergies between light rail and the new U of M stadium in order to minimize traffic impacts on surrounding neighborhoods.

Response PlaTP-092. The Central Corridor Project Office worked very closely with the U of M and other stakeholders during preliminary engineering to develop a set of traffic mitigation commitments in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which can be found in Appendix E of the FEIS. These commitments are detailed in section 6.2 of the FEIS. The MOU also states that the various stakeholders are committed to continue working together to explore alternatives and resolve outstanding project related matters including: mitigation impacts, design issues, construction issues, and operation matters. The Preferred Alternative adopted after preparation of the SDEIS will not conflict with these efforts.

Issue Summary ProHLP-012. [The preferred alignment will have negative impact on proposed plans for U of M on-campus football stadium](#) (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) ProHLP-025

Paragraph #4 - The DEIS alignment will prohibit the ability to construct the on-campus football stadium, recently approved by the State. The University's preferred alignment would provide the site for the future multi-modal transit facility and at the same time provide excellent pedestrian connection to users south and north of University Avenue.

(CCLRP0199) ProHLP-065

3) Design and construction of the East Portal of the proposed University of Minnesota tunnel should be done together with the design and construction of the new Minnesota Gophers' Football stadium. This combination will provide the best result for both facilities, and should reduce costs.

(CCLRP0443) ProHLP-108

3.34, page 3-27, POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES - The DEIS alignment will prohibit the ability to construct the planned on-campus football stadium, recently approved by the State. The University's preferred alignment would provide the site for the future multi-modal transit facility and at the same time provide excellent pedestrian connection to users south and north of University Avenue. The University-preferred alignment would not require the displacement of the City of Minneapolis Fire Station 19.

Response ProHLP-012. The Preferred Alternative adopted after preparation of the SDEIS will not conflict with the TCF Bank stadium at the U of M. Fire Station 19 will not be displaced. The route through the U of M, the station locations, and the At-Grade Transit Pedestrian Mall are fully described in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

Section: 3.2 - Neighborhood Preservation

Issue Summary EcoEE-020. Mitigate effects to local businesses and homes (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0108) EcoEE-151

Every possible effort must be made to mitigate adverse effects on current business owners and to protect and enhance the cultural diversity of the corridor.

(CCLRP0002) EcoEE-153

Even if businesses and homes are not condemned, economic pressure may force current residents and businesses away. Although economics may change the area, development must be done so as to minimize the negative impact on the current communities. Don't subsidize Starbucks!! Ensure the local businesses have the first chance to thrive in the areas served by the light rail. I don't know how to do this - more stops near University in exchange for fewer downtown; care to minimize direct impact on businesses during the construction phase; outreach to local business owners during development of new, mixed-use buildings in the corridor, etc.

(CCLRP0259) PlaTE-1

In addition to these real inconveniences to those who would, I believe, make up the majority of riders, train tracks down the middle of the street and stops a mile apart could cause the death of many small businesses, including restaurants. The neighborhood would, in essence, be transformed into a boring railroad with little of the varied cultural and ethnic shopping/dining/living University Avenue and its surrounding streets have today.

I hope you and others concerned with this project will consider this likely damage to the human environment as you are considering its impact on the physical environment.

Response EcoEE-020. Every effort has been taken to minimize adverse impacts of the Preferred Alternative while maintaining the positive benefits this project would deliver. The Preferred Alternative will provide increased mobility to both residences and businesses within the Central Corridor and is expected to support future growth. New transportation capacity could create competitive advantages for businesses located in the corridor. Since publication of the AA/DEIS, the City of St. Paul developed the Central Corridor Development Strategy (a chapter of the City's Comprehensive Plan). In addition, Minneapolis is updating the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth, which recognizes the importance of strategic infrastructure investments along transportation corridors and the vitality of its downtown neighborhoods. These plans have been taken into consideration and are described in the FEIS. The Central Corridor Development Strategy includes implementation of Transit Opportunity Zone overlay districts (TOZ) -that would guide new development. See chapter 5 for anticipated economic effects.

Issue Summary ProPM-010. [Comment about new housing along the LRT line](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0137) ProPM-006

4. Creation of affordable housing along the corridor, both rental and owner-occupied. Unlike the nearly all-market-rate housing along Hiawatha Line.

Response ProPM-010. The City of Saint Paul adopted the Central Corridor Development Strategy (October 2007). The St. Paul Central corridor Development Strategy has an Inclusive Housing strategy that is intended to mitigate the potential displacement of low-income individuals and families from the corridor as property values rise. Further, specific strategies are identified for home ownership assistance. Minneapolis is updating the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth, which recognizes the importance of strategic infrastructure investments along transportation corridors and the vitality of its downtown neighborhoods. These plans have been taken into consideration and are described in the FEIS.

Issue Summary PubPI-002. [Design should include esthetic design to reflect community interests](#) (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) PubPI-002

The design of the stations should reflect the aspirations and character of the neighborhood so them. This differentiation can best be accomplished through a process of community discussion and the assistance of a public artist, experienced in such projects. An interdisciplinary team should be assembled to assist each surrounding neighborhood develop elements that can reflect such aspirations and characteristic including: engineers; public artists; planners; and developers.

(CCLRP0531) PubPI-035

5. Light Rail must incorporate community input for design of history displays, neighborhood information, public art, and local green space. Transit stops and other construction in our community can add understanding of our history and culture, but our residents must be part of decisions regarding messages and style.

Response PubPI-002. Station design during the course of preliminary engineering was set to provide a uniform system of station elements based on the experiences learned from Hiawatha LRT of the difficulty of maintaining stations with custom components. The basic station design will be differentiated to reflect the local neighborhood character and history by the public art program, as summarized in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocNC-004. Project will benefit neighborhoods/community (22)

Comments:

(CCLRP0231) SocNC-033

LRT will represent a huge transit and quality-of-life advancement. LRT represents a significant step forward in improving the urban environment and assuring the long-term vitality of our community.

(CCLRP0051) SocNC-043

Light rail is a form of transportation that not only serves to transport people, but enriches the communities it runs through and the stature of region!

(CCLRP0769) SocNC-070

It also connects neighborhoods, not just Minneapolis and St. Paul. I really do believe it connects east side, west side with Midway and it's the biggest stretch. You know, these are neighborhoods, not just two big cities; and so that's real important that we connect our neighborhoods as well as the two cities.

(CCLRP0852) SocNC-073

As a mid-sized company representing those interests, we're very interested in a quality of life for our employees and presenting the Twin Cities as a progressive, forward-thinking city to the extent that we are competing with other leading cities across the country for top talent. Positioning the Twin Cities that way is very important both to retain existing staff as well as to attract new employees. So, again, we're very supportive of light rail.

(CCLRP0750) SocNC-075

Livable communities are what the architecture community is all about in the Twin Cities. We've got a great Twin Cities metropolitan area that will only become stronger as LRT happens in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0284) SocNC-087

I grew up in the Hamline-Midway neighborhood, and it is where my family decided to buy a home. In the newspapers, there are a few vocal critics that worry about LRT "changing" the neighborhood. These critics are the minority, everyone of my neighbors welcome the changes that LRT will bring.

(CCLRP0877) SocNC-099

I support the light rail alternative because it shows a significant commitment by our public officials to the well-being of citizens through the year 2020.

(CCLRP0043) SocNC-114

Diversity adds richness to our city. Rather than the boring blandness of big box retailers, tract housing and series of malls with asphalt parking lots it is the homes, small business and cultural diversity that makes St. Paul a rich, warm tapestry.

(CCLRP0850) SocNC-130

Finally, again, speaking on behalf of the Wilder Foundation, I would say that we're moving to University Avenue within the next couple of years and Light Rail Transit offers us the opportunity both to serve more clients as well as to make connections with people throughout the region, convening, offering leadership on social issues and helping all members of the Twin Cities to improve the quality of life and increase the competitiveness and the economic vitality of the Twin Cities region.

(CCLRP0699) SocNC-143

I am a firm believer in doing what we can to lighten the environmental load in any way in any city. When the lightening of that load is also a system that makes a city more accessible, user-friendly and vital - what's not to love? I have just returned from Portland, OR, and feel that part of that city's charm is it's great transit system which includes light rail.

(CCLRP0779) SocNC-147

Light rail development along the corridor cannot only connect the two cities; it can also help heal the past and contribute to the creation of a prosperous and valued diverse Twin Cities.

(CCLRP0423) SocNC-154

Livability of people, a growing number of citizens want a more urban lifestyle of living.

(CCLRP0231) SocNC-162

LRT represents a significant step forward in improving the urban environment and assuring the long-term vitality of our community.

(CCLRP0346) SocNC-189

I both live and work in St. Paul and believe that improvements in public transit will help improve the quality of life for all of its residents and help spur new redevelopment efforts, encourage businesses to locate in the Twin Cities area, and expand the opportunities for each resident and visitor.

(CCLRP0204) SocNC-193

All of this will improve our quality of life in SE Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0855) SocNC-194

While there will be challenges that will need to be resolved for all of us who live and work along the corridor, LRT represents the best long-term transportation and quality of life option for our community.

(CCLRP0871) SocNC-197

Light rail is a significant step forward to improving our urban community and as a result our bank's social responsibility in the community-invested programs.

(CCLRP0750) SocNC-201

I believe firmly it will reinforce existing neighborhoods and development in many neighborhoods that will benefit from investment.

(CCLRP0103) SocNC-208

We need light rail to stabilize our inner city neighborhoods.

(CCLRP0864) SocNC-218

We believe that a healthy downtown and a vibrant corridor including the Central Corridor between our two cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul portrays a positive image that reflects our local, neighborhood, and business communities.

(CCLRP0779) SocNC-232

The diversity of the Twin Cities will meet along the corridor and it will help to build a stronger and more unified community.

(CCLRP0208) SocNC-236

Having experienced firsthand the construction and successful implementation of the light rail in Salt Lake City, I have seen how these types of projects can improve not only the corridor adjacent the rail, but the community as a whole.

Response SocNC-004. Comment noted.

Issue Summary SocNC-005. [Preserve local neighborhoods](#) (11)

Comments:

(CCLRP0166) SocNC-013

Any transit investment in the Corridor must preserve key community assets and meet the needs and interests of the communities through which it passes. To ensure community participation in transportation and land-use decision making, timely education and outreach about decision making processes are required. Resources to authentically integrate community input are also necessary.

(CCLRP0059) SocNC-036

Make sure when you make the final decision you're not killing the community look from every view and look from every one side cause you can destroy in the process of building.

(CCLRP0341) SocNC-039

Rest assured I am a strong believer in light rail and use it frequently. Please advocate for our Cedar Riverside Neighborhood! That we receive the same benefits other stops already have, namely drawing people into our neighborhood, and not circumventing us.

(CCLRP0192) SocNC-053

However, I am not in favor of destroying neighborhoods in order to do it.

(CCLRP0002) SocNC-090

LOCAL NEIGHBORHOODS must be PRESERVED during and after construction of the Central Corridor LRT. This is my biggest concern about the light rail. Development of I-94 destroyed a vibrant African American community in the same area only a few decades ago. Frogtown is home to vital immigrant communities today.

(CCLRP0356) SocNC-093

There is also a strong "upside" to light rail, not just reduced "downsides". I have seen what light rail can do to revitalize aging urban neighborhoods, and using the example of Portland again, the housing quality has actually improved in the 20 years since light rail was implemented. Their neighborhoods are of an age similar to those of St. Paul, and rather than seeing growing numbers of houses in poor condition, each year there are fewer as young professionals and their families buy into the less expensive neighborhoods and renovate those homes. Many people owning homes and businesses near University Avenue fear the months of disruption created while a main traffic artery is dug up, but do not realize the immense benefits of light rail because so much of the discussion is focused on quickly a lot of people can be moved between Minneapolis and St. Paul. Those of us living in the neighborhoods are less likely to be enthusiastic about the sheer number of people who can be moved through our communities. But we do care about our health and that of our children, and we care about the investment we have made in our homes.

(CCLRP0207) SocNC-134

If we can build LRT and be sensitive to the current people that live and work along University, I'm 100% in favor.

(CCLRP0798) SocNC-146

I wish to submit that we are different than Hiawatha and that St. Paul represents a very different context within which the light rail is projected. If that is true, there are several things that need to be put in place to ensure and extend the stability of the area.

(CCLRP0470) SocNC-150

The objective that LRT/BRT "facilitate the highest and best use of adjacent property" does not spell out how this will be decided. Any method other than one that utilizes the current property owners as the decision makers is contrary to the expressed desires of our community for neighborhood-driven land use decisions. In particular, the residents of Sherburne Ave. have stated, over and over, for over 30 years, that they wish to maintain the single-family character of their street.

(CCLRP0038) SocNC-152

10. Negative effects on residential neighborhoods nearby. (parking problems, noise, etc.

(CCLRP0793) SocNC-164

Unless the light rail authority, the government have to have some sort of good solution to deal with that issue then we can go forward. Otherwise you just do something benefit a few but create a great damage for a lot of us to come here to be the business on University Avenue.

Response SocNC-005. Community cohesion—maintaining the physical, emotional, and cultural connections of individual neighborhoods—is a key consideration of the Metropolitan Council. Metropolitan Council recognizes that the character and diversity of the Central Corridor’s neighborhoods are aspects of the community that must be preserved and celebrated. As discussed in Chapter 11 of the FEIS, extensive outreach activities were conducted as a part of the AA/DEIS and SDEIS to inform area residents and businesses about the project and to listen to their concerns. These activities have allowed the public to provide input on the proposed alignment and alternatives, station locations, environmental issues, future development implications, the project planning process, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative. The cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul have adopted development and design guidelines as part of city and neighborhood comprehensive plans and zoning policies to both guide development in the corridor and preserve adjacent neighborhood characteristics and community cohesion. The Metropolitan Council has supported the development of these plans. The City of St. Paul’s Central Corridor Development Strategy (October 2007) is one example of the plans developed to enhance and protect corridor neighborhoods. This plan includes strategies to promote and facilitate the changes and improvements through public redevelopment and rehabilitation activities and private investments that will naturally follow the development of the Central Corridor LRT project. Minneapolis is updating the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth, which recognizes the importance of strategic infrastructure investments along transportation corridors and the vitality of its downtown neighborhoods. These plans have been taken into consideration and are described in the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocNC-006. Concerns that valued, cultural character of the area will be altered (4)

Comments:

(CCLRP0485) SocNC-018

The valued, cultural character of the area will alter as more affluent households resettle in a newly revitalized area. The eastern segment of University Avenue risk no longer being associated as the cultural destination corridor rich with diverse communities, thriving ethnic businesses, social, religious and cultural institutions.

(CCLRP0134) SocNC-024

There should be a priority to support minority businesses and cultural communities that have settled along University Avenue.

(CCLRP0798) SocNC-031

The other thing is to extend that stability by saying there is going to be real estate exchanges, there's going to be hopefully parking built and all the rest, that somehow those real estate exchanges have some impact in building the ability to extend the heritage of this neighborhood, especially that where houses are right next to the city -- or to the University Avenue and that there be opportunities for those who decide to stay and those who decide to build a fruitful life and a thriving life in this territory.

(CCLRP0532) SocNC-104

5. No business should close as a result of construction and/or operation of the light rail line. Our community is very unique and we want it to stay that way. We have many small, family-owned, ethnic businesses on University Avenue. Certain developments may work well at other points on the Central Corridor, but would not fit in well with the character of University Avenue on this end.

Response SocNC-006. Metropolitan Council recognizes that the character and diversity of the Central Corridor's neighborhoods are aspects of the community that must be preserved and celebrated. However, zoning and development review are the responsibility of the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul. To address the development pressures that are underway and that are likely to continue following implementation of the Central Corridor LRT Project, both cities have adopted development and design guidelines as part of city and neighborhood comprehensive plans and zoning policies to both guide development in the corridor and preserve adjacent neighborhood characteristics and community cohesion. These plans are supported by Metropolitan Council. -----

Issue Summary SocNC-009. Concern about tearing down buildings to provide parking (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0475) SocNC-006

p. 6-37 "Mitigation for the loss of parking: in both the LRT and BRT alternatives may include creation of small off-street parking facilities proximate to retail businesses." What does this mean? Tearing down buildings to provide parking? This will not enhance neighborhood fabric. Smaller businesses won't have the money to create off street parking.

Response SocNC-009. There are no plans to tear down buildings for the purposes of providing parking. Parking impacts and mitigation strategies are discussed in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocNC-012. Extend the comment period to ensure that the needs of impacted communities are addressed (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0489) SocNC-029

At the April 20th meeting of the Central Corridor Coordinating Committee, it was decided to not recommend an extension of the DEIS comment period. As the committee deliberated on rationales that came across as scheduling inconveniences and fears associated with jeopardizing federal funding competitiveness, a disbelief in government's propensity to ensure the needs of impacted communities was once again reinforced. We must all be students of history and learn from past mistakes as to not repeat them. Least we forget under the rubric of urban renewal, the transportation construction project of I-94 in the late 50's early 60's significantly displaced inhabitants due to the loss of over 600 homes and businesses within the longstanding African-American Rondo community. Although the proposed building of light rail does not compare to that of building a highway, it is the lessons associated with the disregard for community wellbeing that must be elevated. Similar to then, it now appears that community needs and concerns are being disregarded. Even so, a wise and good government would realize that it is not too late to turn the tide and implement good policy making principles. Considering that this contemporary proposed transportation investment of \$840 million is shrouded in the misdeed of I-94, restoring trust in government and its processes should take precedence over matters of convenience and expediency. That being said, we urge you as the final decision making body to not adhere to the CCCC's position and vote affirmatively to support an extension of 60 days or more for a public hearing on the DEIS. Although the CCCC agreed to an additional public hearing within the minimally required 45-day time frame, such a compromise grossly misrepresented the intent of our original request. To reiterate, the modesty of our extension request would grant more time for environmental justice constituencies to review the April 3rd release of the Alternative Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement in-order to make well informed and thoughtful comments as early in the process as possible. Keep in mind that unlike government and more earlier identified stakeholders such as the University of Minnesota and the larger business community, the people who would be most impacted have been little engaged throughout the years on development of this proposal; therefore, much catching up is needed.

Response SocNC-012. The comment period for the AA/DEIS started on April 21, 2006 and closed on June 5, 2006 for a total of 45 days. Public involvement activities, however, have continued to be provided in the Central Corridor to ensure that all residents and businesses would be heard and concerns would be considered. In February 2007, the Metropolitan Council prepared the Central Corridor LRT Communication and Public Involvement Strategic Plan. To promote the broadest range of opportunity for public involvement, meetings and open houses were held in geographically varied locations and at varied times of the day and week. Printed materials were translated into multiple languages. Public hearings were also held for the SDEIS in August 2008. Details are listed and described in Chapter 11 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocNC-019. Concerns over losing affordable housing (10)

Comments:

(CCLRP0524) SocNC-004

MICAH is a religious (faith) based organization of over 150 congregations representing Christian, Islamic, and Jewish perspectives. Our purpose is to take our common religious injunction for social justice for the poor seriously. (MICAH 8. 6.) Specifically, the stated goal of this chapter is to: Work towards getting 30% the new housing stock that will follow transit development in the Midway area to be dedicated to affordable housing.

(CCLRP0938) SocNC-008

Now that our neighborhood is picking up in diversity, and everything is wonderful, now you are going to divide it. Our property values, the noise, senior citizens going a mile for transportation. Many people are going to loose their homes-not that anyone cares.

(CCLRP0283) SocNC-016

I do hope you will keep the arts community in mind as planning goes on for the proposed rail corridor connecting the two twin cities. Affordable housing for emerging artists in a designated area would be a cultural boon for the twin cities. We have such beautifully designed cities and it is my hope that this transit project would reflect our cultural treasures in its design and stations.

(CCLRP0109) SocNC-022

There should be no revitalization that causes gentrification. The diversity and vitality of University Avenue MUST be protected.

(CCLRP0139) SocNC-025

1. Affordable housing that is at or below the 50% of AMI.

(CCLRP0134) SocNC-027

Affordable housing along and close to the corridor must be preserved. i.e. can land trusts be implemented?

(CCLRP0893) SocNC-030

Within the corridor itself we must ensure that there is adequate mixed-income life cycle housing available to serve the needs of the current and future residents of the neighborhoods. Inclusionary zoning has proven to be effective in creating such housing options and should be implemented along the corridor.

(CCLRP0138) SocNC-121

Increase/maintain affordable housing.

(CCLRP0651) SocNC-161

I am sure that the members of the various government bodies (including Mr. Ortega) have worked long and hard on transit solutions between Minneapolis and St. Paul and should be commended for their efforts. We know that additional transit options can improve life along University Avenue, but will they? And, will the people who live and work on/near University now be able to afford to be a part of the 'new, improved' University Avenue?

(CCLRP0915) SocSoc-001

economic development has to be third because in my experience when I see reports like this coming from institutions like yourself, economic development is just a euphemism for gentrification, for eminent domain, and for an increase in income to the big bucks retailers and to large corporations that normal folks like myself never get to see a piece of but we have to pay for it.

Response SocNC-019. St. Paul adopted the Central Corridor Development Strategy (October 2007). The Development Strategy contains an Inclusive Housing strategy that is intended to mitigate the potential displacement of low-income individuals and families from the corridor should property values rise. Further, specific strategies are identified for home ownership assistance. The Central Corridor Development Strategy is referenced in the FEIS in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 and Chapter 5.

Issue Summary SocNC-020. Feels proposed stops ignore needs of community along corridor (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0141) PlaTE-012

The fact that you care only going to have stops at Rice Street, Lexington, and Snelling Ave is an insult to the residents who LIVE in this corridor, ignoring OUR needs, tearing up our neighborhood, endangering small businesses.

Response SocNC-020. To address community access issues in this segment and to respond to community concerns regarding station spacing, the Metropolitan Council evaluated future stations at Hamline Avenue, Western Avenue, and Victoria Street in the SDEIS. Public meetings were held in this segment of the corridor to elicit comment regarding the inclusion of future infill stations and other project attributes (see Chapter 11 and supporting documentation in Appendix F). The locations of these future infill stations would reduce the

station spacing from approximately one mile to a half mile along University Avenue in the portion of the corridor. Recognizing the potential LRT stations have to enhance growth and development around station areas, the City of Saint Paul City Council adopted the Central Corridor Development Strategy. Although these stations are not included in the project as described in Section 2.3, the underlying infrastructure would be constructed in order for these stations to be built as ridership and finances allow, without disrupting the operation of the Central Corridor LRT.

Section: 3.2 - Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections

Issue Summary SocLU-013. Needed updates to FEIS Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) SocLU-020

Since 2002, the City has completed "station area plans" for Dale & University, Snelling, Lexington & University, and Zoning Code revisions that introduce the new "family" of zoning classifications dealing with "traditional neighborhoods." Also, the Downtown Development Strategy was completed. Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 should be updated to reflect such work.

Response SocLU-013. Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the FEIS include references to these neighborhood plans and guidance documents.

Section: 3.3 - Acquisitions and Displacements -

Issue Summary ProALT-003. Acquisitions, Relocations and Displacements with Preferred Alternative (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0076) ProALT-040

Our caveat would be that University not be widened to the extent that homes are taken along the corridor.

Response ProALT-003. No homes will be taken for implementation of the Central Corridor LRT.

Issue Summary ProPOL-001. Acquisitions, relocations, and displacements (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0135) ProPOL-36

Affordable housing must be included. At least 30% s/b affordable rate minimum 1 to 1 to replace existing housing.

(CCLRP0109) SocLU-001

must be replacement policy - one-to-one - for housing lost due to construction of line.

Response ProPOL-001. No housing will be taken for construction of the Central Corridor LRT Preferred Alternative. Maintaining existing affordable housing and providing additional opportunities for affordable housing is a priority for the City of St. Paul, as outlined in the goals for City of St. Paul's Public Housing Agency.

Issue Summary SocNC-014. No one should be displaced by the current design (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0096) SocNC-052

This does not appear to be a revisiting of the neighborhood because no one should be displaced by the current design.

(CCLRP0475) SocNC-182

p. 1-10 As far as Hiawatha being an example of preservation of neighborhoods, that is misleading. Hiawatha LRT was built where houses were tom down many years in advance of Hiawatha.

Response SocNC-014. The right of way and property acquisition data are presented in Section 3.3 of the FEIS. Although in a few cases residential properties will be slightly affected, no homes will be acquired for the project,. The proposed acquisitions, relocations, and displacements were identified using preliminary engineering (PE) design information and approximate ROW requirements.

Section: 3.4 - Cultural Resources

Issue Summary NatVA-003. Station location in front of the historic Union Depot headhouse is still of historic and aesthetic concern (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) NatVA-3

Since the LRT alignment is now planned north of the Capitol, visual impacts are minimized. But the station location in front of the historic Union Depot headhouse is still of historic and aesthetic concern.

Response NatVA-003. Design of these stations are ongoing, and comments will be solicited from SHPO, consulting parties to the 106 process, and local stakeholders. These issues are fully evaluated in the Sections 3.4 and 3.6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocCR-001. More detail is needed for a review of potential impacts to cultural resources (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0457) SocCR-2

Chapter 3 - Social and Land Use Impact Analysis:

Cultural resource management: There needs to be more detail on the Area of Potential Effect. It appears that some properties are missing from the NRHP listed and eligible table.

Minneapolis City Hall is not listed. The IDS tower, the Minneapolis Club, the Northwestern National Life/ING building, and possibly other downtown structures are eligible for this designation. The 1995 study recommended these structures for eligibility, as well as the Minnesota Transfer Railway in St. Paul, which is listed as needing Phase II review. More detail is needed for a review of potential impacts to cultural resources.

(CCLRP0457) SocCR-5

Page 3-52: Cultural Resources. The small section on Historic Resources offers little to review. The Station Areas should note the APE (area of potential effect) and directly comment on the affected cultural resources with plans and photographs. All affected cultural resources must be identified, photographed and documented. At this time, the Cultural Resources documentation is inadequate and staff cannot analyze the impact or mitigation without further information on the station plan, track design and affected historic resources.

Response SocCR-001. Cultural resource reports have been completed for the project with input from SHPO, consulting parties to the 106 process, and local stakeholders. Detailed evaluations of parks, cultural and historic resources are included in Sections 3.4 and 3.5 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocCR-002. Provisions for history displays, neighborhood information, public art, and green space must be included (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0531) SocCR-6

Provisions for history displays, neighborhood information, public art, and green space must be included.

Response SocCR-002. Following the Record of Decision (ROD) for the FEIS, the Final Design Phase will begin. During this phase the aesthetic design elements become more focused. Aesthetic elements include, but are not limited to, the appearance of bridge and wall treatments, shelters, barriers, fencing, landscaping, lighting fixtures, and transition plazas. Workshops will be held by the project teams to seek stakeholder participation and input in these areas. The City of St. Paul completed a Central Corridor Development Strategy, which presents guidelines for future decisions regarding land use and zoning, capital investments, and the delivery of City services. It creates a framework for development of the alignment and station area planning including public art and a general vision and emphasis on the transition to more vibrant and beautiful neighborhoods.

Issue Summary SocHI-001. Concern that historic buildings and monuments will be impacted (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0878) SocHI-1

Light rail will cause not only disruption for the need for extreme street widening, pollution cleanup, and utility relocation, it will also cause the relocation if possible of many businesses and the elimination of historic and/or long standing buildings.

(CCLRP0407) SocHI-3

In the text of 3.6.2 on p3-49, there should be some recognition of the historic buildings along 4th Street, as this is one of the best stretches of intact historic facades extant in downtown.

(CCLRP0442) SocHI-6

If there are any planned activities which will disturb or destroy these monuments, NOS requires not less than 90 days' notification in advance of such activities in order to plan for their relocation. NOS recommends that funding for this project includes the cost of any relocation(s) required

Response SocHI-001. These issues are fully evaluated according to the Section 106 process, and are described in Sections 3.4 and 3.6 of the FEIS. The resolution of these Section 106 issues is outlined in the Programmatic Agreement, which is included in Appendix G of the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocHI-002. Concern in regard to impact on Historic Station 19 (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0457) SocHI-2

Historic Station 19 needs to be protected and should not be disrupted as part of this project.

Response SocHI-002. This project will not disrupt Station 19.

Issue Summary SocHI-003. Request that the Memorandum of Agreement with the State Historic Preservation Office be included in the FEIS (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0428) SocHI-4

6) Historic properties and potential sites for listing after Phase One evaluation have been identified from extensive research, DEIS Section 3.7 Tables 1 and 2. We request that the Memorandum of Agreement with the State Historic Preservation Office be included in the FEIS with all appropriate signatures to affirm concurrences.

Response SocHI-003. A Section 106 Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Transit Administration, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office regarding the Central Corridor LRT project has been executed. The FEIS contains a copy of this agreement..

Issue Summary SocHI-004. Report must include newly designated University-Raymond Heritage Preservation District (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) SocHI-5

The University-Raymond Heritage Preservation District (local) has now been designated and the text on p3-59 should be amended to so note.

Response SocHI-004. This change has been incorporated into Section 3.4 of the FEIS.

Section: 3.5 - Parklands and Recreation Areas

Issue Summary SocP4-001. Public spaces and green spaces. (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0781) SocP4-1

Great cities have great public spaces.

(CCLRP0135) SocP4-5

Public space with green space/open space

Response SocP4-001. Comment noted.

Issue Summary SocP4-002. Should identify all potentially impacted regional trails and corresponding potential adverse impacts (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0435) SocP4-2

Parks and Open Space. The Central Corridor build alternatives cross existing and proposed trails including regional trails as identified in the Regional Parks Policy Plan and systems statements for the Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul. It appears that the document does not address regional trails. The following trails appear not to be identified: Existing Regional Park: The build alternatives use the Washington Avenue Bridge and cross over trails in Mississippi Gorge Regional Park in Minneapolis. Proposed Regional Trails: Cedar Lake Regional Trail (BNSF Mainline, Minneapolis), Mississippi Como Regional Trail (Raymond Avenue, St. Paul), Lexington Parkway Regional Trail (Lexington Parkway, St. Paul), Munger State Trail (Jackson Street, St. Paul). The FEIS should identify the above regional trails, any potential adverse impacts, and appropriate mitigation. Attached for your information are the Regional Parks System Statements for the Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

Response SocP4-002. Section 3.5 does not discuss any trails. Rather it discusses the existing parklands, open space, and recreation areas that are located in proximity to the Central Corridor. It evaluates the potential direct and indirect impacts to public properties that are

generally used as parks, open areas, and recreation areas by the public. The Mississippi National River and Recreation Area Overlay District (MNRRA) is not owned by the public. MNRRA is a designated corridor that has National Park Service administrative oversight and is described as such in Section 3.5 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocP4-003. The City has a "no net loss" policy regarding parkland and report should list additional parks (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) SocP4-3

The City has a "no net loss" policy regarding parkland. It should be so noted in 3.4.1 on p3-28. In addition, the Museum Park is listed as a public park in 3.4.2 p3-32. It is not, so the text should so note. Also, Hamm Memorial Park is actually Hamm Plaza. Finally, Landmark Plaza (old Firststar site), Harriet Island Regional Park, Lower Landing, Bruce Vento Nature Sanctuary and the Wacouta Commons should be added to the list on pp3-32 to 33.

Response SocP4-003. For this analysis, the Study Area was identified as a 0.5-mile wide area centered on the Central Corridor LRT alignment. Parks outside this boundary are not included in the inventory or analysis of potential impacts. Identification of the parks and recreation areas was based on the AA/DEIS, review of electronic data from the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, and the DNR. In Section 3.5 of the FEIS, Museum Park is described as "a landscaped urban open space." Hamm Plaza is correctly named.

Issue Summary SocP4-004. Green spaces should be provided along University Avenue. (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0527) SocP4-4

We encourage green spaces along University Avenue. In the early 1900's, Dickerman Park was originally part of a plan outlining a grand boulevard for University Avenue, one featuring art and gardens, with the intent of creating a Midwest rendition of the Champs Elysees. Dickerman Park is now undergoing a renaissance and we believe that provisions must be made to provide these amenities all along University Avenue and the Central Corridor.

Response SocP4-004. Since publication of the AA/DEIS, the City of St. Paul developed the Central Corridor Development Strategy (a chapter of the City's Comprehensive Plan). The Development Strategy contains a set of guidelines for development at and around station locations including parks, connections to the neighborhoods, building mass and design, and other guidelines to honor and enhance neighborhood character. In addition, Minneapolis is updating the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth, which recognizes the importance of strategic infrastructure investments along transportation corridors, the vitality of its downtown neighborhoods, and its relationship to important institutions. These plans have been taken into consideration and are described in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the FEIS. The Metropolitan Council does not own or maintain parkland along the Central Corridor.

Issue Summary SocP4-005. LRT would not substantially impact or diminish the activities, features, or attributes at any of the ten parks, within 300-feet of the proposed alignment (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) SocP4-6

Beginning on p3-28 the Draft EIS outlines parklands and potential impacts of LRT on parks, concluding " ...the University Avenue LRT Alternative would not substantially impact or diminish the activities, features, or attributes at any of the ten parks, within 300-feet of the proposed alignment." The City of Saint Paul agrees with this assessment.

Response SocP4-005. Section 3.5 of the FEIS states, "Because the existing parks are in urban settings that are both fairly noisy and visually busy, these impacts would be minor in nature. These impacts would not result in the substantial impairment of the use of any of the recreational resources within the corridor."

Issue Summary SocP4-006. Preserve green spaces (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0545) SocP4-7

There should be no loss of current green spaces such as Dickerman and Iris Parks. Efforts should be made to preserve the oak grove at the old Midway Hospital site.

Response SocP4-006. As noted in Section 3.5 of the FEIS, Dickerman and Iris Parks would not be affected by the project.

Section: 3.6 - Visual Quality and Aesthetics

Issue Summary NatVA-002. Concerns about aesthetics of overhead electrical wiring and stations (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0485) NatVA-2

The overhead electrical wiring that's designed to operate the LRT will be visually displeasing. In an area with a high residential concentration already crowded with commercial advertisement displays, overhead electrical lines will further the "visual clutter" currently borne by EJ communities at a time when many communities desire more open space. As a mitigation alternative, work with the impacted EJ communities to develop their visions of greener and open spaces. Introduce the element of water to incorporate peace and serenity.

(CCLRP0407) NatVA-8

The issue of introducing an overhead electrical system along the route is of interest and concern to the City. Potential mitigation measures outlined on p3-51 should be vigorously pursued in Preliminary Engineering.

(CCLRP0485) NatVA-14

C. Visual/Aesthetic. The overhead electrical wiring that's designed to operate the LRT will be visually displeasing. In an area with a high residential concentration already crowded with commercial advertisement displays, overhead electrical lines will further the "visual clutter" currently borne by EJ communities at a time when many communities desire more open space. As a mitigation alternative, work with the impacted EJ communities to develop their visions of greener and open spaces. Introduce the element of water to incorporate peace and serenity.

Response NatVA-002. The FEIS includes recommendations for mitigating visual impacts (Section 3.7 of the FEIS). The use of aesthetically pleasing support poles and landscaping could help minimize their visual obtrusiveness. The catenary system associated with a 25-kV electrification system may be perceived as resulting in visual clutter, depending on the complexity of the network of wiring needed for the overhead catenary system. The project will further refine mitigation of visual impacts during final design.

Issue Summary NatVA-004. Beautify corridor especially including public art (15)

Comments:

(CCLRP0550) NatVA-4

Finally, I would recommend that art be considered integral to the design of the entire Central Corridor line. Each station should reflect the social, cultural and physical context of its surroundings. While public artwork cannot repair old wounds it can help honor, communicate to and inspire communities. It should be your mission is to create a transit corridor that can be a source of neighborhood pride, as well as a tool for social and cultural development.

(CCLRP0340) NatVA-9

However, I'd like to urge that the project be done carefully. It needs to be done in a way that adds a positive atmosphere to the Frogtown area. The stops should look classy and not be magnets for gang tagging and hanging out.

(CCLRP0458) NatVA-13

Mr. Schweigert outlined nine issues, concerns, or potential benefits raised by the district councils, in consultation with each other and their constituents that have to be addressed or included in this project: ...7) the best possible designs for beauty and attractiveness of the streetscape and open spaces including public art;

(CCLRP0139) NatVA-15

3. Public art

(CCLRP0006) NatVA-17

I hope that street trees and appropriate landscaping will be considered in addition to integrating LRT stops with bike paths and pedestrian walk-ways.

(CCLRP0483) NatVA-22

I'd like to express my opinion regarding public art along the University/light rail. Line. I think including art in bus stop shelters and other possible structures would be a wonderful way to highlight and integrate the work of community artists as well as help beautify and vitalize the areas involved.

(CCLRP0271) NatVA-23

There is obviously much that could be done to beautify University Avenue and improve transit service in the Central Corridor. Plant some trees. Stripe a bike lane. Improve the sidewalks. Double, rather than halve, the frequency of the every-block transit service by replacing the big old dirty buses with smaller, cleaner, more energy-efficient transit vehicles. A greener, more pedestrian, bicycle and transit-oriented University Avenue would do much to make the Central Corridor a more livable community.

(CCLRP0479) NatVA-24

The Central Corridor project affords a chance to physically unite the citizens of St. Paul while offering them an inclusive, aesthetic experience in the process. Public art should be central to any plans developed for this corridor because by their very nature, the arts are inclusive.

(CCLRP0531) NatVA-25

The plans for public space amenities and visual appeal in conjunction with the construction of light rail should use the highest quality materials in the street and sidewalk surfaces as well as shelters, signs, lights, and fixtures. Fixtures should include bicycle racks.

(CCLRP0303) NatVA-27

I moved here from Texas--a state with dismal public transportation despite gridlocked freeways and ozone action days--and I have been so impressed with the Twin Cities. They are truly a metropolitan model for other cities to follow, in two very important ways: 1) their commitment to public transportation, and 2) the state's overall commitment to the arts. It is imperative that artists have affordable spaces to work out of. Most artists are forced to pursue their careers after-hours, when they've returned from an unremarkable 40-hour/week job that pays the bills. Providing affordable spaces for artists assists their careers tremendously. Moreover, arts districts have been shown to markedly revitalize neighborhoods, particularly those which formerly housed warehouses and factories which have fallen into disrepair. Public art is the best antidote to elitist art. Everyone has ownership of public art--one needn't be a millionaire to enjoy it. Public art--particularly mural art--also discourages graffiti (taggers are more likely to paint graffiti on a blank slate than on another person's work of art) and can even put those same graffiti makers to work, creating something of value to everyone. (Other cities have created successful mural programs for convicted taggers to serve community service hours.) Public art would also put our "legitimate" artists to work. Just think of the numerous projects created during the WPA that we still enjoy today.

(CCLRP0271) NatVA-29

Plant some trees on University Ave. Stripe a bike lane on University Ave. Double the frequency of existing transit service on University Ave. by replacing the dirty old buses with smaller, cleaner, more energy-efficient transit vehicles. Do some landscaping and other improvements on the sidewalks of University Ave. All would be great improvements for Central Corridor neighborhoods, businesses and transit riders.

(CCLRP0484) NatVA-32

Make the walk between stops pleasant. Repair & maintain sidewalks, plant trees in the boulevard and encourage other shade opportunities. Have a mix of businesses that are friendly to pedestrians such as coffee shops, deli, ice-cream. Have interesting things to look at between stops, window shopping, public art.

(CCLRP0178) NatVA-33

7. Streetscapes, public art/aesthetics, and open spaces. A. The DCC, recognizing the important effect aesthetics have on the comfort, security, and sense of belonging of residents, businesses, and visitors, strongly recommends that innovative means be used to ensure that public (and private, where possible) spaces reflect the history, aspirations, and character of each neighborhood, employing community input for designing history displays, neighborhood information, public art, and increasing local green space. B. The DCC supports station designs that incorporate, wherever possible, elements linking the new system with the individual character, history and cultural sensibilities of each neighborhood, while recognizing the need for user safety, comfort, and convenience. C. The DCC recommends the use of neighborhood committees comprised of local artists, designers, community and cultural historians, along with planners and engineers for developing standards for design and outcomes for differentiation appropriate for each neighborhood.

(CCLRP0532) NatVA-34

No matter what happens, we need facade and streetscape improvements on University Avenue. We request investment in making our end of University Avenue more attractive.

(CCLRP0286) NatVA-35

Additionally, it's important that Public Art be integrated into the design of the stations, streetscape, or other elements. Please add my comments to your survey.

Response NatVA-004. Following the ROD for the FEIS, the Final Design Phase will begin. During this phase the aesthetic design elements become more focused. Aesthetic elements include, but are not limited to, the appearance of bridge and wall treatments, shelters, barriers, fencing, landscaping, lighting fixtures, and transition plazas. Workshops will be held by the project teams to seek stakeholder participation and input in these areas. In addition, the project will include \$3 million in public art, which will be incorporated into the new stations. Ten artists have been asked to submit sample station designs and public outreach plans for the Central Corridor LRT project. It is intended that three to five artists will work with the community to develop public art for integration into station designs. Selection of the artists was based on artistic merit, maintainability, durability, appropriateness for local climate, and public involvement. Members of the public are being asked to serve on station

art committees to work with the artists to ensure that the art at the station reflects the neighborhood. The 13 LRT station art committees will advise the five artist teams on the culture and history of the community. The committees will assist the Metropolitan Council and its Central Corridor Project Office in planning and promoting public art meetings with the community.

Issue Summary NatVA-005. The project will improve the aesthetics of the area (6)

Comments:

(CCLRP0288) NatVA-6

I feel that it will be good for the neighborhood economically and aesthetically. There is just something about light rail that makes people want to ride it. It is more chic than a bus and also more comfortable.

(CCLRP0050) NatVA-10

I also think it would be an attraction for people visiting from other states and or countries.

(CCLRP0761) NatVA-11

You know, the light rail on Hiawatha was supposed to be aesthetically pleasing until you ride one of these trains that have the windows covered so you could sell advertising in order to pay for the expenses of the rail. That's a pretty disgusting operation to sit on one of those trains with the big giant beautiful windows and you can't see anything out of that.

(CCLRP0479) NatVA-18

I am currently the Artist in Residence for the city of Saint Paul. The members of B.O.M.A. (the Building Owners Management Association of Saint Paul) funded this position and I have an office in the administration of the Department of Public works and a seat on the Core Team of the Design Center. My residency is charged with the task of incorporating the arts into the ongoing infrastructural development of the city. I was recently given the opportunity to integrate the arts into the streetscape around the new Rondo library located at University and Dale by the city engineer John Maczko using STAR grant funds made available by Debbie Montgomery, the district's councilperson. Specifically, I was asked to incorporate ideas from community members and the diverse ethnic and cultural groups that make up the neighborhood surrounding the library into the design of the artwork. Over the past two months I have had the honor to meet with members of the African American, Hmong, Cambodian, Native American, Mexican American, Vietnamese, and Somali communities to show them the scope of the project and ask for their participation. Every single individual and cultural group that I have spoken with knows exactly what I am trying to accomplish and why it is important for them to be included. The arts are central to all cultures, no matter the political, religious or geographic background of its citizens. I attended the first meeting held by the city council in their chambers to take input from the citizens of St. Paul on the Central Corridor project. I had gone there to speak myself but was so overwhelmed with the beauty of the chambers that I was speechless. It was the first time I had attended a city council meeting, even though my office is on the ground floor of same building. City Hall itself is a testament to the role the arts should play in all municipal buildings and other public spaces such as parks, plazas and transportation corridors. The arts speak to the heart of who we are

as a community and what we consider to be important. It represents the individual aspirations that we all share -no matter our background- and serves to focus our diverse cultural inheritance into an expression of our identity, shared through the language of art.

(CCLRP0791) NatVA-19

I'm very much for Light Rail Transit as an individual living in Lowertown right next to the depot, but right now I'm working in the administration section of the Department of Public Works trying to bring art into the city streetscape and as such through Debbie Montgomery received a Star Grant to do just that around the sidewalks of University the sidewalks surrounding Rondo Library at University and Dale. And as part of my program I'm not there to do my own work but to try to integrate other cultures' arts and writings into that streetscape. As such, I've spent the last two months contacting every single cultural group on that University intersection, University and Dale Street intersection, and in the process of handing them my business card from the city, I also hand them my own personal card with my own work over the last 20 years; and after I explain the project through photographs and everything else -- and what the project is very quickly, it's just putting in pavers into the streetscape and it shows different cultural motifs, be they poetry, quotes, historical sayings from all these different cultural groups. Every single one of these cultural groups that I've gone to recognizes what it is that I'm doing and why it is I'm doing it. Everyone understands the arts and the arts are critical to the inclusive nature of whatever is going to be built up here. I went to the City Council Chambers for this first meeting a couple of days ago to say the same thing and I was so stunned by the aesthetic within that chamber itself. The art speaks so well just by themselves if given a chance to exist in public space. I think the City Council Chambers is probably the best example of that. We don't need a 30-foot-high onyx makeup of a peace god on every stop, but the arts should certainly be included. I'd like to leave two of these brochures that I've handed out to over 40 different groups here on the University Corridor.

(CCLRP0407) NatVA-28

Further, the Draft EIS states "[t]he proposed budget for the LRT Alternative would include a complete rebuild of the Avenue, which would allow for aesthetic improvements." The City of Saint Paul whole-heartedly supports the need for a complete rebuild of University Avenue, and asserts that this is not only all aesthetic concern, but a concern for economic and community stability.

Response NatVA-005. Comment noted.

Issue Summary NatVA-006. Preserve existing and add new green space including trees

(4)

Comments:

(CCLRP0545) NatVA-7

8) That beautification of the avenue should result from any development. TN zoning should be in place all along the avenue. Transit stops should reflect the history and cultural variety of the local neighborhoods. Greening of the avenue should take place along with development.

(CCLRP0137) NatVA-12

5. Aesthetics - that businesses and housing along the corridor will be attractive and safe.

(CCLRP0457) NatVA-20

Page 3-48: Impacts Related to Visual/Aesthetic Conditions. The LRT alternative proposes a complete rebuild of University Avenue but does not indicate whether the mature boulevard trees existing on the Minneapolis portion of University Avenue would be retained. Retention of the existing, mature boulevard trees is important in enhancing the visual appearance of the area and is important to the Prospect Park East River Road neighborhood.

(CCLRP0457) NatVA-30

It is very important that mature trees be preserved wherever possible if the entire roadway is reconstructed.

Response NatVA-006. The City of St. Paul organized a series of open houses and workshops to engage community members to develop a vision of how each station area could grow and respond to the LRT with respect to land use and built form (among other themes). Improving the image of the corridor is also addressed in St. Paul's Central Corridor Development Strategy, which is described in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the FEIS. As part of advanced preliminary engineering for the Central Corridor LRT project, a design plan for streetscaping improvements is underway. This plan is being created with input from all project partners and stakeholders, as well as the general public. Existing boulevard trees that are removed due to the construction of the Central Corridor LRT will be replaced consistent with city policies. The preliminary design plans, as illustrated in Appendix L, provide space within the corridor for vegetation, and the streetscaping design plan will provide guidance and criteria for placement of additional vegetation. Other elements identified in the streetscaping design plan include criteria for lighting standards, wayfinding signs, street furniture, and public art.

Issue Summary NatVA-007. Project should beautify the streetscape, including the use of public art (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0539) NatVA-16

(CCLRP0807) NatVA-21

Two, streetscape improvements on University Avenue through Prospect Park must also be maintained.

Response NatVA-007. At this stage of the planning and impact review process only the content of the preliminary design plans, which includes elements such as general dimensions and locations of the light rail alignment, and station locations are considered. As part of advanced preliminary engineering for the Central Corridor LRT project, a design plan for streetscaping improvements is underway. This plan is being created with input from all project partners and stakeholders, as well as the general public. The project will also include \$3 million in public art, which will be incorporated into the new stations. The artists will

work with the community to develop public art for integration into station designs. Members of the public are being asked to serve on station art committees to work with the artists to ensure that the art at the station reflects the neighborhood.

Issue Summary NatVA-008. Concerns in regard to aesthetics of train and electric wire running down middle of avenue, plus support for BRT (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0447) NatVA-26

Aesthetics: 1) Let's move the high-end development of Grand Avenue to University Avenue on both sides of the street and add trees along the boulevard, pedestrian friendly foot traffic, gleaming storefronts and plantings. Now, put a 28-foot wide path into this picture with electrical wire running along this corridor with a train barreling down only stopping at four stops, Snelling, Lexington, Dale and Rice Street and into downtown. You would not be able to cross the street at normal crossings. You would have to walk two to four blocks minimum east or west depending on where you are going. Is this aesthetically appealing? This becomes nothing more than a glorified expressway to accommodate those who would not think of getting off before their destination to and from work. 2) Now remove the train and replace with a center islands with blooming shrubs, trees, sculptures and banners all along University Avenue, transform the buses to hybrid or electrical (fuel cells) and add buses as needed. We have the minds and technology to do so. Let's put the much needed bricks and mortar and beautification into University Avenue. This would accentuate the corridor in a very nice way. Which would one choose?

Response NatVA-008. The BRT alternative was evaluated during the AA/DEIS process; see Chapter 2. The Preferred Alternative satisfies project goals and objectives, which are discussed in Chapter 1 of the AA/DEIS, the SDEIS, and the FEIS. The selection of the Preferred Alternative is discussed in Chapter 2 of the FEIS. Aesthetic concerns are discussed in Section 3.6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary NatVA-009. The functionality & aesthetics of the University campus must be enhanced (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0437) NatVA-31

The functionality & aesthetics of the University campus must be enhanced.

Response NatVA-009. The Metropolitan Council and other project sponsors are working closely with U of M officials to enhance aesthetics, functionality, and safety within the campus setting.

Issue Summary PlaTP-078. Cross-section design is extremely important (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-056

CROSS-SECTION DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS (Section 2). The cross-section design is extremely important to ensure that the LRT can be easily integrated into the community. ...This cross-section should include boulevards with landscaping, street furniture and bus shelters.

Response PlaTP-078. Cross sections of the Central Corridor LRT have been developed to accommodate areas for landscaped plantings. These are depicted in the preliminary engineering plans for the Preferred Alternative as provided in Appendix L of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProHLP-027. Streetscape amenities, sidewalk improvements, and transit enhancements should be included in the project (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0457) ProHLP-097

There is community interest in fully reconstructing University Avenue, 4th Street SE, and Washington Avenue from building face to building face and including streetscape amenities, sidewalk improvements, and transit enhancements as part of the project.

Response ProHLP-027. The street surface, curbs and sidewalks along the Central Corridor LRT ROW will be reconstructed, but the roadbed or subsurface is in good condition and will not be replaced. This will shorten the construction time and reduce costs. Metropolitan Council is working closely with the cities, neighborhoods, and citizen committees to ensure that the stations and their surroundings are compatible with their neighborhoods. For example, Metropolitan Council supported the City of St. Paul's Central Corridor Development Strategy, which engaged the public and corridor stakeholders in creating a framework for development of the alignment and station area planning including public art and a general vision and emphasis on vibrant and beautiful neighborhoods. Basic station design will also reflect the local neighborhood character and history through the public art program. Five artist teams with experience on public infrastructure projects will develop artwork to be integrated into the 15 Central Corridor LRT stations. The Metropolitan Council approved the recommendations of the artist selection committee on Oct. 22, 2008, clearing the way for the project office to negotiate and execute contracts totaling \$2.8 million. The artists must create community task forces for each station and involvement plans to engage the community. They are to complete substantive station design work before April 2009. The importance of including green space as part of sensitive and compatible station design and Central Corridor streetscapes continues to be the focus of planning, review, and public input. In addition, the project sponsors are working closely with U of M officials to enhance aesthetics, functionality, and safety within the campus setting. The Metropolitan Council has committed to working with area stakeholders during final design to incorporate these important elements. Section 3.6 of the FEIS describes these programs in more detail.

Section: 3.7 - Safety and Security

Issue Summary EngBP-015. **Bus/Rail [safety] concerns** (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0114) SocSS-56

The bus will pull over to the curb at the corner and drop you off. This kind of traffic will be very bad on University Avenue. Also people would have to stand out in front of traffic to get on a rail type.

Response EngBP-015. Station platform locations will provide shielding to LRT users, and pedestrian improvements at station locations and intersections along the route will be made to improve the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists wishing to use the train or simply cross University or Washington Avenues. A full discussion of the existing conditions and planned future impacts to pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure is provided in FEIS Section 6.3 "Other Transportation Impacts."

Issue Summary PlaTP-059. **City of Saint Paul recommendations in regard to station design.** (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-230

The City of Saint Paul recommends that in Preliminary Engineering there needs to be: * Extensive discussions on the details of station design with respect to safety and security. * A baseline design for station platforms of 300 feet (p2-8 "Stations"). * Extensive discussions on both the corridor-wide approach to station design as well as to the individual stations themselves. * Interdisciplinary teams to assist neighborhoods in differentiating station design that reflects the character, history and aspirations of each neighborhood. * Discussion on the design, location, uniformity and differentiation of bus shelters. * Negotiated operations and maintenance budget to provide for adequate resources for excellence in appearance, timely repairs and sufficient security personnel at stations and on trains.

Response PlaTP-059. Most of the issues raised have been addressed in PE (see Appendix L for drawings and cross sections), stations have been designed and will be constructed to manage three-car trains at approximately 300 feet, and extensive discussions have taken place regarding station design and safety and security. Some of these issues will be ongoing into advanced preliminary engineering and final design specifically involving the community in station art and design and negotiating maintenance agreements. It is intended that three to five artists will work with the community in the fall and winter of 2008 to develop public art for integration into station designs. Operations and maintenance budget items are discussed in Chapter 8 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-096. There needs to be more trash containers on Lexington Avenue (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0488) PlaTP-099

Trash pickup: The corner of Lexington is projected to have 1030 riders. Riders will need a place to toss their coffee cups and sandwich wrappers--with the fast food on University Ave. many residents spend time picking up trash from customers of the fast food stores--with an increase of public traffic in the area--the trash will increase. There needs to be more trash containers on Lexington to eliminate this problem.

Response PlaTP-096. Trash receptacles will be located on LRT station platforms.

Issue Summary SocSS-002. General safety concerns of stations and adjacent neighborhoods (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0113) SocSS-007

Security officers available on all LT Rail Trains.

(CCLRP0189) SocSS-034

Furthermore, the construction of the LRT will pose many inconveniences and safety concerns for the families who reside in the neighborhoods near the proposed sight.

(CCLRP0484) SocSS-042

The area around the LRT lines must be safe and have the appearance of being safe. Reduce loitering, pan handling, run down buildings, broken sidewalks. Increase police beat patrols, businesses have windows to view inside the business and to view from the business to the outside. It's important to have others around to observe what is happening on the street. Within the LRT it must be a safe place.

(CCLRP0127) SocSS-044

Safety of vulnerable people. Security for passengers. Stops - are they going to be safe? More stops. How late will it be running? Is there going to be enough lighting at stops?

(CCLRP0755) SocSS-054

It's going to be unsafe. It's going to contribute to crime.

Response SocSS-002. Section 3.7 of the FEIS explains that although security resources for the corridor are primarily the responsibility of the two city police departments, the Metropolitan Transit Police provides roving security for bus transit facilities within the corridor. Transit police routinely patrol the bus routes and bus stop areas. Transit police officers on the Hiawatha LRT system, which is similar to the proposed Central Corridor LRT system, provide security at the LRT stations and in the rail cars.

Issue Summary SocSS-003. Safety should be the primary objective (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) SocSS-009

Safety is paramount with respect to station design. Protection of patrons accessing the station platform, as well as protection on the platform requires special accommodations including lighting, signal control, railings, security, LRT vehicle warning lights/sounds and many others. Particular attention needs be paid to issues of visually and hearing

impaired as well as mobility impaired. In addition, access to the stations must be kept free of snow with well-maintained surfaces and pleasing aesthetics.

(CCLRP0152) SocSS-018

Concerns are: 2. Safety

(CCLRP0084) SocSS-049

Safety is the primary objective, but once safety measures are taken care of, speed and efficiency for riders is critical.

Response SocSS-003. The Central Corridor LRT system would be developed in accordance with the Metropolitan Council's Safety and Security Management Plan (SSMP), a part of the Project Management Plan (PMP). The SSMP ensures that safety and security are considered when designing and constructing the project. This plan covers safety and security design criteria, hazard analyses, threat and vulnerability analyses, construction safety and security, operational staff training and emergency response measures, and would include development of a Metro Transit SEPP to ensure continuation of safety and security during operations. The Metro Transit Fire Life Safety Committee facilitates exchange of information on safety and security policy to minimize fire and life safety hazards to rail patrons, project employees and the public. The FLSC maintains project safety criteria and supports inspections of transit system elements in compliance with established fire/life safety criteria and reviews the facilities and systems design for compliance with established federal, state, and local regulations, codes, and standards relating to fire/life safety. See Section 3.7 of the FEIS for additional details.

Issue Summary SocSS-004. Provide good lighting to improve safety (4)

Comments:

(CCLRP0135) SocSS-017

Safe lighting

(CCLRP0139) SocSS-020

Lightening and security in the design of station platforms

(CCLRP0797) SocSS-032

You need to have more light into the area if you're going to have this going on most of the night. The light on University Avenue is very dim.

(CCLRP0122) SocSS-047

I am concerned about the safety of it. I would like to see more stops. Make sure that everything is well lit at night.

Response SocSS-004. Central Corridor LRT stations, platforms, and pedestrian approaches will be designed to be in compliance with all applicable local, state, and national codes and standards. In addition, the Central Corridor LRT system would be developed in accordance with the Metropolitan Council's Safety and Security Management Plan (SSMP), a part of the Project Management Plan (PMP). The SSMP ensures that safety and security are considered when designing and constructing the project.

Issue Summary SocSS-005. Concerns about public and personal safety (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) SocSS-030

...there are important considerations to protect transit patrons from personal crime, particularly at station areas and on the trains. Such security will require not only careful design, but ongoing funding to ensure personal safety.

(CCLRP0714) SocSS-043

Public Safety Considerations. We provide the radio backbone of Minnesota's Emergency Broadcast System, as well as the backbone for the State's AMBER alert system (the child abduction warning system). Any disruption to these services creates a critical public safety risk.

Response SocSS-005. System safety and security oversight for the Central Corridor LRT project would be achieved through Metropolitan Council implementation of the Safety and Security Management Plan (see FEIS Section 3.7). The plan would include requirements for development of a Metro Transit Security and Emergency Preparedness Plan (SEPP) to ensure continuation of safety and security during Central Corridor LRT operations. Security and safety for the Central Corridor LRT project would also be facilitated by a Metro Transit Fire/Life Safety Committee (FLSC).

Section: 3.8 - Environmental Justice

Issue Summary SocEJ-028. Concerns in regard to impact on environmental justice communities (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0524) SocEJ-060

3. Another inconsistency in the DEIS are repeated statements that minorities will be no more affected than other groups, and saying at the same time that they will be differentially affected. (5.3.4) What is the logical basis for asserting that benefits and adverse effects "...would be representative of the neighborhoods within and adjacent to the corridor?" Especially when the report states 'all displacements and partial displacements would occur in

low income areas.(3-74) We have heard many minority business people say they feel more vulnerable. A cogent case can be made that while development with its pluses and minuses may equally influence different neighborhoods, that does not logically mean the effect or impact on the community's would be equal, which the report seems to repeatedly assert. By their very nature, low income and minority neighborhoods may be more "fragile." It is illogical to state the same stimulus (development) will, a priori, have the same effect on neighborhoods. It is even more dubious to maintain the "null effects' assertion in the face of empirical data from other projects. The DEIS repeatedly ignores these logical problems and hence glosses over very real potential problems for minority communities.

Response SocEJ-028. Comment noted. Transportation equity issues, both in terms of construction and operation, are a critical concern for the Metropolitan Council. The Council has undertaken numerous steps since the publication of the AA/DEIS to address environmental justice concerns in the neighborhoods and communities surrounding the project area. This has included staffing a team of Community Outreach Coordinators to work closely with the affected communities. A team of seven full-time outreach coordinators, many of whom are fluent in foreign languages, including Hmong and Vietnamese, currently work in the project office and this complement of staff will work in the community through project construction. Based upon the comments received from the AA/DEIS, an enhanced discussion of impacts to environmental justice communities is included in the FEIS.

Section: 3.8 - Inclusive Community Involvement

Issue Summary PubPI-005. Concerns about input from the African American community. (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0550) PubPI-005

In order to avoid the pain, destruction and displacement that occurred in old Rondo, the African American community, must given full participation in the planning process. To engender a sense of ownership of the proposed transit line, the African American community specifically and the disparate communities along the line, in general, must be a part of the design development planning phase of the Central Corridor. There should be no displacement.

Response PubPI-005. The Community Advisory Committee was constituted to intentionally represent all geographic, neighborhood, ethnic, and cultural interests along the corridor. The Preferred Alternative as discussed in the FEIS will not result in the acquisition of or displacement of any residential properties or businesses in identified environmental justice areas.

Issue Summary PubPI-006. Concerns about environmental justice and the involvement from all communities. (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0884) PubPI-006

The EJ section does not adequately address the need for real community engagement, especially with communities of color, immigrant communities, and low-income populations, to ensure the whole community derives the ranges of benefits that should be outcomes of equitable development along and near the Central Corridor.

Response PubPI-006. A comprehensive plan for public involvement was developed as part of project development and is summarized in Chapter 11 of the FEIS. The plan included outreach to all communities along the corridor and included hiring Community Outreach Coordinators whose sole responsibility is to interface with residents, business owners and other stakeholders in the process. The plan included a component to reach out to those with limited English proficiency and other sectors of the community who may be typically underrepresented in the planning and public involvement process.

Issue Summary PubPI-007. Concerns about the formation of a Community Advisory Committee. (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0904) PubPI-009

I also would like to comment here that whatever is decided upon -- BRT, LRT, or we do nothing that there is a community advisory committee formed which is definitely representative of the impacted communities which are the communities that's going to be from Rice Street to Snelling. These are the communities that are not on the radar screen. They are not looked at as being viable. They're looked at as being actually dispensable.

(CCLRP0549) PubPI-014

The Merriam Park Community Council believes that the Central Corridor project needs to involve the community in decision-making about LRT throughout planning, design, and construction. A strong Citizens' Advisory Committee should be set up at the beginning of Preliminary Engineering, and should work in partnership with the Central Corridor Management Committee for the duration of the project. ... It is essential that there be transparency throughout the planning process, to ensure that the Central Corridor LRT provides all possible benefits for the people it serves, from downtown to downtown, and all along the corridor.

(CCLRP0171) PubPI-025

I support the comments presents by the DCC and MPCC, but would like to comment as an individual on one of the issues raised by both those groups - the importance of establishing a strong, representative Citizens Advisory Committee with staffing, funding, and influence in planning and mitigation for the Central Corridor light rail project.

(CCLRP0458) PubPI-043

Mr. Schweigert outlined nine issues, concerns, or potential benefits raised by the district councils, in consultation with each other and their constituents, that have to be addressed or included in this project: ...9) the formation of a citizens advisory council

(CCLRP0907) PubPI-086

The primary recommendation that we want to make is that there be formed a citizen advisory committee so that citizens and community members can influence the decision-making process at all stages from planning through construction, through operation of this transit system and that this citizens advisory committee have real power to influence the decisions and outcomes of the transit system with good strong community representation.

Response PubPI-007. A Community Advisory Committee (CAC) was formed during the project development process as a means of engaging community representatives and leaders in the process. Coordination with the CAC is documented in Chapter 11 of the SDEIS and FEIS. The CAC will continue to meet throughout advanced preliminary engineering, final design, and construction of the Central Corridor LRT.

Issue Summary PubPI-009. Community Advisory Committee must have diverse representation (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0171) PubPI-011

In any billion dollar project as complex as this, the balance of influence is likely to be weighted toward the technically savvy, the politically connected, those with resources to present their views in a polished, compelling presentation. The question is, what can we do to ensure a more equal balance, so that the views of neighborhood residents and businesses will have weight? The answer, I believe, lies in the critical importance of setting up a broadly representative Citizens Advisory Committee, with special weight given to representation from transit-dependent populations and those located directly on the corridor, who would be more directly impacted by the light rail line.

(CCLRP0171) PubPI-030

The success of the Salt Lake City light rail project was largely attributed to the effectiveness of the CAC in working with the community to keep people informed and listen to their concerns and needs throughout the project. The costs for the CAC were less than 1% of the overall project cost, and paid huge dividends in generating community support for the light rail project and ensuring that no businesses failed as a result of construction impacts.

The Twin Cities Central Corridor project deserves no less. I hope you will put a high priority on establishing a powerful, well-funded CAC to ensure community engagement and support for the Central Corridor light rail project.

(CCLRP0171) PubPI-052

I believe the Central Corridor project should adopt a number of principles based on the Salt Lake City experience: A broadly representative Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) should be set up at the same time the Central Corridor Management Committee (CCMC) is appointed. Priority should be given to business owners and residents located directly on the corridor in choosing CAC members.

Response PubPI-009. A Community Advisory Committee (CAC) was formed during the project development process as a means of engaging community representatives and leaders in the process. Coordination with the CAC is documented in Chapter 11 of the SDEIS and FEIS. The CAC will continue to meet throughout advanced preliminary engineering, final design, and construction of the Central Corridor LRT. The CAC was constituted to intentionally represent all geographic, neighborhood, ethnic, and cultural interests along the corridor.

Issue Summary PubPI-033. Concern about public input and the Hmong Community in the project planning process (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0794) PubPI-062

I'd like to raise two concerns. One, the resident, the Hmong resident living in that area. I like to encourage to find ways to bring the Hmong resident to be part of the planning process because I don't see many resident here tonight so they have -- particularly the task maybe on the properties or the resident or business.

Response PubPI-033. During project development, a comprehensive public involvement program was created and is discussed in Chapter 11 of the FEIS. This included hiring Community Outreach Coordinators fluent in the languages most commonly spoken by area residents and business owners, including two Outreach Coordinators fluent in Hmong. Several public meetings have been conducted in Hmong and outreach staff members have participated in Hmong community events such as the Hmong Art Fair and Hmong Resource Fair.

Issue Summary SocEJ-000. Citizen and organization views on desirability of Central Corridor LRT project (9)

Comments:

(CCLRP0001) SocEJ-020

Including my above mentioned concerns, I want to add the following: I have been a resident of St. Paul, MN for seventy-one years. I have been uprooted once already from my community and neighborhood of Rondo due to I-94. I remember University Ave with the old street cars used to run from St. Paul to Minneapolis and vice versa. Those old street cars were streamlined to a more modern version that had overhead electrical wiring. I do not remember how long they were in existence but my point is they were all discontinued and dismantled - all the rail tracks in the streets were removed and now you want to replace them again. I see buildings today being newly constructed, opened for a few years and then closed

tight/shut down. People seem so excited for this new endeavor. I, and those who are making these decisions today, may not be here to see this project upon its completion. After ten or twenty years, new city and county commissioners will want to make other changes. I say "DO NOTHING!"

(CCLRP0771) SocEJ-028

The Wilder Foundation is investing \$40 million in a new service center at Lexington and University that serves low-income children and families, most from this immediate area of the corridor. Anticipating the future needs of the community, that facility is incorporating most of the transit-oriented design features needed for our community and is building an environmentally sustainable building as a model for the rest of the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0747) SocEJ-036

I'm speaking impromptu in regard to the poor and underprivileged that live basically between Fairview and the Capitol, that University section.

(CCLRP0771) SocEJ-059

The Foundation supports Light Rail Transit in the Central Corridor for all of the obvious reasons that were mentioned before; the economics of what it attracts, it's good for regionalism, and most importantly Light Rail Transit is more environmentally friendly than the alternatives, but the real agenda of the Wilder Foundation above and beyond that is we have particularly impacted our interest and impact of light rail on low-income individuals and maintaining that light rail has the opportunity right now to make many more services including Wilder's 22,000 visits a year from the community much more accessible for neighborhood folks.

(CCLRP0884) SocEJ-067

University Avenue Community Coalition does not have a position of one particular transit mode for the Central Corridor. The following comments focus instead on the environmental justice section of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, DEIS, and applies regardless to the transit mode recommended.

(CCLRP0751) SocEJ-068

Since I've been on these committees for such a long time, I have been getting older and I will be even older by the time LRT goes in; and I have to say one of the things that I think about as I think where I will continue to live or where I will need to move is that I need to be somewhere where I will have good transit and won't have to use a car. So I think this is one thing that hasn't been mentioned yet. LRT is wonderful for people as they are aging. It's so much easier to use and provides more alternatives not only for folks who don't have cars for economic reasons but also for senior citizens.

(CCLRP0142) SocEJ-073

Your time is short! All of the dastardly deeds you've done to the poorest and most vulnerable and disenfranchise people in their own community will come back to haunt you and/or your children. It happened to the people who did similar things in South Africa and I could list other examples but space will not allow me to. You will reap what you sow tenfold! It is always our neighborhoods that have to give up houses, land, etc. but it is your shame and inevitable damnation!

(CCLRP0166) SocEJ-096

4. LRT provides easier and faster boarding for wheelchairs, bicycles, and strollers, and people carrying groceries or luggage.

(CCLRP0485) SocEJ-098

This document is the written comment of the Central Corridor Equity Coalition (Equity Coalition) and is submitted in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") and the regulations set forth by the Council on Environmental Quality ("CEQ") in accordance with NEPA. The Equity Coalition is a grass roots, community group comprised of the Aurora St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation, District 7 Planning Council, Lex/Hamline Community Council, Community Residents, JUST Equity, MICAH - Organizing Project of African American Congregations, Community Stabilization Project, Lutheran Church of the Redeemer/ISAIAH, St. Paul Area Council of Churches and individual citizens that reside in the area impacted by the proposed LRT expansion. The Equity Coalition represents minority and low-income residents, cultural institutions and merchants that live, work, worship and operate businesses in the impacted area. Our comments are designed to reflect impacts on the highest minority and low-income concentration along the entire stretch of the corridor - between Lexington Avenue and Rice street in the Thomas-Dale and Summit-University neighborhoods. Over 100 impacted Environmental Justice community members and allies have supported the hereinafter comments of the Equity Coalition. See attached list of Endorsees.

Response SocEJ-000. Comment noted.

Issue Summary SocEJ-011. Information regarding the project must be available in the multiple languages of the community (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0004) SocEJ-061

Information regarding the project must be done in languages of the community. Not just English

(CCLRP0485) SocEJ-091

As a mitigation alternative, impacted EJ community members must be intentionally sought after early for meaningful engagement with influence in the decision making process. Again, establish very early on and continue throughout the project's duration a Community Action Committee with community supported EJ constituencies as voting members. Ensure that all information material and processes be available in Spanish, Hmong, Vietnamese, Loa,

Somali and any other languages spoken by communities along the corridor; including hotlines, warning or other mitigation material. Also ensure that the Central Corridor transit investment exceeds that of Portland, Oregon as a model of EJ community participation, mitigation and enhancement outcomes. See attached Portland related material.

Response SocEJ-011. As discussed in Chapter 11 of the FEIS, extensive outreach activities were conducted as a part of the AA/DEIS and SDEIS to inform area residents and businesses about the project and to listen to their concerns. This included hiring Community Outreach Coordinators fluent in the languages most commonly spoken by area residents and business owners. Additional translation services were available at public meetings and hearings. Informational meetings and open houses were held in geographically varied locations and at varied times of the day and week.

Issue Summary SocEJ-012. Need for Community Benefit Agreements for impacted communities (8)

Comments:

(CCLRP0468) SocEJ-052

There are those who do not want to see LRT as it is currently proposed on University Avenue as well as those who would want assurances that if it is built, protections and mitigations through a community benefits agreement be secured from all levels of government responsible for the project.

(CCLRP0904) SocEJ-088

Again, I want to reiterate that environmental justice is -- we want to pay attention to that, incorporate creative policies and unique measures to protect the environmental justice communities and mitigate adverse impacts from construction or economically-based displacements such as, again, property tax freezes, rent controls, business loss compensation, et cetera.

(CCLRP0524) SocNC-001

Chapter 8 does not outline a process for developing Community Benefits. Agreements. In fact, the Chapter 8 does not specifically say how the promise " ...the active involvement of all neighborhoods would continue to be a goal through design and implementation" (3-76), will be achieved, other than presumably repeating the process which lead up to the DEIS. Thus, the possibility a more focused post-DEIS debate might necessitate new communications patterns is ignored. We recognize that delay or resistance significantly raises construction costs. On the other hand, on- going community involvement, with specific Community Benefits Agreements that can be used by the community to secure accountability, might increase trust. Major parts of this community remember how transportation development of I-94 crippled their community's coherence and economic viability. Existing small merchants in the area have invested their limited resources and have brought a Renaissance to large parts of University Avenue. These entrepreneurial skills and effort should be carefully nurtured, and the health of these businesses ought to get more attention as the project continues. Community Benefits Agreements are one vehicle to do so.

(CCLRP0136) SocNC-015

Community Benefit Agreements should be part of this project to be sure (3) the cultural character of the area is not at risk.

(CCLRP0138) SocNC-055

Work with communities affected to ensure stability to residents and community benefits agreements to protect businesses.

(CCLRP0136) SocNC-085

Community Benefit Agreements should be part of this project to be sure (2) affordable housing so that current residents are not displaced is part of the plan

(CCLRP0043) SocNC-128

By all levels of government working with impacted communities to develop community benefits agreements relating to LRT construction and all subsequent development along the Central Corridor that receives any kind of public funding.

(CCLRP0485) SocNC-179

Mitigation alternatives can include: 1. Community Benefits Agreement: with an impacted EJ base of community supported representatives, negotiate a CBA (as determined by EJ communities) relating to the LRT project and all subsequent developments along the Central Corridor prior to preliminary engineering.

Response SocEJ-012. Although community benefits agreements may be desired by neighborhoods along the Central Corridor LRT alignment and the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis, they are not within the scope of this FEIS. The Metropolitan Council legally able to enter into a Community Benefits Agreement as requested in this comment.

Section: 3.8 - Contracting

Issue Summary SocEJ-019. Utilize minority firms for design (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0550) SocCR-001

Many of the architectural, landscape architecture, engineering and graphic design firms are owned or led by people of color. I strongly advocate hiring some of those firms to help solve many of the design issues along the Central Corridor.

Response SocEJ-019. Meaningful participation by Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) is required by the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) and 49 CFR part 26. The Metropolitan Council's goal for DBE participation in development of the Central Corridor LRT is 17 percent for the entire project, from preliminary engineering through construction. Thus, 17 percent (or approximately 1/5) of the total estimated cost of the Central Corridor LRT Project will go to DBE firms. Each firm hired to fulfill the 17 percent goal is properly certified by the Metropolitan Council as a DBE. This program confirms the Metropolitan Council's

commitment to utilize businesses owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals in their procurement and contracting efforts. The list of DBE contractors, consultants, and concessionaires was compiled and certified by the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC), the Metropolitan Council, or the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT). More information about this program can be found at http://www.metrocouncil.org/doing_business/dbeinfo.htm.

Section: 3.8 - Businesses

Issue Summary SocEJ-001. Concerns about impacts on small and minority businesses along corridor and mitigation (8)

Comments:

(CCLRP0789) SocEJ-002

We are here tonight because of the revitalization efforts of the community here and so I'm really concerned with the stops. While light rail would be great for University Avenue I'm very concerned that the stops may not bring the economic development that we all hope for because they're so far apart, and I'm also very concerned that the businesses along University as well as the Asian families living in this area are already struggling, and I haven't heard anything about how we are going to help these businesses stay in business while the project is in progress. Any drop basically -- they basically live day-to-day and have cash flow issues that they have -- they struggle with every day and so I'm very concerned that any drop of business will also put these businesses out of business.

(CCLRP0902) SocEJ-003

Some of the threats to our communities are construction may cause few of the African-American businesses to close down, for example.

(CCLRP0280) SocEJ-004

5. Business Impacts. It is imperative that significant resources are committed to help small businesses along the Corridor survive both the LRT construction phase and the increased property costs that are already taking effect. Small businesses, many of them minority owned, have led a revitalization of parts of the corridor over the last decade. We need to ensure that LRT does not wipe out the history and character of Corridor neighborhoods.

(CCLRP0794) SocEJ-005

Secondly, on the business, I'd like to bring the attention to Hmong business are family-operated and they depend solely on the income of the business. During construction we know that there's going to be an interruption because the street be closing and there's going to be impact on business, on Hmong business. So I'd like you to find ways to compensate for the loss of business of these family so they can pay for the more years opportunity to raise family where this will be hard for them to get by every day.

(CCLRP0523) SocEJ-006

Given the way in which small businesses, many of which are owned by and serve minority communities, have revitalized much of the eastern end of the corridor, it is essential that

detailed construction mitigation plans be developed with these business owners. Although "sequenced construction" is briefly mentioned (3-27), a full Community Benefit Agreement designed for the whole project, must contain specific details for saving these businesses during construction.

(CCLRP0481) SocEJ-009

Light rail does not belong on University where it will put minority businesses out of business by disrupting traffic and parking and have to stop too frequently.

(CCLRP0522) SocEJ-095

Mitigation for this impact should include specific language in the DEIS Environmental Justice sections that addresses the impacts that could potentially occur to businesses along University Avenue, including loss of revenue, as well as increased tax assessments, which also have hurt Lake Street businesses.² If this language is not included, along with mitigations for said impacts, there is no guarantee that these very potential impacts will be mitigated at all. As mitigation, we suggest the following: subsidies for businesses during construction that reflect the losses that other businesses have seen from similar projects; tax-breaks for businesses that have occupied the corridor for a certain period of time; and outreach to business owners on a regular basis to ensure that they are not being excluded from the process.

(CCLRP0867) SocNC-026

And construction may cause our African-Americans and Asian business and religious and social institutions to fade out.

Response SocEJ-001. Roadway operations and parking, access to businesses, public utility services, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, along with short-term impacts to air quality, noise, and vibration are likely to be the most significant impacts experienced by the people and businesses located adjacent to or near the construction zones. Short-term impacts would be minimized by using standard construction BMPs such as dust control, erosion control, proper mufflers on equipment, and restricted times for construction. Maintenance of traffic and sequencing of construction would be planned and scheduled so as to minimize traffic delays and inconvenience. Access to all businesses would be maintained throughout the construction period. BMPs would include working with business-owners to provide alternative access, giving them adequate notice about construction plans and phasing, maintaining access to bus stops, and alerting the public to detours. Long-term effects such as increased development and redevelopment along the Central Corridor LRT, particularly in station areas, are being addressed by both cities. These plans are discussed in Section 3.1 and 3.2 of the FEIS.

Section: 3.8 - Affordable Housing

Issue Summary SocEJ-002. Project impacts on communities (lower income and other) along the corridor (13)

Comments:

(CCLRP0485) EngCI-7

K. Construction, Construction impacts will be acutely experienced by EJ communities with businesses and residencies on and adjacent to the corridor. The construction period could harm the profit margin of small businesses. See attached news articles referencing similar affects on other street/LRT projects. Noise, vibrations, construction debris and traffic diversion into neighborhoods will cause major inconveniences. As a mitigation alternative, build the project in small stages that could revert back to road access quicker and have a 24 hour hotline service to report problems that could responded to immediately. Provide Business Interruption compensation and set aside funds with no repayment required.

(CCLRP0142) PubPI-048

The people who are impacted by the decision to have light rail that runs directly through a main street in their community have no more say in the matter than they did when the powers that be put the I-94 Freeway through their neighborhood in the 60's and urban removal (displacing poor-working class and minority residents) in the 70's!

(CCLRP0922) SocEJ-026

And I'm not the only one because we were not considered. No one has come to the community in which we live because - is it because we're poor? But I pay taxes just like everybody else does and it's not benefiting our community. benefiting all the corporations that spoke first. It's not viable for this community.

(CCLRP0043) SocEJ-031

When I-94 was constructed, it was as if a huge, deep channel was cut right through the Rondo community. Homes and businesses were destroyed and people displaced to make way for our cars. There was never a public or community apology to the Rondo community and our displaced citizens. Even if current public officials were not involved in the construction of I-94, they are the current voice of our community and it is necessary that there be a public acknowledgement and apology for that destruction and hurt in order for there to be healing and reconciliation. Furthermore, we must seeks to make amends and ensure that no revitalization causes gentrification or displacement but instead preserves, enhances, restores and heals our communities.

(CCLRP0485) SocEJ-035

Also, it was not noticeable that organizations or representatives from EJ communities provided comment in June of 2001 at earlier public scoping meetings. Even Virginia Laszewski with the United States Environmental Protection Agency who at the time stated she would be the person reviewing the Environmental Impact Statement and rating it for national environmental policy compliance (NEPA), commented at a scoping meeting on June 26, 2001, that the agency should make sure environmental justice communities are involved in the process. See Scoping Summary Report Dec. 7, 2001, p. 7-14 and Scoping appendix p. 21-32.

(CCLRP0882) SocEJ-043

I'm also concerned about the double standards that I've seen over the years when it comes to our community and someone else's community being uprooted. I've seen where they put new

bridges in most recently and stopped once it got to our community and picked up again once it got into the Midway area. It's about time that we start to look at people as people and we start treating each other correctly and properly. I lived over the years and seen where pavement in our community has not been repaired. I have purchased in all two homes in this community and I've seen where our streets have been left behind when it comes to the simple thing as plowing the snow. That's why we're concerned, that every time there's an improvement it seems to affect our community when it benefits someone who does not live in our community. We are very concerned and it's about time that we as people start to look at the real deal here. Our people have worked for this nation and now you got people that didn't work for this nation who wants to take over this nation. So we better start looking at who our friends are and who's really doing something for each other. Yes, everyone want to come to America and work just like everybody want to tear up our community and build it for a better place for somebody else to benefit, but we need to start looking at what's going on here. I love my church, I love my community, and I appreciate the job that I have, but I have to speak out for my people.

(CCLRP0816) SocEJ-054

The promise of rapid trains along this main corridor can only be realized if all of the communities along the corridor have an opportunity for meaningful involvement in determining the outcomes of development, especially communities of color, people who are low income, immigrant communities, and senior citizens.

(CCLRP0902) SocEJ-062

Now, many in the impacted environmental justice communities, minority and low income, do not believe that the proposed transportation investment plan is designed in our best interest. Commonly environmental justice communities have asked what are the benefits, who will reap them, will the environmental justice communities be the ones saddled with disproportionate burdens all the while paying their share of taxable contributions. In asking such critical questions and reviewing the DEIS, there are many disproportionately negative impacts to EJ communities to warrant blind support of LRT on University Avenue, most notably in the Thomas-Dale and Summit-University area. These areas have been recognized as the highest minority concentrations along the entire stretch of the corridor. There has been expressed views that our community should not be sacrificed or put into harm's way for the good of the region; therefore, alternative views with more win-win outcomes must be devised. Many sentiments have arisen expressing preference for either a no-build as proposed or one wanting assurances that protections, mitigations, and enhancements through our community benefits agreement be secured before final approval is made.

(CCLRP0428) SocEJ-066

The DEIS states that this may have greater impacts in the low income neighborhoods and thus be an environmental justice issue.

(CCLRP0779) SocEJ-079

History has shown a tendency of those in power in the Twin Cities to devalue and discount communities of color when it comes to significant transit decisions. The development of the Central Corridor offers an opportunity to heal the wounds of the past.

(CCLRP0489) SocEJ-084

Again, we suggest to you that now is the time to begin using sound environmental justice principles one being: to ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process. That being said, a modest extension can only be seen as FULL and FAIR.

(CCLRP0185) SocEJ-085

Environmental Justice impacts ought to be closely evaluated as these same communities were[/are] significantly impacted from non-EJ-compatible solutions sought in the past.

(CCLRP0407) SocEJ-097

NOTE: In general, LRT on University Avenue does not disproportionately adversely affect neighborhoods with high minority and/or low-income populations. However, it may be that similar impacts may be felt more acutely by low-income neighborhoods.

Response SocEJ-002. No displacements or acquisitions will occur in the identified environmental justice neighborhoods. These neighborhoods, their residents, characteristics, and other qualities are described in Section 3.8 of this FEIS, along with any anticipated impacts and proposed mitigations. As discussed in Chapter 11 of the FEIS, extensive outreach activities were conducted as a part of the AA/DEIS and SDEIS to inform area residents and businesses about the project and to listen to their concerns. These activities have allowed the public to provide input on the proposed alignment and alternatives, station locations, environmental issues, future development implications, the project planning process, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative. The St. Paul Central corridor Development Strategy has an Inclusive Housing strategy that is intended to mitigate the potential displacement of low-income individuals and families from the corridor as property values rise. Further, specific strategies are identified for home ownership assistance. Minneapolis is updating the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth, which recognizes the importance of strategic infrastructure investments along transportation corridors and the vitality of its downtown neighborhoods. These plans have been taken into consideration and are described in the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocEJ-007. Concerns in regard to gentrification (12)

Comments:

(CCLRP0480) ProHLP-115

2) I believe the transit function of the Central Corridor project should be front and center - it should not be viewed and assessed as a development project - specifically, as a way to gentrify University Avenue. I am concerned that in much of the proposed planning, the tail has been wagging the dog, and thought has not been placed first and foremost on quickly and efficiently moving folks from one place to another.

(CCLRP0522) SocEJ-021

Property tax burdens for residents must be alleviated. Section 1.3 of the DEIS correctly notes that "the transit system and the existing economic development and related activities are

interdependent" (1-9). However, we saw no indication in the environmental justice section or elsewhere that a potential impact of this development, rising property values that low-income residents often cannot afford, is likely to occur as well. ...Language referencing this potential and well-documented impact should be included in the DEIS, and as mitigation we recommend a study of potential ways to alleviate this problem so that development for new residents and businesses does not supersede the need to support the current residents along or near the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0523) SocEJ-038

Ironically, whatever the intent of the planning, the impact of the project as it is currently designed will actually bring a disproportionate amount of hardship for the people mentioned above. Since Goal #2 (8-4) is to: "facilitate the preservation and enhancement of neighborhoods in the Central Corridor," the disproportionate negative impact could be viewed by some as a repeat of the institutional, systemic racism inherent in the building of I-94 through the same neighborhoods in the 1950's. Although there is no analysis of Table 3.1-1 on the racial make up of the neighborhoods, the table shows that in the four neighborhoods most directly affected by the one-mile stops (Fairview on the west to Rice St. on the east) two of the neighborhoods are overwhelmingly populated by people of color. (Summit-University 55% and Thomas-Dale 73% people of color). There are current residents who experienced the destruction of the Rondo neighborhood and the community remembers that destruction.

(CCLRP0485) SocEJ-042

This single paragraph is inadequate to meet the legal requirements of NEPA and the CEQ regulations promulgated there under. This single paragraph does not mention the sweeping economic effects of the project on the EJ community. The project will spur transit-oriented development, alter tax values, change rental rates, displace residents, close minority owned businesses and cause gentrification throughout the EJ community. These effects must be discussed by the Agency and mitigation alternatives must be considered. The Agency's failure to even mention these many significant impacts is fatal to the DEIS.

(CCLRP0524) SocEJ-047

MICAH is a religious (faith) based organization of over 150 congregations representing Christian, Islamic, and Jewish perspectives. Our purpose is to take our common religious injunction for social justice for the poor seriously. (MICAH 8. 6.) Specifically, the stated goal of this chapter is to: Mitigate gentrification and maintain and expand present business in the corridor.

(CCLRP0788) SocEJ-055

My concerns relate to the fact that the Environmental Impact Statement lacks any real focus on the economic, racial, and equity impacts of the proposed Light Rail Transit. This community has already experienced upheaval and displacement from the last major transportation system that was brought through this community.

(CCLRP0485) SocEJ-065

With the introduction of a large-scale public investment project being implemented within the community, there is the tremendous threat of business and residential gentrification and displacement related to either project construction or longer term economic affects associated with increased land values and high end transit oriented developments. See attached article referencing gentrification and increased land value due to LRT.

(CCLRP0137) SocEJ-071

1. Particular concern regarding gentrification of neighborhoods adjacent to Central Corridor that would displace residents and small businesses.

(CCLRP0134) SocEJ-072

Issues around gentrification must be studied.

(CCLRP0138) SocEJ-074

Concern that rise in property values along the corridor will pose a serious threat of displacement and gentrification.

(CCLRP0485) SocEJ-090

National chain stores may saturate the area and replace small locally owned businesses. Upscale high-density housing will lock EJ communities out of one of the last affordable housing markets remaining in the city. Property taxes will greatly escalate making survival hard for small ethnic business owners, as well as low and fixed income homeowners some of whom are seniors or single parents. Rents will escalate forcing current renters to leave the area in search of shrinking, urban-centered affordable housing options. Pressures from real estate speculation will also entice institutions and property owners to sell, in the long run dissolving EJ communities with long standing business investments, cultural roots, nearby social and infrastructure support systems (i.e. access to public transportation, medical and public facilities).

(CCLRP0038) SocNC-216

1. Gentrification (i.e. replacing small business on University Avenue with large chain business.

Response SocEJ-007. The Preferred Alternative is expected to have positive effects on commercial and residential development. It is anticipated that the Preferred Alternative will contribute economic benefits by encouraging and supporting higher-density residential and commercial land uses around transit stations. The Preferred Alternative will provide increased mobility to both residences and businesses within the Central Corridor and is expected to support future growth. New transportation capacity could also create competitive advantages for businesses located in the corridor. Further, the minimization of the effects of natural market forces in vulnerable neighborhoods is a goal of such plans as the Central Corridor Development Strategy (2007), wherein St. Paul has created a set of guidelines for the development of the Central Corridor LRT and surrounding areas. See Chapter 5 for anticipated economic effects.

Issue Summary SocEJ-008. Project must be designed to benefit low-income and vulnerable local populations (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0788) SocEJ-053

We must be assured that this system will create wealth in the community and not displacement.

(CCLRP0850) SocEJ-083

I support it as well because Light Rail Transit is so critically important for low-income and vulnerable populations who are living throughout the neighborhoods in the Twin Cities. It offers them in many cases the only means of transportation, the only means to connect with resources throughout the Twin Cities. Transportation projects sometimes in the past have not been cognizant of the needs of low-income and vulnerable populations. Light Rail Transit as an alternative offers that opportunity.

Response SocEJ-008. Every effort has been taken to minimize adverse impacts of the Preferred Alternative while maintaining the positive benefits this project would deliver. The Preferred Alternative will provide increased mobility to both residences and businesses within the Central Corridor and is expected to support future growth. New transportation capacity could create competitive advantages for businesses located in the corridor. See chapter 5 for anticipated economic effects.

Issue Summary SocEJ-009. Preserve existing single family zoning (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0485) SocEJ-027

Mitigation alternatives can include: 10. Limit the reach of TOD overlays in EJ residential areas: do not rezone from single family to multifamily use. Incorporate height restrictions on TODs adjacent to single family dwellings.

Response SocEJ-009. Saint Paul adopted the Central Corridor Development Strategy (October 2007). The plan addresses development in the Central Corridor and recommends a strategy for regulating future growth and development in the corridor. The Development Strategy includes Transit Opportunity Zone overlay districts (TOZ), which, generally, would be established to preserve and protect underlying zoning while, at the same time, promoting and facilitating a desired change or improvement through redevelopment and rehabilitation activities.

Issue Summary SocEJ-010. Impact of LRT project on property values and taxes (16)

Comments:

(CCLRP0005) SocEJ-022

With the threat of big business and public investment prospects, the property tax will rise so high that the average home owner and small business owner will be forced to move which will cause the break-up of the community again.

(CCLRP0532) SocEJ-023

The light rail line will certainly raise property values on surrounding commercial and residential properties. This will likely create a financial hardship for a large number of people, and may force some out of the neighborhood. To minimize this, there should be a property tax abatement program to relieve existing homeowners and business owners of increased property taxes.

(CCLRP0545) SocEJ-024

2) That property tax increases for residents and existing businesses be mitigated. We do not want to see long-time businesses and residents taxed out of their homes by increasing property values.

(CCLRP0909) SocEJ-029

I also would like to just ask the community to focus on building affordable housing and affordable home ownership in the corridor as it's looking at housing plans around the stops. We'd be happy to work with the community in any way to make that possible for the very low-income families that want the dream of home ownership in America.

(CCLRP0884) SocEJ-030

And just as an example, the EJ section of the DEIS does not adequately address the need for equitable development that serve communities on and/or near the Central Corridor. A solution: Equitable development defined by both racial/cultural and economic equality should be fully discussed in relation to the transit-related development on and near the Central Corridor. The EJ section should include the following principles.

(CCLRP0458) SocEJ-039

Mr. Schweigert outlined nine issues, concerns, or potential benefits raised by the district councils, in consultation with each other and their constituents, that have to be addressed or included in this project: 6) mitigation of negative impacts of rising property values;

(CCLRP0004) SocEJ-044

Increase in property value and taxes may price some resident's out of their homes. Some arrangement must be made.

(CCLRP0177) SocEJ-045

The existing DEIS fails to adequately consider the following: - the long-standing social and economic disparities persistent along the Central Corridor, and subsequently, - the opportunity to promote an approach to transit-oriented development here that improves outcomes for disparately impacted constituencies.

(CCLRP0140) SocEJ-057

Plans should also include affordable housing preservation and development so current residents and other low wage workers can benefit from this public investment.

(CCLRP0816) SocEJ-063

Also, it's important that existing affordable housing along the corridor is preserved and that new affordable housing be created as new buildings are developed along the corridor. I would urge that these issues be addressed in the environmental justice section of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

(CCLRP0485) SocEJ-064

Mitigation alternatives can include: 6. Rent controls: institute rent controls that protect EJ community businesses and residents from tax increases resulting from the expected transit-oriented developments. 7. Just Cause Evictions: implement just cause evictions to protect renters of businesses or dwellings by ensuring landlords can only evict with proper cause such as failure to pay rent or destruction of property. 8. Maintain current level of affordable housing: prevent condo conversions and provide for one to one replacements of affordable housing units. 9. Foreclosure Prevention: prevent accelerated foreclosure policies and assist with foreclosures incurred by current EJ community members who are exceptionally vulnerable to predatory lending scams and other unscrupulous measure to remove them from their current homes.

(CCLRP0007) SocEJ-075

Taxes are already high. More taxes are forth coming because of the Gopher Stadium. I believe our property taxes will force most of the residents out of their homes. Because most are elderly and are on fixed incomes we are citizens also.

(CCLRP0779) SocEJ-080

And what will be done to ensure that the poor and elderly are not displaced by significant increases in property taxes and rents due to the rising property values light rail construction will bring? Will the worst fears of the African- American and Asian-American communities comes to pass, being driven out to make way for wealthier white businesses and residents? This does not have to be.

(CCLRP0798) SocEJ-092

Also then to take consideration of the fact that we have populations that may be distressed by this kind of an operation like 94 caused great distress and in that there ought to be some incentives to stabilize and stay in the neighborhood, that somehow we say to them if you stay you won't pay any additional taxes than what has already been foisted on us by city and county and school systems.

(CCLRP0003) SocEJ-093

I'm also concerned about property tax increase along/in the area which would be difficult for low-income fixed income residents, and would personally be greatly affected by this.

(CCLRP0032) SocEJ-094

Affordable, life-cycle housing must be part of the planning and development of University Ave. Housing must be mixed income to prevent concentrated poverty. Inclusionary zoning, Baltimore's recent developments is a good tool to use.

Response SocEJ-010. Every effort has been taken to minimize adverse impacts of the Preferred Alternative while maintaining the positive benefits this project would deliver. The Preferred Alternative will provide increased mobility to both residences and businesses within the Central Corridor and is expected to support future growth. New transportation capacity could create competitive advantages for businesses located in the corridor. See Chapter 5 for anticipated economic effects. Saint Paul adopted the Central Corridor Development Strategy (October 2007). The Development Strategy includes Transit Opportunity Zone overlay districts (TOZ) that would guide new development. In addition, the Development Strategy contains an Inclusive Housing strategy that is intended to mitigate the potential displacement of low-income individuals and families from the corridor should property values rise. Further, specific strategies are identified for home ownership assistance. The Central Corridor Development Strategy is referenced in the FEIS in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 and Chapter 5.

Issue Summary SocEJ-017. Maintaining affordable housing (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0109) SocEJ-082

There must be adequate (at least 30%) affordable housing on the light rail line accessible to community residents.

(CCLRP0485) SocLU-036

Mitigation alternatives can include: 3. CDC Land-banking: help local CDC's by land-banking for the creation of affordable mix use developments that current EJ constituencies can afford to help them remain in or return back to the community.

Response SocEJ-017. The respective cities have the authority to oversee affordable housing and issues of land use. Planning documents that govern housing along the Central Corridor are discussed in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocEJ-023. Concerns about property values and taxation for vulnerable local populations along the corridor (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0460) SocEJ-056

There were concerns about vulnerable populations that were defined as the elderly, young, ethnic minorities, disabled, and small businesses. They were all presumed to be vulnerable to rising costs of real estate along the corridor. Suggestions were made to mitigate this by a tax overlay district so people wouldn't be priced out of their homes or businesses. Vulnerable populations were presumed to be subject to negative impacts due to changes in feeder lines to the Central Corridor and frequency of local transit along the corridor, and access to businesses across the avenue from their homes.

Response SocEJ-023. Land development and property taxation policies are principally the responsibility of the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul. In anticipation of new and transit oriented development, both cities have adopted comprehensive land use and development

strategies or are updating plans and policies to manage the projected land use development changes that are expected to follow the construction and operation of the Central Corridor LRT project and which could cause increase property values. These plans include the St. Paul Central Corridor Development Strategy, and the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth, and both are discussed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. These plans recognize that land use changes are a function of real estate market changes, and these plans attempt to mitigate the market forces. Recommendations are made in the plans for ensuring that the community, sustainable practices, and local businesses benefit and are strengthened. The St. Paul Central corridor Development Strategy has an Inclusive Housing strategy that is intended to mitigate the potential displacement of low-income individuals and families from the corridor as property values rise. Further, specific strategies are identified for home ownership assistance.

Since publication of the AA/DEIS, several operational changes to the Baseline Alternative and AA/DEIS LPA were developed and incorporated into the 2030 transit network (Chapter 6 of this FEIS). Changes include a frequency reduction on Route 16 and the addition of two new routes--the 60 and 83. The introduction of LRT service running at 7.5 minutes during the peak hours and Route 60 serving as a feeder has the overall effect of increasing transit service in the corridor. Section 6.3 of the FEIS reports that incorporating system elements such as non-signalized pedestrian crossings and secondary station platform access would provide clearly defined crossing areas and connections along the corridor, enhance the overall pedestrian environment, and promote community cohesion.

Section: 3.8 - Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue Summary ProHLP-030. Station stops should be revised/placed to benefit minority and low-income communities (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0485) ProHLP-011

In a transit dependent EJ community, stops along the minority concentrated area are proposed at mile long intervals representing a longer walking distance than those proposed for downtown Minneapolis, the University of Minnesota and downtown St. Paul. This presents a tremendous burden to area seniors and other transit dependent riders especially during the winter season and are not supportive of Goal 3: Objective C of the Project which is as earlier identified to "enhance the existing transportation infrastructure to serve the high number of transit dependent persons in the Central Corridor." See DEIS, p. 7-2. As a mitigation alternative, incorporate additional stops at Western and Victoria so there is an equal benefit of stops in EJ communities as there are in more affluent areas of the corridor. The transit project must not only use our numbers to boost projected LRT ridership figures, EJ communities must also benefit by obtaining at the time of construction their fare distribution of stops.

(CCLRP0923) SocEJ-077

My comments are these: This Environmental Impact Statement will only be adequate if it seriously addresses the environmental justice issues that are raised here. There must be a

discussion about the impacts of light rail or Bus Rapid Transit on displacement of businesses along University Avenue, the displacement of persons along University Avenue and the larger neighborhood. There must be discussion in this document about how the city, the county, and the state can mitigate those impacts. If light rail, for instance, goes in we can expect to see rising property values along University Avenue which could force people out of their homes if those impacts aren't mitigated. We want to see some options. We want to see how the housing, for example, can be made available to people who live in our neighborhood. We want to see ways in which businesses that are owned locally can be preserved. We want to see ways in which there will be opportunities for local entrepreneurs to realize the benefits of this investment along University Avenue.

Response ProHLP-030. In response to community concerns regarding station spacing, the Metropolitan Council evaluated three potential infill stations as described in Chapter 2 of the FEIS. This analysis is provided in Section 3.8 of this FEIS. The Preferred Alternative includes the underground and system infrastructure to construct these at point in the future when ridership merits. Additionally, the SDEIS and FEIS considered additional factors beyond minority and low-income populations as part of the environmental justice discussion that affect transit dependency, including age, disability, Limited English Proficiency, and households without vehicles.

Issue Summary SocEJ-004. Need for added stations along University Avenue to benefit environmental justice communities (4)

Comments:

(CCLRP0522) SocEJ-013

Due to this well-established dependency, along with the critical need for environmental justice to be given equal weight to cost-efficiency, we propose as mitigation that stations be added to the DEIS at Western Ave. and Victoria St. At minimum, an additional study should be completed on the feasibility of a station at Victoria St., as the population surrounding it exceeds that of Western Ave. and has similar transit dependency. This study should include an account of environmental justice and the negative effects and benefits on low-income and minority communities.

(CCLRP0522) SocEJ-015

The impact of not including stations at half-mile intervals along University Ave., while including stations approximately every quarter-mile in downtown Saint Paul and approximately every half-mile near the University of Minnesota, is essentially to discourage LRT ridership in the very neighborhoods where transit dependency is statistically highest. This impact entirely counteracts the mission of the environmental justice section. It should further be noted that those communities that would benefit most from stations at Victoria St. and Western Ave.- those residents that are in closest proximity to the Avenue-are those that have by far the highest minority and low-income concentrations within the Summit- University and Thomas-Dale neighborhoods. Those six census tracts, at last count, were home to 14,311 minorities, 78.8 percent of the total population in the tracts, and they had median income levels ranging from \$14,423 to \$34,286 (See attachment). These are the people who would suffer adverse impacts if stations were located at one-mile intervals instead of at half-mile intervals.

(CCLRP0522) SocEJ-018

LRT stations must be implemented at both Western Ave. and Victoria Ave. According to Table S.1- I and references thereafter, the DEIS proposes that LRT stations along the border of the Summit-University and Thomas-Dale neighborhoods be located at Snelling Ave., Lexington Pkwy., Dale St., and Rice St., one mile apart from one another. The aforementioned neighborhoods are referenced specifically because, according to Tables 3.1-1 and 3.1-3, respectively, they are home to far and away the highest total number of minority and low-income residents of all impacted neighborhoods, and according to the Environmental Justice sections of the DEIS, it is necessary "to determine whether or not negative effects can be minimized and benefits can be maximized, with special regard to minority, low-income, and transit dependent populations" (S-24).

(CCLRP0522) SocEJ-019

The Route 16 buses must run with higher frequency than currently proposed. According to Table 2.3-2, the Route 16 bus, which currently stops at much shorter intervals than the recommended LRT line, would decrease in service to every 20 minutes at peak hours and every 30 minutes during off-peak hours. Many residents have expressed to us a need for continued regular access to the Route 16 bus. This need will be exacerbated if no new stops are added at Victoria St. and Western Ave., but in any circumstance, the direct impact of reduced bus service is the increased difficulty for the transit-dependent populations of the communities surrounding the Central Corridor in reaching their means of transportation. Between the Summit-University and Thomas- Dale neighborhoods of St. Paul, this population includes many seniors (2663 in number according to the 2000 Census) and disabled individuals. Again, the environmental justice regulations are not being adequately considered in addressing the concerns of these populations. We propose as mitigation an increased planned frequency of the Route 16 bus service after the completion of LRT, as well as additional funding for increased feeder buses to the implemented LRT stations.

Response SocEJ-004. To address community access issues in this segment and to respond to community concerns regarding station spacing, the Metropolitan Council evaluated future stations at Hamline Avenue, Western Avenue, and Victoria Street. Public meetings were held in this segment of the corridor to elicit comment regarding the inclusion of future infill stations and other project attributes (see Chapter 11 and supporting documentation in Appendix F). The locations of these future infill stations would reduce the station spacing from approximately one mile to a half mile along University Avenue in the portion of the corridor. Additional analysis was conducted and is described in Section 3.8 of this FEIS. Recognizing the potential LRT stations have to enhance growth and development around station areas, the City of Saint Paul adopted the Central Corridor Development Strategy. Although these stations are not included in the Preferred Alternative, the underlying infrastructure would be constructed in order for these stations to be built as ridership and finances allow, without disrupting the operation of the Central Corridor LRT.

Issue Summary SocEJ-005. Preserving community uniqueness along the corridor (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0809) SocCR-003

...it's going to destroy the cultural developments that have been taking place that can't withstand that kind of interruption.

(CCLRP0829) SocCR-007

Strive to balance the opportunity for development with the need to preserve uniqueness and other characteristics of the corridor

(CCLRP0789) SocEJ-011

We are here tonight because of the revitalization efforts of the community here and so I'm really concerned with the stops. While light rail would be great for University Avenue I'm very concerned that the stops may not bring the economic development that we all hope for because they're so far apart, and I'm also very concerned that the businesses along University as well as the Asian families living in this area are already struggling, and I haven't heard anything about how we are going to help these businesses stay in business while the project is in progress. Any drop basically -- they basically live day-to-day and have cash flow issues that they have -- they struggle with every day and so I'm very concerned that any drop of business will also put these businesses out of business.

Response SocEJ-005. Impacts to communities and neighborhoods are discussed in Section 3.2 of this FEIS. Additionally, the City of St. Paul developed the Central Corridor Development Strategy (a chapter of the City's Comprehensive Plan). The Central Corridor Development Strategy contains a set of guidelines for development at and around station locations including parks, connections to the neighborhoods, building mass and design, and other guidelines to honor and enhance neighborhood character. This plan has been taken into consideration and is described in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocEJ-022. Address effect on minority populations and low-income populations (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0485) ProALT-052

In review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) the Equity Coalition believes that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority (RCRRA) have: I). Failed to sufficiently identify all impacts and/or effects of the preferred alternative (LRT down University Avenue) and fails to propose sufficient mitigation alternatives. II). Failed to comply with Environmental Justice requirements. III). Failed to consider all alternatives as required by NEPA.

(CCLRP0485) ProALT-186

III. The DEIS fails to consider all alternatives as required by NEPA. The preliminary selection of the University Avenue LRT along a minority concentrated section of the corridor needs some rethinking due to the multitude of adverse social and environmental impacts as set forth herein. Since 1-94 was once the preferred alternative it should again be studied or

that of Pierce Butler to determine if less adverse impacts will be borne by EJ communities. Also, it should be studied if an elevated or tunneled approach for the LPA would provide less of an adverse impact to EJ communities.

(CCLRP0485) SocEJ-058

II. The DEIS Fails to comply with Environmental Justice requirements In 1994 Presidential Executive Order 12898 directed every Federal agency to make environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing the effects of all programs, policies and activities on "minority populations and low-income populations." Environmental Justice is an expansion of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act based on the effects of discriminatory actions or results from federal, or federally assisted or approved actions. Environmental Justice is predicated upon three fundamental principles: (1) To avoid, minimize or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects on minority and low-income populations, (2) To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process, and (3) To prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations. The LPA will result in disproportionate economic impacts upon minority and low-income populations. Despite these disproportionate impacts, the DEIS does not propose a single mitigation alternative designed to address these impacts. Specifically, the DEIS' entire analysis of mitigation alternatives for the project's economic effects on the EJ communities states: The active involvement of all neighborhoods in the corridor would continue to be a goal through design and implementation. Public engagement for all neighborhoods in the corridor would continue through the length of the project and is explained in detail in Chapter 8.0 Public and Agency Involvement Program. See DEIS p. 5-40.

Response SocEJ-022. FEIS Section 3.8 outlines the Environmental Justice issues and the project's compliance with federal, state, and local directives and regulations. The section also provides a detailed description of the analysis, impacts, project benefits and specific mitigation. Chapter 11 of the FEIS discusses how extensive outreach activities were conducted as a part of the EIS processes to inform residents and businesses about the project and to listen to their concerns. The public provided input on the proposed alignment and alternatives, station locations, environmental issues, future development implications, the project planning process, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative. Chapter 11 also discusses the CAC, its membership, and how it was used to guide project development. Printed materials for the public were translated into multiple languages to facilitate communication with immigrant communities. This input from public participation resulted in concurrent planning processes by the City of St. Paul for the development of the Central Corridor Development Strategy, which addresses many of the issues and concerns raised by adjacent neighborhoods (see Sections 3.1 and 3.2 and Chapter 5).

Issue Summary SocEJ-024. Concerns regarding displacement of people of color (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0874) SocEJ-046

The people of color of the community have already been moved twice. The first time they were removed from the north end, Rice Street and beyond, when the KKK came to St. Paul and they moved over into the Summit-University community; the second time the center of the Rondo community to make the freeway up and put the 94 there.

(CCLRP0867) SocEJ-051

I was here during the time in the '60s when they bought up all the houses and so many of our close friends were moved out. Some never came back to the area. Some left the churches. And we are very concerned about that.

Response SocEJ-024. As discussed in Section 3.3 of the FEIS, no residential property would be acquired for right of way for the Central Corridor LRT project.

Issue Summary SocEJ-027. Impacts to minority communities (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0524) PlaTE-107

Increase the economic development of the Midway Corridor to benefit fairly and equitably those who have invested so much in revitalizing this area MICAH is a religious (faith) based organization of over 150 congregations representing Christian, Islamic, and Jewish perspectives. Our purpose is to take our common religious injunction for social justice for the poor seriously. (MICAH 8. 6.)

(CCLRP0470) SocEJ-007

It is interesting to note (see Land Use map, Figure 3.2-1b in DEIS) that Sherburne Avenue between Snelling and Lexington contains almost entirely single-family homes. This is the area where many African-American families have their first chance to become homeowners. The African-American community in St. Paul is primarily concentrated on either side of University Avenue between Lexington and the Capitol. University Avenue in its current configuration doesn't limit north-south travel between the two areas. LRT on University Avenue will create a significant barrier that will prevent the free flow of people between the two major portions of the African-American community because crossings will be limited to only those with signals, which are few and far between. This new barrier, in addition to the one created in the 1960s when the Rondo neighborhood was ripped apart, will fragment the African American community to such an extent that the community's identity will be lost.

(CCLRP0866) SocEJ-069

My name is Oralee Patterson and I was just wondering who is going to get up tonight to speak for the oppressed people in our community, the southern University community, the Frogtown community. I'm here tonight specifically as a representative of Pilgrim Baptist Church on behalf of Reverend Charles Gill who is away at a funeral in his family. We're very concerned about this project and I'll tell you right now that we're not gonna tell you that we're supportive of it. One of the reasons why we're not gonna jump out here and say we're supportive of it right now is because Pilgrim is celebrating 143 years of being in this

community. I'm a lifelong resident of this city and I have seen the tearing up of Rondo, the business community, for the sake of a freeway and there are still some of us that are around that experienced that and we're still going through that pain and now we're suffering through the pain of a Central Corridor coming down the middle of the street on University Avenue and we're wondering about the ramifications of all of that.

(CCLRP0938) SocEJ-081

First of all, I think it is such an insult to us again as a community to divide us one more time.

(CCLRP0485) SocSoc-004

B. Community Cohesion, An LRT down the middle of a highly populated EJ residential and business section of the corridor will create a physical obstacle creating a social barrier between communities north and south of University Avenue. Also, the Aurora S1; Anthony neighborhood that was once separated in the 1960's with the building of the adjacent freeway from the larger Historic African American Rondo community will once again be isolated and sandwiched in between two physical barriers, I-94 and the LRT University Avenue alignment. As a mitigation alternative, take a current revitalizing opportunity to transform the shame of a past transportation development misdeed and turn it into one of healing and restoration. Acknowledge, respect and take responsibility by apologizing for the destruction to the vibrant African American Rondo community due to the construction of I-94. Honor the fact that restoration is owed as a result of the demolishing of a combined 650 homes and businesses. Now, support the growing culturally centered revitalization vision that is supported within the 2006 District 8 Comprehensive Plan and dubbed as a "cultural heritage preservation destination." Enact to redesign the Dale Avenue intersection and Bridge as a gateway to the heart of the Rondo community. Artistically depict the I-94 story and symbolize the reunification of divided souls. Support current efforts being designed by this community to heal the wounds of this past and create a community controlled Rondo Renaissance Community Restoration Trust Fund through the use of developer exactions, real estate tax transfers or extractions from parking or transit fairs not only as an anti-gentrification tool but to help retain the character of the community and to help finance its re-development aspirations (i.e. cultural/history center, small business incubators and below market rate housing).

Response SocEJ-027. Since I-94 was constructed in the 1960s, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) was enacted to protect communities and the environment from the abuses described in the comment. The Central Corridor LRT is being developed under NEPA. The construction of the LRT would not create a physical or social barrier to anyone because the Preferred Alternative will maintain almost all legal crossings of University Avenue, and the signalized and non-signalized crossings will be enhanced with pedestrian safety features. These are more fully described in Chapter 6 of the FEIS. Construction of the LRT would not require the acquisition of any buildings or structures in this neighborhood. The capital investment of the project is expected to help infuse much needed funds to neighborhoods along the corridor. Furthermore, in effort to address neighborhood concerns, the Metropolitan Council's outreach efforts included the hiring of six Community Outreach Staff, each assigned to one of the six planning segments along the proposed route. The intent of this approach was for outreach staff to actively engage and solicit input from community

members and the neighborhoods as part of the planning process within their specified planning segment. A more detailed discussion of the Community Outreach is provided in Chapter 11.

Section: 3.8 - Miscellaneous

Issue Summary ProPM-014. Project should help provide greater economic stability to the most vulnerable (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0901) ProPM-146

These types of costs are legitimate project expenses and should be factored in. I believe they would support our vibrant community during the construction and allow greater economic stability to the most vulnerable.

Response ProPM-014. Construction, continuing operation, and market reaction to the availability of this improved transit service is expected to influence economic activity in the local economy. Construction of these facilities will expand local earnings for the duration of the project's construction cycle. Operating the Preferred Alternative will also expand earnings. The new jobs required to operate and maintain the Preferred Alternative will be long-term. These jobs represent the direct effects of investment in the Central Corridor. The earnings of these new construction and transit workers will translate into a proportional increase in consumer demand as these workers purchase goods and services in the region.

Issue Summary SocEJ-006. Impacts of proposed LRT on transportation options along some portions of the corridor (12)

Comments:

(CCLRP0932) PlaPla-6

According to the DEIS, the number 16 bus that is one of the most widely utilized buses in the entire system, a bus that many of our members depend upon will go from an every 10 minute schedule to every 20 minutes during peak time, and every 30 minutes off-peak. According to the statements, the mode chosen will be to improve and expand ridership. We find that this reduction in services is unacceptable because it places the onus on those less able to take the change.

(CCLRP0813) PlaTP-165

Another concern I have is... I'm concerned with the distance between stops on the proposed light rail. If the 16 bus does not continue to run, these people are going to have a hard time getting to where they need to go.

(CCLRP0937) ProALT-148

I would be for the current #16 bus and #50 bus. ...I am very concerned that I would have to walk further to my stop if it is light rail and not a #16 bus.

(CCLRP0003) SocEJ-008

With stops every mile, the light rail would, in effect, be a pass through from downtown St. Paul to downtown Mpls and not really benefit the community along University. The University route is, I believe, the most used bus route in the Metro area because of the relatively low income of most residents.

(CCLRP0642) SocEJ-012

There are other instances in the Evaluation section in which, to quote Matthew Rycroft "the intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy." For instance, Table 7.2-5 of the DEIS asserts that a more diverse population will be served by LRT than by the Baseline. However, there are many properties where one can presently take a bus at ten minute intervals, but will have to either walk an extra half mile or wait 20 minutes longer with the proposed LRT. While handicapped persons can more easily board the LRT, it would be even easier for them to board a low floor bus at the curb than to make their way to a station in the middle of University Avenue. Suffice it to say that for many who live near the Avenue and often depend on transit, the case for LRT seems based on something other than a dispassionate and rational view of the evidence. Within Objective 1A may lie the answer: the alleged greater proximity to developable and re-developable land." Yet, the only way this can be the case is if those who authorize the building of the LRT intend to use it as a means to clear existing development they are not satisfied with.

(CCLRP0470) SocEJ-014

If LRT is built on University Avenue, it will reduce transportation options for transit-dependant and limited mobility persons. Current bus service for the #16 is every 10 minutes, and the bus stops at every corner. The estimate is that LRT service would be every 7.5 minutes, but the train would only stop once per mile. Meanwhile, the #16 bus would come only once every 30 minutes. For handicapped people, it is difficult to travel much more than a couple of blocks to use transit, and now if they miss their bus, they will have to wait a lot longer for the next one. If these people want to use LRT, they will need to catch a bus to an LRT station, then get on LRT. For many handicapped people, it is physically difficult and time-consuming to get on and off the bus, so they keep transfers to a minimum. Rather than go through the agony of a transfer, they will use the bus for the whole distance. Right now the bus takes 58 minutes to travel between the two downtown areas, but with LRT this changes to 73 minutes. Unless the origin and destination of handicapped users is very close to an LRT station, LRT is not a viable option to meet their travel needs, and the bus service will be greatly reduced. The disability community will bear a disproportionate share of negative impacts from LRT.

(CCLRP0471) SocEJ-017

If the LRT system is built on University Avenue, it will not serve a large number of the bus users who live close to University but more than a couple of blocks from a station, especially those users who have difficulty with walking. This is the case for many senior citizens and disabled folks who live in the University Corridor. For these people, the stations will be too far away from their homes, so they will continue to use the bus. Right now the bus comes every 10 minutes, but if LRT is built, the bus will only come once every 30 minutes. Limited

mobility transit users should not see a reduction in service frequency in order to accommodate LRT for the able-bodied.

(CCLRP0165) SocEJ-025

Many of us near and along University Avenue are senior citizens. At the present time we either drive or take the University Avenue bus which stops at every block both going and returning. The Central Corridor transit would eliminate our means of transportation. It would not be beneficial to any St. Paul resident.

(CCLRP0108) SocEJ-041

2. It must include a bus shuttle service to accommodate elderly and disabled transit users who cannot navigate the distance to a business lying between the designated stops.

(CCLRP0033) SocEJ-050

I am concerned about elderly riders losing easy access to local bus routes in their neighborhoods.

(CCLRP0095) SocEJ-086

I am physically disable and work as a TESL volunteer at Franklin Library Branch, Franklin Learning Center...Downtown Transit other than Light Rail is rude, dangerous and anti-disability. Bus drivers are the WORST. "HELP!!!"

(CCLRP0114) SocEJ-087

I don't think this will work at all for most older people.

Response SocEJ-006. Several operational changes to the Baseline Alternative and Preferred Alternative were developed and incorporated into the 2030 transit network and are used in the development of ridership results presented in Chapter 6 of this FEIS. As disclosed in the SDEIS, Route 16's service frequency will be modified to 20 minutes in the peak period, and 30 minutes during midday, evening, and weekend, which is the same as it was proposed for the AA/DEIS LPA. Although a reduced frequency on Route 16 has the potential to affect transit riders in this corridor, the introduction of LRT service running at 7.5 minutes at peak and the Route 60 serving as a circulator has the overall effect of increasing capacity in the corridor. See Chapter 6 of this FEIS more information.

Section: 3.8 - Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections

Issue Summary SocEJ-013. Address the needs for equitable development to serve all communities along corridor (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0884) SocEJ-037

The EJ section does not adequately address the exacerbation of housing affordability problems along the Central Corridor. The EJ section does not adequately address the need for

local hiring, living wages, reinvestment of wealth creation within low-income populations and communities of color, the rights of workers to organize or the lack of enforcement of existing employment civil rights laws and policies established on all levels of government.

(CCLRP0177) SocEJ-040

Given the destruction of the historic Rondo Community in the 1960s by the construction of I-94 right through the heart of the community, it is important to do this development in a way that demonstrates cognizance of that historic reality and demonstrates active learning from that experience. Among the considerations to incorporate more clearly are: - specific benefits to transit dependent households; - specific benefits to low to moderate income households likely to be impacted by increase real estate values following development; - specific benefits to ethnic enterprises and an approach to development that not only supports the retention of existing ethnic enterprises but ensures their participation in development benefits over the long-term; - specific benefits to the low to moderate income constituencies who would benefit from employment during and after construction; and - the development of an equitable development partnership that ensures during both planning and implementation that the concerns and hopes of affected EJ constituencies are duly embraced and incorporated.

(CCLRP0280) SocEJ-078

7. Affordable Housing. Central Corridor Transit improvements will result in an acceleration of a gentrification process that has already begun in many parts of the corridor. In order to compensate for the effect of this process on low-income residents, the Central Corridor Transit project should include provisions for additional affordable housing. 8. Jobs and Wages. As an additional amelioration of gentrification effects on the corridor population, the Central Corridor Transit project should include provisions for hiring local, low-income workers, hiring local and minority contractors, and for mandating living wages.

(CCLRP0485) SocNC-014

Mitigation alternatives can include: 4. Cultural Corridor Designation: help materialize culturally centered revitalization that will preserve & enhance the current EJ communities. Maintain current and create new affordable housing and commercial options. Sustain current ethnic businesses and support the creation of new small business incubators. For example, build off of the thriving Asian business market and the re-emerging Historic African-American Rondo Renaissance. This could be similar to what was created in the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund.

(CCLRP0884) SocNC-109

The EJ section does not adequately address the needs for equitable development to serve all communities on and/or near the Central Corridor.

Response SocEJ-013. Many of the concerns expressed by the comments are the responsibilities of the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis. Both cities are updating their comprehensive plans, and these include policies that address many of these concerns. For example, the Central Corridor Development Strategy adopted by the City of St. Paul in 2007 addresses some of these issues. The strategy recognizes and makes recommendations about the cultural and ethnic characteristics of the Central Corridor neighborhoods, and how the

LRT and its stations can be used to stimulate business and become part of each neighborhood's unique attributes. In addition, the Central Corridor Development Strategy includes recommendations for Inclusive Housing, and Home Ownership Assistance. Furthermore, City teams will be established to implement policy direction, work with developers, and coordinate, consult, and communicate with area residents, businesses, and stakeholders. The Central Corridor Development Strategy is described in the FEIS in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 and Chapter 5. Environmental Justice (EJ) communities are identified and described in Section 3.8. Anticipated impacts to EJ communities and proposed mitigation are also described in Section 3.8.

Issue Summary SocEJ-015. Concerned that AA/DEIS income and household information is outdated (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0470) SocEJ-089

One big flaw in the DEIS is the fact that the income and household information on which the assumptions are based is over 15 years old. Section 3.1.2 of the DEIS states, "Using 1990 U.S. Census, at the time of this analysis income data from the decennial 2000 Census was not available." Table 3.1-3: Income and Transit Dependency by Neighborhood uses 1990 Census data and 1989 Income data. The analysis was done in 2001. It is now 2006 and five years have passed. The analysis should have been updated prior to release of the DEIS in order to determine if the assumptions are still valid. If the updated data is not provided to the public prior to the close of the public comment period, then the comment period should be reopened once the updated data has been released. When looking over the demographic map (Figure 3.9-1 of DEIS) that shows the concentrations of minority populations throughout the Corridor, it is very clear that minorities will suffer disproportionate negative impacts if LRT is built on University Avenue. Virtually all of the District 7 (Frogtown) and District 8 (Summit-University) neighborhoods contain minority populations in excess of 36.1% of the total population. In my Hamline Midway neighborhood, the areas of high minority populations are located along Sherburne and Charles Avenues, which are the two streets closest to University Avenue. In my neighborhood, the costs to implement permit parking, as well as the noise from the LRT vehicles, will be disproportionately borne by minorities, and in particular African Americans. Also, University Avenue from Snelling east to the Capitol has one of the largest concentrations of minority-owned businesses in the Twin Cities metro area. LRT construction will hurt these businesses while having little impact on areas with predominantly majority white-owned businesses.

Response SocEJ-015. Demographic data in the FEIS was updated and analyzed with the latest available Census Bureau information. Construction of the Central Corridor LRT would result in mostly short-term impacts as noted in Section 3.8. A decrease in transit capacity on one Census block and several severe noise impacts have been identified. These will be mitigated. No project related impacts are disproportionately borne by low income or minority populations.

Issue Summary SocEJ-021. Environmental justice section of AA/DEIS be strengthened in several areas (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0884) SocEJ-070

University Avenue Community Coalition believes the environmental justice section of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement should be strengthened in several areas regardless of the preferred alternative recommended. Several comments are provided to strengthen the EJ section and some include detailed examples of issues raised.

Response SocEJ-021. Comment noted. The FEIS integrates additional analysis for the Environmental Justice section.

Section: 3.0 - Report Corrections Needed

Issue Summary ProPM-018. Report corrections needed (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) NR-39

Section/page/table is S.4.1 page S-9: SOCIAL EFFECTS Land Use, Local Plans, and Zoning: Major Activity Centers In addition to the generic activity centers listed, "higher education facility" and "public/private research facilities" should be added.

(CCLRP0457) ProPM-199

Page S-8 (Section 4.1): Social Effects The baseline paragraph "the Minneapolis Plan..." should be changed to "the Minneapolis Comprehensive Plan..."

(CCLRP0435) ProPM-207

Page 3-7, Regional Blueprint, Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. The FEIS should reference the most current regional plans, including the 2030 Regional Development Framework, (adopted January 14, 2004 to replace The 2020 Regional Blueprint) and the subsequent three regional systems plans: The Water Resources Management Policy Plan, The Regional Parks Policy Plan and The Transportation Policy Plan.

Response ProPM-018. All chapters and sections of the AA/DEIS have been updated since publication of the AA/DEIS and selection of the AA/DEIS LPA. The Metropolitan Council has conducted and published an SDEIS to assess the impacts of necessary changes to key elements of the AA/DEIS LPA before the subsequent adoption of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is fully described in Chapter 2 of the FEIS, and all chapters and sections assess the potential beneficial and adverse impacts of the Preferred Alternative and present mitigation strategies. The FEIS utilizes the latest information and analysis methods available for each section. It uses the most current data, studies, community plans, model outputs, and assumptions, and is based on the current design and engineering studies for the Central Corridor LRT.

Section: 4.0 - Environmental Effects

Issue Summary SocEE-001. **Project will have positive environmental impact** (16)

Comments:

(CCLRP0240) SocEE-1

I also support light rail from both environmental and economic development standpoints.

(CCLRP0050) SocEE-4

It's environmentally safe.

(CCLRP0428) SocEE-5

Our review of this DEIS has identified concerns in the areas of traffic impacts, hazardous waste consideration, noise impacts, possible geologic, water, and air issues, and alternative selection clarification. Based upon these human and natural environmental concerns and the information we request be provided in the FEIS, we have assigned a rating of "EC-2" (environmental concerns - insufficient information). Please refer to the enclosed Summary of Rating Definitions Sheet. This rating will be published in the Federal Register.

(CCLRP0154) SocEE-6

We strongly support the goals of cleaner air and water, more efficient energy use, and a safer healthier environment.

(CCLRP0894) SocEE-8

For the period between the years 2008 and 2020 LRT is expected to divert 3,300 to 3,800 new riders from autos. The electric-powered LRT vehicles are more environmentally-friendly than buses. We will have less pollution, noise, and auto congestion.

(CCLRP0077) SocEE-12

Light rail can best minimize environmental effects on the entire region.

(CCLRP0193) SocEE-14

The project to build the route through the University of Minnesota campus presents an opportunity to rectify the existing and considerable danger to pedestrians, air pollution, and noise presented by four lanes of high volume through-traffic dividing the heart of the campus.

(CCLRP0856) SocEE-15

I find light rail more environmentally friendly and I believe less likely to be affected by traffic and weather conditions.

(CCLRP0475) SocEE-16

Also, the conclusion in DEIS/AA that the LRT alternative is environmentally beneficial is not supported by the data in the DEIS/AA itself.

(CCLRP0028) SocEE-17

I would use this as a citizen and enjoy the fact that it would be pollution free.

(CCLRP0423) SocEE-18

Environmental considerations, healthy living for the community should be a primary goal of every citizens.

(CCLRP0166) SocEE-19

It will help address traffic congestion, air and noise pollution, disinvestment in our core cities and suburban sprawl.

(CCLRP0073) SocEE-21

Light Rail Transit also reduces pollution and traffic congestion.

(CCLRP0071) SocEE-22

It will be a relief ecologically and economically when it is up and running.

(CCLRP0345) SocEE-23

From an environmental perspective, LRT offers a transportation alternative that would help reduce air pollution in heavily trafficked areas. With gas prices steadily rising, LRT ensures that my customers will continue to patronize my business. The line would also serve as an efficient transportation option for area residents, as well as the employees and customers of local businesses.

(CCLRP0750) SocEE-24

It's good for our environment. Fewer cars we know is good for the environment.

Response SocEE-001. Comment noted.

Issue Summary SocEE-003. General environmental impact concerns (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0940) SocEE-9

This all needs to be taken into account with noise levels, air pollution, and traffic and pedestrian safety and bicycle access needs to be looked at as a whole.

Response SocEE-003. Section 4.6 of the FEIS contains a full analysis of noise generated by the project, where sensitive receptors are located, and proposed mitigation. Air quality is addressed in Section 4.5 of the FEIS. Traffic, pedestrian safety, and bicycle access are addressed in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Section: 4.2 - Water Resources

Issue Summary EngCI-008. Concerns in regard to impact on water quality (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0428) EngCI-17

Geologic areas with a bedrock structure that includes Karst or cavitated formations have the potential for transferring water runoff, carrying pollutants quickly and directly into the water table without the typical cleansing benefit of a soil percolation process. Such direct feed channels can disperse pollutants quickly in an aquifer over large areas. Diligence in assessing road spill and run-off risks at such potential impact and construction sites is warranted, with avoidance being the preferred option.

(CCLRP0232) EngCI-23

Lack of water run-off and water quality issues from storm water management of the rebuild of University Ave, at least in the Capitol Region Watershed District under the rules that will be in place when the project is implemented. These will have environmental and economic impacts.

Response EngCI-008. The project would be constructed in accord with Federal, State, local and regional water quality agency requirements, including the Capitol Region Watershed District. Chapter 4 of the FEIS provides a comprehensive discussion of impacts to water quality as a result of constructing and operating the Preferred Alternative.

Issue Summary EngUT-004. Concerns in regard to stormwater rate control and treatment (6)

Comments:

(CCLRP0435) EngUT-11

This draft document does not address the probable need to provide runoff rate, volume, and water quality improvements as a component of the overall project.

(CCLRP0435) EngUT-12

6.8.2: Utility Impacts - Potential Impact to Sanitary and Storm Sewer Service - The draft document states that drainage from the proposed bridge and tunnel structures, station platforms, and parking facilities would be introduced to the existing storm sewer systems, presumably without additional treatment. The Council recommends, consistent with previous comments relating to storm water runoff leading to the river, that these flows will require pretreatment, consistent with Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) recommendations.

(CCLRP0435) EngUT-13

Impacts and Mitigation - The draft document states that both the Cities of Minneapolis and Saint Paul will require the reconstruction of existing storm sewer structures as necessary to allow for proposed project construction, but that the former will not require additional storm water runoff treatment, and the latter may only require minor upgrades, consisting primarily of grit separation. In light of the documented river impairment status discussed above, these identified treatment expectations will likely be inadequate.

(CCLRP0435) EngUT-14

Pretreatment of runoff as a component of this proposed project will be necessary to ensure that the project does not result in a potential adverse impact on the metropolitan wastewater system.

(CCLRP0375) EngUT-15

The Impacts and Mitigation portion of Section 4.6.2 Surface Water Quality in Study Area (pg 4-52) indicates that "the Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul may require additional stormwater runoff treatment above storm sewer replacement and that it would likely be in the form of sump manholes and grit chambers." Currently, the Capital Regional Watershed District is in the process of adopting Rules. By September 2006, CRWD intends to have rules adopted. As these rules are currently drafted, the Central Corridor Project, regardless of which alternative is selected, would be required to incorporate stormwater volume reduction and water quality treatment. We would suggest that this issue be addressed by revisions to the Impacts and Mitigation portion of Section 4.6.2 Surface Water Quality in Study Area. Specifically, a statement indicated that "a post construction stormwater permit from the Capital Region Watershed District will be required" should be added.

(CCLRP0435) SocEE-20

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) is in the process of updating its list of Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) impaired waters within the State for the Environmental Protection Agency, as a requirement of the Clean Water Act Section 303d. The River reach that receives runoff from the document's Study Area is listed as "impaired" for mercury, PCB, fecal coliform, and turbidity. Additionally, Lake Pepin, located within the river channel about fifty miles downstream of the Metropolitan Area, was listed in 2002 for excess nutrients. The latter listing is expected to have far-reaching impacts upon upstream nutrient-contributing areas of the state. The Capitol Region Watershed District's (District) draft rules view new projects of significant scale (like the Central Corridor LRT/BRT) as an opportunity to assist in resolution of the existing receiving water quality problem. This proposed project will likely need to be revised during the facility design and permitting phase to provide both runoff rate and volume reduction to diminish the degrading effect on the river, and pollutant (sediment and nutrients) reduction to protect river water quality.

Response EngUT-004. The project would be constructed in accord with Federal, State, local and regional water quality agency requirements, including the Capitol Region Watershed District (CRWD). This issue is further evaluated in Chapter 4 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary NatWB-001. [Water resources concerns](#) (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0435) NatWB-1

The Council's 2030 Regional Development Framework Policy 4 states that the Council will work with local and regional partners to conserve, protect and enhance the region's vital natural resources. In carrying put this policy, it is our stated role to promote the restoration of degraded natural resources and work with communities to implement best management practices to control and treat storm water as redevelopment opportunities arise. The Council's

2030 Water Resources Management Policy Plan implementation strategies further expand on the Framework's policy discussion, presenting the Council's long-term goal of no adverse impact on water resources in the region. The Council recognizes that it will not be possible to reach this goal without encouraging and supporting the use of the most effective non-point source pollution reduction technologies, including low impact development (better site design) practices and best management practices aimed at protecting water quality and maintaining storm water runoff rates and volumes at or below predevelopment conditions.

(CCLRP0441) NatWB-2

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has reviewed the above referenced LRT Project Draft EIS. The project sponsors are not USDA program benefit recipients, thus the wetland conservation provisions of the 1985 Food Security act, as amended are not applicable, and there are no wetlands within agricultural fields within the proposed urban project corridor. And, since your project will not be affecting agricultural lands, compliance with the Farmland Policy. Protection Act (FPPA) does not apply and a site assessment need not be filed.

Response NatWB-001. Comment noted.

Issue Summary SocEE-002. Concerns over meeting clean water goals (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0435) SocEE-2

7.2.3: Goal 2 - Communities and Environment - Objective C - Support regional goals for cleaner air and water, more efficient energy use, and a safer and healthier environment. University Avenue LRT or BRT Alternative - The draft document states that under either proposed alternative, no significant impacts to the surface water quality in the study area are anticipated during construction or operations. With the use of proper construction erosion control practices these statements may be correct, although this path will not successfully achieve the cleaner water goal stated in "Objective C."

Response SocEE-002. Although the project does not include specific best management practices that would directly improve the quality of surface water runoff, it would support the other regional goals for cleaner air, more efficient energy use and a safer and healthier environment. Chapter 4 of the FEIS provides additional details on each of these subjects.

Issue Summary SocEE-006. Ensure that all agencies involved in regulating water quality are included (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0435) SocEE-11

The draft document also states, at the bottom of the same page, that the WMO and District are responsible for insuring that runoff best management practices as outlined in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Permits (NPDES), are used to limit sediment and particulate runoff during construction activities. As Phase I communities under the NPDES permit program, the same responsibility also applies to both the Cities of Minneapolis and Saint

Paul.

(CCLRP0435) SocEE-13

The draft document states on page 4-51 that principally, the MPCA, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and the City of Minneapolis regulate water quality in the Mississippi River. The City of Saint Paul should be included as an entity that is also responsible for regulating water quality in the river.

Response SocEE-006. . The FEIS water resources discussion has been updated to include the appropriate regulatory agencies, including the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis. The most recently available data have been used to determine all impacts and propose any mitigation measures. Additional information regarding best management practices has also been provided. A discussion of water resources and associated impacts as a result of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Chapter 4, Section 4.2.

Issue Summary SocHM-002. Provide analyses and mitigation approaches for accidental spills with regard to impact on groundwater (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) SocHM-2

Beginning on p4-54 is an analysis of groundwater resources issues. The primary issue relates to contamination from accidental spills that may be discovered during construction. The analysis and mitigation will be developed as the project progresses in Preliminary Engineering by way of a system of disclosure and mitigation set by State and Federal rules.

Response SocHM-002. Phase II Investigative Work will be conducted prior to construction. A Response Action Plan for addressing potential hazardous material impacts identified in the construction zone by the Phase II investigation will be prepared and implemented prior to construction. Implementation of this plan together with the Construction Contingency Plan and Site Safety and Health Plan will mitigate any accidental hazardous material spills during project construction, unidentified existing contamination in the right of way, and future operation and maintenance. Table 4-20 provides a summary of the hazardous/regulated materials investigation.

Section: 4.6 - Air Quality

Issue Summary EngTI-005. Air quality impact questions (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0478) EngTI-6

"1. What is the average and maximum expected length of backup of cars on Snelling (north and south) under LRT. Compare it to Baseline. 2. How will the increased congestion on University Avenue and north/south streets affect average, and maximum, air pollution levels at these intersections, compared to Baseline? 3. How will an increased backup of idling cars affect average, and maximum air pollution levels at the intersection of (for example) Snelling

and Marshall compared to Baseline? At Snelling and Selby compared to Baseline? 4. Because of increased congestion on University Avenue caused by LRT, there will be an increase in automobile traffic on parallel streets. For example, how will traffic be impacted on Marshall Avenue, which is currently filled at rush hour? More precisely, what are projected levels of average and maximum levels of air pollution along Marshall Avenue (and Lake Street) compared to Baseline?"

Response EngTI-005. #1) What is the average and maximum expected length of backup of cars on Snelling (north and south) under LRT. Compare it to Baseline. This information can be approximated by the air dispersion model CAL3QHC, but final results are not currently complete. The model uses data from the traffic-supplied Synchro model, which may provide a better approximation of traffic through the Level of Service predictions. Level of Service is a measure of traffic flow or delay experience by vehicles passing through an intersection, and is reported with a letter grade A through F, with A being the best. The Intersection LOS for the Snelling and University intersection in the 2030 No-Build scenario is D, while the Intersection LOS for the 2030 LRT scenario is E. #2) How will the increased congestion on University Avenue and north/south streets affect average, and maximum, air pollution levels at these intersections, compared to Baseline? The air quality analysis will use the CAL3QHC model to predict CO concentrations at 5 intersections along University Avenue. This analysis is not yet complete, but it is anticipated that there will be no exceedances of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards as a result of the LRT scenario. #3) How will an increased backup of idling cars affect average, and maximum air pollution levels at the intersection of (for example) Snelling and Marshall compared to Baseline? At Snelling and Selby compared to Baseline? The Snelling and Marshall, and Snelling and Selby intersections are not among those 5 intersections which have been selected for air quality modeling. The 5 intersections selected were chosen according to predicted Level of Service and traffic volumes. Because the selected intersections, in general, have higher or equal volumes of peak hour traffic than other non-selected intersections, impacts predicted at those intersections can be assumed to be conservative. That is, if National Ambient Air Quality Standards are met at the 5 selected intersections, then it can be assumed that other intersections would also meet applicable standards. #4). Because of increased congestion on University Avenue caused by LRT, there will be an increase in automobile traffic on parallel streets. For example, how will traffic be impacted on Marshall Avenue, which is currently filled at rush hour? More precisely, what are projected levels of average and maximum levels of air pollution along Marshall Avenue (and Lake Street) compared to Baseline? See response to item 3 above.

Issue Summary NatAQ-001. [Project will improve air quality](#) (16)

Comments:

(CCLRP0777) NatAQ-1

As a health care organization, HealthEast is very concerned about air quality in the Central Corridor. Light Rail Transit instead of Bus Rapid Transit is the best option for improving air quality and reducing traffic noise.

(CCLRP0258) NatAQ-3

LRT improves air quality as well as reduces traffic noise. Air quality is an important health factor in a metropolitan area.

(CCLRP0166) NatAQ-4

2. LRT is the best option for improving air quality in the corridor and the reducing traffic noise.

(CCLRP0545) NatAQ-5

9) That air quality should be increased and noise pollution should be decreased.

(CCLRP0855) NatAQ-6

Air pollution, noise pollution, and congestion will be significantly reduced with LRT.

(CCLRP0666) NatAQ-7

I also like the metropolitan appeal of light rail. The smooth ride allows me to pleasantly watch the city go by. The electric powered cars are clean and do not emit pollutants. They also look more appealing to my aesthetic eye.

(CCLRP0845) NatAQ-10

The Central Corridor Light Rail Transit Line will help reduce air pollution, thereby improving air quality and assisting in greening up our environment in the Midway. A light rail system through the heart of St. Paul is an environmentally-friendly solution to the urban sprawl that threatens to turn the Twin Cities into a parking lot.

(CCLRP0204) NatAQ-11

will improve air quality

(CCLRP0356) NatAQ-12

To me, the major issue is air quality, particularly at the University and Snelling intersection. Currently, if the data I've seen are correct, the University/Snelling intersection has the worst air quality in the entire state--and that must change. Families with young children simply will not buy into Midway neighborhoods if the air quality is detrimental to their children's health, and if families do not buy the homes, the neighborhood is likely to deteriorate, as well as property values. Even if "clean" buses are purchased, the sheer number of buses necessary to move the number of people that can be moved by light rail can only worsen the air quality and traffic conditions along University Avenue.

(CCLRP0871) NatAQ-16

It will certainly reduce the auto emissions on the heavily traveled intersection of University and Marion.

(CCLRP0742) NatAQ-18

There are many environmental issues. It would cut down the air pollution and the depletion of fossil fuels.

(CCLRP0773) NatAQ-22

It will reduce car pollutants.

(CCLRP0231) NatAQ-23

Those of us who currently drive their own cars will have another comfortable, reliable transportation option. Non-automobile transit will reduce dangerous emissions and improve air quality. LRT will reduce air pollution in heavily trafficked areas and will serve as an environmental benefit to area businesses and residents.

(CCLRP0231) NatAQ-25

LRT will reduce air pollution in heavily trafficked areas and will serve as an environmental benefit to area businesses and residents.

(CCLRP0650) NatAQ-28

It provides a more reliable and faster alternative to buses and is the best option for improving air quality along the corridor.

(CCLRP0024) NatNV-1

I believe buses haven't worked as good as possible. It's time for a clean alternative.

Response NatAQ-001. Comment noted.

Issue Summary NatAQ-002. Concerns over air quality impacts, especially at intersections with increased queues (11)

Comments:

(CCLRP0482) NatAQ-8

4) There is less than 1/2 percent change in pollution, even though the public has been led to believe that the LRT will reduce pollution. This percentage is far less, by at least an order of magnitude, than the model's margin of error. They predict a diversion of fewer than 2,000 round trips from cars and trucks to lrt per day, and many of those trips will come from vehicles that still make a trip much like before

(CCLRP0485) NatAQ-9

E. Air quality - Considering that cars will more likely be backed up along north/south routes waiting for the frequent passage of the light rail, EJ communities will be at greater air quality risks from motor vehicle emissions like carbon monoxide. Already those positioned adjacent to the freeway have high rates of asthma. As a mitigation alternative, build up walls along the freeway to cut back on current vehicle emissions already emanating from the freeway. Introduce greening (i.e. tree and shrub plantings) as a natural barrier to absorb and separate CO effects.

(CCLRP0436) NatAQ-13

It is critical that the Twin Cities Metro area does not slip into Non Attainment status. Given our comments regarding traffic volumes and level of service, the air quality hot spot analysis for selected intersections may need to be re-evaluated.

(CCLRP0475) NatAQ-14

p. 4-19 "Motor vehicles emit CO at the highest rates when they are operating at low speeds or idling in queues." The DEIS shows very long queues in some places due to LRT.

(CCLRP0478) NatAQ-15

One of the important goals of public transportation is to reduce overall air pollution levels, by enabling a switch from automobile transportation to more efficient mass transport. It is disappointing therefore to read that the DEIS predicts at best a minimal decrease in the total level of carbon dioxide due to LRT (as opposed to the Baseline estimate). Even this minimal estimated decrease seems less than meets the eye, since part of this predicted minimal decrease seems to stem from decreased automobile traffic on Highway 94, where people in transit remain for short periods of time. For the more important areas on University Avenue and especially the major intersections such as University and Snelling where there are large numbers of people often for extended periods of times, (including permanent residents) it seems that LRT will cause an increase in air pollution levels. The reason, of course, is increased traffic congestion on University Avenue and especially intersections with the major north-south streets that will be caused by LRT. During rush hours, it is estimated that a train will pass an intersection on average every 3 minutes and 45 seconds (once every 7+1/2 minutes each way). This, in addition to the normal substantial backup of traffic on streets such as Snelling, will cause extensive air pollution from the idling of cars waiting back (several blocks?) from these intersections. The information provided in the DEIS (based on old traffic studies) is not at all convincing in this regard. A more detailed, comprehensive study is needed.

(CCLRP0460) NatAQ-17

They also want to be assured that air pollution will be decreased at the major intersections.

(CCLRP0475) NatAQ-19

p. S-14 The CO pollution decrease of 2,066 tons per year out of a baseline of 352,853 is only 0.56%, hardly worth spending \$840 million on. VOC decrease of 178 out of 41,580 is only 0.43%. NOx increases very slightly so LRT is not cutting down air pollution.

(CCLRP0895) NatAQ-24

You hear communities talking about less pollution. Sorry. Read the DEIS and it says there's less than a half a percent change in pollution by their own forecasts.

(CCLRP0407) NatAQ-26

The Draft EIS concludes that " ...no mitigation measures are necessary in order to demonstrate project-level conformity of the project-related emissions inventory." This satisfies federal requirements, however, if the City is to encourage substantially more active pedestrian and bicyclist use of the Central Corridor, CO emissions will continue to be of concern. This is particularly true at very busy intersections (e.g. Snelling and Lexington).

(CCLRP0475) NatAQ-27

p. 53 of Central Corridor Transit Study Traffic Operations Report queue length exceeds

storage length by 2,948,3,846, 1,019,1,101 in some places. If a block is 300 feet, than those queues are 3 to 12 blocks long. This will increase CO emissions due to idling and increase congestion.

(CCLRP0435) NatAQ-30

The reduction in vehicle miles traveled from the two build alternatives would not appear to be sufficient to result in the reduction in air pollutants (particularly CO) as stated in Table 4.3-4: Emissions Inventory for the Project Study Area. Further documentation or explanation of the methodology used in estimating this inventory is requested.

Response NatAQ-002. Chapter 4 of the FEIS contains a full evaluation of air quality issues as they pertain to the existing conditions of the corridor and the projected future conditions with construction and operation of the Preferred Alternative. Mitigation requirements are based on the results of the air quality analysis and comply with federal and state air quality regulations for a project of this type.

Issue Summary NatAQ-003. Concerns that superior grade awarded to LRT for environmental impact is not proven (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0642) NatAQ-20

Similarly, the superior grade awarded to LRT for Objective 2C - environmental impact - is contradicted by information found on pages 4-17 and 4-57. Table 4.3-4 shows total emissions of carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds (VOC), and nitrous oxide (NOx) are virtually the same for LRT as for the other alternatives, not clearly superior as indicated by the high grade. Table 4.7-3 on page 4-57 shows that the LRT will consume more BTUs than either alternative. In terms of utilization of existing right-of-way, it should be noted again that the LRT option will result in more traffic congestion and preempts the possibility of widening sidewalk space for pedestrians and street trees, or delineating a bicycle lane.

Response NatAQ-003. In the AA/DEIS, Table S.5-1: Comparison of Alternatives Against the Project Goals and Objectives, shows if alternatives "do not support, somewhat support, supports, or strongly supports" the objective. LRT was rated as an alternative that "strongly supports" objective 2C which is to "Support regional goals for clean air and water, more efficient energy use and a safer and healthier environment." Although LRT uses more BTUs than the other alternatives, LRT has a higher capacity to move people. A more effective measure would compare BTUs expended per person miles traveled. The LRT option results in the lowest overall vehicles miles traveled in the region. The construction of LRT will allow for the placement of street trees in many locations along the corridor. In addition, the sidewalks may actually be widened in some locations.

Issue Summary NatAQ-004. Official EPA vehicle emissions factor model must be used for FEIS (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0428) NatAQ-21

5) The DEIS section 4.3.2 provides air emissions information for the project study area which were developed using US EPA's MOBILE 5b emissions factor model. MOBILE 6.2 is now the US EPA's official vehicle emissions factor model. MOBILE 6.2, as a major revision of the MOBILE model, includes the effects of regulations that have been issued since MOBILE5b was released. The FEIS should provide information on how the use of MOBILE 6.2 would impact air emissions estimates for the proposed project.

Response NatAQ-004. The FEIS uses MOBILE 6.2 for emission factors and related analysis. A discussion of environmental impacts, including air quality, is provided in Chapter 4 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocHM-004. Concerns about increased lead consumption from cars (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0899) SocHM-4

And then the other question would be the health damages that may be caused by increased parking on side streets as a result of increased lead consumption from cars.

Response SocHM-004. Beginning in 1973, EPA worked towards the total elimination of lead from gasoline, and completed the phase out over the next 25 years. Since January 1, 1996, the Clean Air Act has required a complete ban on the sale of leaded gasoline for use in on-road vehicles. Therefore, no increases of lead consumption are anticipated as a result of increased parking by cars on side streets.

Section: 4.7 - Noise

Issue Summary NatNV-001. Project will have positive impact on noise (4)

Comments:

(CCLRP0303) NatNV-6

Many people have complained that they do not want a light rail running through their neighborhoods--that the light rail is noisy and offensive. I'd love to let these folks spend a night in my apartment on the corner of Hennepin and Franklin--where the sound of automobile traffic doesn't dissipate until well after 3 am. Comparatively, the light rail is quiet, efficient, and clean, with only the occasional call of a pleasant bell.

(CCLRP0407) NatNV-7

Beginning on p4-38 is an analysis of vibration issues. With new technology, mostly associated with the track bed, vibration issues are minimal with LRT systems. Minor mitigations are listed on p4-44.

(CCLRP0204) NatNV-12

will reduce noise pollution from both cars and buses

(CCLRP0017) NatNV-14

In more recent times in Portland, Oregon I had my choice of Transportation - auto, bus or LRT. It was more convenient and less noise, by far.

Response NatNV-001. Comment noted.

Issue Summary NatNV-002. Wheel squeal concerns for sharp turning movements (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) NatNV-3

In other corridors in North America, noise has not normally been a problem with one exception: "wheel squeal" particularly during sharp turning movements. This therefore, may be a problem at Robert & University, Robert & 12th, 12th and Cedar and at Cedar & 4th. Any intersections with a curve with radius of less than 82 feet are vulnerable to wheel squeal. This is potentially avoided by angling across intersections somewhat (e.g. the University & Robert and 12th & Cedar alignments).

(CCLRP0154) NatNV-13

The MPCC strongly recommends an alignment with as few turns as possible to minimize wheel squeal.

(CCLRP0428) NatNV-15

We note however, that the proposed ROW alignment in St. Paul at Roberts Street and Columbus Avenue, Columbus Avenue and Cedar Street, and again at Cedar Street turning onto 4th Street has sharp turns (Appendix 9.9.3.2 LRT Passbys, Table 1-7 indicates a radius less than 82 feet becoming significant) where wheel squeal would be anticipated to be greatest along the route. Although testing was not done at these points, the close-by Capitol Offices and the canyon effect of buildings at these points recommend either design modification or a workable mitigation plan to avoid and/or reduce such impacts.

Response NatNV-002. Comment noted, and forwarded to the design team. For the Preferred Alternative, one of the 90 degree turns was removed by using the diagonal at Cedar and 4th Streets. Chapter 2 of the FEIS contains further details about the Preferred Alternative alignment, and Section 4.6 provides a discussion of wheel squeal.

Issue Summary NatNV-004. General concerns about noise and vibrations (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0485) NatNV-2

F. Noise/Vibration - LRT related vibrations and noise will be borne disproportionately by EJ communities who are small merchants or residents directly on or living adjacent to the corridor. As a mitigation alternative, sound-proof properties where necessary and ensure the overall effectiveness of design to prevent such affects.

(CCLRP0714) NatNV-19

Sound: We have significant concerns related to the noise generated by the operation of the LRT on Cedar Street. In addition to our sound studios, part of our expanded broadcast facility is a public space called The Forum. The Forum is a public space dedicated for convening groups of 20 to 200 participants and serves as an interactive production and broadcast facility for keynote speeches, political debates, town-hall meetings and cultural dialogues. The Forum was designed with special audio, acoustics and communications considerations. Noise from the operation of LRT on Cedar could potentially interfere with this important space in our new facility.

(CCLRP0482) NatNV-20

Increased noise from warning bells and horns. If the pedestrian crossings at the Bloomington Central station are any guide, residents and businesses will be greatly bothered by train warning bells and horns, crossing warning bells, and wheel squeal.

Response NatNV-004. Where noise impacts have been predicted to occur, noise mitigation measures have been evaluated per FTA guidance. Chapter 4 of the FEIS contains a full description of the mitigation practices deployed to reduce potential noise and vibration impacts.

Issue Summary NatNV-005. Concerns about overnight noise (8)

Comments:

(CCLRP0488) NatNV-8

1---The Train Noise of horn and bells at Lexington Ave. should be limited during late night hours--No ringing after 9:00pm---to 6:00am so the residents can have some quiet time. The best solution is no ringing from 6:00pm--to 6:00am if possible especially on the weekends.

(CCLRP0545) NatNV-9

...and should not add to the levels of noise to which residents are currently subjected. We recommend that noise restrictions are placed on the transit operations overnight.

(CCLRP0038) NatNV-10

As to noise, we don't relish hearing horns and whistles 18 hours a day. We also don't want our building shaking or vibrating every time a train goes by not to mention during the construction itself.

(CCLRP0784) NatNV-17

Plus, if you're building this are you going to have this being built at night like 94 was and then all the noise comes along with that? Plus there is a noise when these trains stop and are we going to hear this all night too? So there is I live here.

(CCLRP0460) NatNV-18

Environmental concerns were shared; they want mitigation of noise during construction and especially at night during regular operation.

(CCLRP0813) NatNV-21

I have a major concern on noise and I don't know if it was addressed in the impact statement or it will be, but I'm concerned about construction noise and then the train noise going by my windows.

(CCLRP0067) NatNV-22

It would be better to take space from or over I-94, where you already have a loud corridor, than to add LRT noise to University Ave.

(CCLRP0031) NatNV-23

The noise of LR is not something I want to hear into the night.

Response NatNV-005. The project team completed a Detailed Noise Assessment in accordance with FTA noise assessment guidelines (Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, May 2006). Existing and project-related noise was expressed using the day-night noise level (Ldn) descriptor. The Ldn is a 24-hour average noise level that incorporates a 10-decibel penalty for each hour between 10:00 pm and 7:00 am. The penalty is applied in recognition that people are generally more annoyed by noise that occurs during the nighttime than to noise that occurs during the daytime. In this manner, the Ldn is useful in assessing community response to LRT noise. Use of the Ldn descriptor means that the noise analysis was assessed both daytime and nighttime LRT noise. Analysis results indicate that a limited number of land uses are predicted to experience project-related noise levels that meet or exceed FTA's noise impact thresholds. In many cases, the predicted impacts are due to noise from crossovers - which can often be mitigated through use of movable point crossing frogs. In other cases, the predicted noise impacts are due to LRT warning bells or the noise made by steel wheels rolling on steel rails. The project team committed to reducing LRT bell noise levels or reducing the duration of their use each time they are used. Either approach reduces the number of predicted noise impacts. However, LRT bell use can not be prohibited because of the important safety function they serve.

Section: 4.8 - Vibration

Issue Summary NatNV-003. General concerns regarding vibration impacts on sensitive areas (4)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) NatNV-4

Section/page/table is 4.4.13, page 4-44 - Vibration from either bus or light rail will be a concern for sensitive research instruments being used or planned for in University facilities along or near Washington Ave SE. The velocity level for BRT is at the threshold for sensitive instruments; LRT is well above the threshold for sensitive instruments. Vibration mitigation is noted in the DEIS for residences directly adjacent to switches. This will need to be considered for the University's research facilities as well.

(CCLRP0443) NatNV-5

Section/page/table is S.4.2, page S-14 - ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS - Table S.4-1 Potential Environmental Effects and Noise and Vibration - Noise and vibration for both the LRT and BRT alternatives have a potential of impacting the sensitive research equipment used in some of the University's research facilities along or near Washington Avenue.

(CCLRP0443) NatNV-11

Noise and Vibration Technical Report - The University recommends the Central Corridor update the March 2002 report to reflect current conditions, regulations and relate the same to the vibration sensitive operations in and around the campus.

(CCLRP0714) NatNV-16

Vibration: We have major concerns about the effect of the operation of LRT on Cedar Street related to our broadcast studios in our building. Studios in the south wing of our headquarters were built more than two decades ago and were not designed to withstand the significant vibration that LRT on Cedar Street will bring. We took some steps to mitigate potential vibration issues in studios in the (newer) north wing of the building, but we have concerns that these steps will not be enough to alleviate the vibration issues with LRT. Our studios are used by world-class musicians for recording. Before construction commenced on the MPR headquarters, a study was completed in December 2003 entitled "Analysis & Assessment of Vibration Issues with recommendations for the new MPR Expansion & Existing Building." (We will provide a copy to you upon your request.) We followed recommended measures to mitigate concerns with vibration in the construction of our facility; however, the engineering firm indicated that additional mitigation measures would need to take place with construction of any LRT near the MPR studios, including the installation of ballast mats under any LRT tracks.

Response NatNV-003. Sections 4.6 (Noise) and 4.7 (Vibration) of the FEIS include the results of a detailed noise and vibration analyses conducted along the corridor in 2008, along with proposed mitigation strategies based on FTA guidance. These analyses were conducted using the most recent FTA approved analysis methods. In addition to considering noise and vibration issues in general along the corridor, several specific locations where noise- or vibration-sensitive equipment is located are also discussed as part of the analyses. FEIS Sections 4.6 and 4.7 provide the results of these analyses, including analyses and mitigation practices during construction.

Section: 4.9 - Hazardous or Regulated Materials

Issue Summary EngCI-006. Concerns in regard to project impact on hazardous waste sites (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0428) EngCI-15

2) Hazardous waste sites have been identified in the project area and include those adjacent to the ROW with potential to be directly impacted by the project's construction, plus those within the project area which would potentially be disturbed due to project-induced development.

Response EngCI-006. The AA/DEIS identified a total of 316 sites that were considered to have a potential impact to the project right-of-way and project construction. From that review, 10 sites were recommended for Phase II investigation. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was performed on the Central Corridor LRT Study Area, excluding the downtown Minneapolis portion, in October 2007. It identified a total of 1,070 sites that could potentially affect the project. 222 sites were considered to be of High potential impact, and 87 sites were selected for review of their MPCA files based on proximity to the alignment, likelihood for impact by construction, and need for rights of way. These 87 sites and the 10 AA/DEIS sites were assessed for future Phase II ESA investigations. After this review, 42 sites are proposed for Phase II level impact assessment including 5 of the 10 sites listed in the AA/DEIS. All of these sites are listed in Section 4.8 of the FEIS. It is recognized some sites identified by the AA/DEIS or the Phase I ESA are not included in the final list of sites for Phase II investigation. However, the Construction Contingency Plan will include provisions for continuous excavation monitoring for suspected hazardous materials as construction proceeds. Any suspect hazardous materials found to be emanating from the above sites to the construction alignment will be tested and disposed of at licensed repositories in accordance with approved state and federal processes. Section 4.8 of the FEIS provides a detailed description of hazardous waste sites and clean-up activities for the project area.

Issue Summary SocHM-001. Determine if there is asbestos present on Washington Avenue Bridge prior to reconstruction for LRT (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0428) SocHM-1

Another air issue may be covered under permitting, but we note that under the asbestos National Emissions Standard for Hazardous Air Pollution (NESHAP) regulations at 40 CFR Part 61, Subpart M, National Emission Standard for Asbestos, Section 61.145(a), there has to be a thorough inspection of bridges before demolition to Determine if there is category I or category II asbestos containing material present. Although the Washington Avenue Bridge is only being remodeled for the LRT alternative in this project, this potential concern should also be addressed in the FEIS.

Response SocHM-001. All buildings and structures expected to be directly impacted by project construction and future operation and maintenance will be inspected and evaluated for asbestos containing materials prior to construction. Any such materials identified will be removed and disposed of in accordance with MPCA and EPA policies, regulations, and procedures. All painted structures including bridges will be evaluated for lead paint potential.

Any lead paint found will be either rendered harmless in-place or removed and disposed of in accordance with MPCA and EPA policies, regulations, and procedures.

Issue Summary SocHM-003. Report should improve cataloging of hazardous materials
(2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) SocHM-3

Section/page/table is 4.2. Page 4-10. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS CONTAMINATION. Summary of Impacts by Alternative: The list of environmental sites with soil or groundwater contamination within 500 feet of the proposed line is incomplete in the vicinity of the University of Minnesota's planned football stadium. The DEIS lists Reichold Chemical Inc. and Archer Daniels Midland Co. properties as posing a medium risk. The EIS does not list the former Republic Creosote site or the Conagra facility which are southwest of the Reichold Chemical site.

(CCLRP0407) SocHM-6

Beginning on p4-8 is an analysis of hazardous materials contamination. This is a significant issue within the Central Corridor, but LRT development will likely have little or no impact on the current condition. Most of the potential contaminants are outside the University Avenue or downtown street rights-of-way. ...However, the cataloging of such hazards is worth inclusion in the Draft EIS in case something is unearthed during construction.

Response SocHM-003. The AA/DEIS identified a total of 316 sites that were considered to have a potential impact to the project right-of-way and project construction. From that review, 10 sites were recommended for Phase II investigation. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was performed on the Central Corridor LRT Study Area, excluding the downtown Minneapolis portion, in October 2007. It identified a total of 1,070 sites that could potentially affect the project. 222 sites were considered to be of High potential impact, and 87 sites were selected for review of their MPCA files based on proximity to the alignment, likelihood for impact by construction, and need for rights of way. These 87 sites and the 10 AA/DEIS sites were assessed for future Phase II ESA investigations. After this review, 42 sites are proposed for Phase II level impact assessment in the FEIS, including 5 of the 10 sites listed in the AA/DEIS. All of these sites are as listed in Section 4.8 of the FEIS. It is recognized some sites identified by the AA/DEIS or the Phase I ESA are not included in the final list of sites for Phase II investigation. However, the Construction Contingency Plan will include provisions for continuous excavation monitoring for suspected hazardous materials as construction proceeds. Any suspect hazardous materials found to be emanating from the above sites to the construction alignment will be tested and disposed of at licensed repositories in accordance with approved state and federal processes.

Issue Summary SocHM-005. There is a need for brown field cleanup and economic development along the corridor (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0868) SocHM-5

In this job and in previous positions I've worked with and for several of the neighborhoods along University Avenue and understand the dire need for brown field cleanup and economic development along the corridor.

Response SocHM-005. Since the publication of the AA/DEIS, St. Paul has begun to establish Transit Opportunity Zone overlay districts (TOZ) , which, generally, promote and facilitate desired change or improvement through redevelopment and rehabilitation activities. Two policy layers are used: The first establishes a priority approach for a range of incentives, planning, infrastructure, economic development, and capital improvements. In general, hazardous materials clean up and redevelopment of brownfields would come under this layer. The second consists of a set of development directions. Each TOZ will have a City TOZ teams to implement policy directions, work with developers to optimize the development potential of strategic sites; prepare future station area plans; and coordinate, consult, and communicate with area residents, businesses, and stakeholders.

Section: 4.10 - Electromagnetic Fields, Utilities and Distribution Systems

Issue Summary EngUT-001. Concerns about impact to District Energy and other utility companies (21)

Comments:

(CCLRP0820) EngCI-8

Proposed routing potentially can impact two miles of the most critical distribution systems. The piping at Fourth and Cedar is our most critical arteries and impacting them impacts everything and the cost of such impact could approach \$20 million. As small nonprofit companies with only 115 downtown customers we do not have the means to defray these costs. Unless funded by the project, all costs would be borne by customers which would be very harmful.

(CCLRP0820) EngCI-9

It is essential that the LRT not be achieved at the expense of one of our community's success stories and we respectfully request that alternatives be considered that lessen the impact of the existing structure and that funding be included for any piping relocations required to accommodate LRT.

(CCLRP0551) EngCI-10

While we would recommend that the route be altered, if that is not the ultimate decision we ask that the funding for the relocation of the distribution systems be included in the cost of the project.

(CCLRP0551) EngCI-11

As we move forward with this infrastructure though, the project must factor in that the downtown area of St. Paul is lucky to benefit from the operation of District Energy St. Paul and District Cooling St. Paul.

(CCLRP0714) EngCI-12

District Heat and Cooling our building is served by Saint Paul's district heating and cooling system. Main arteries for this system run down Cedar Street. Disruption to this system will adversely affect operations in our building.

(CCLRP0540) EngCI-13

In particular we are concerned with the impact it will have on District Energy St. Paul' heating and cooling systems that serve over 80 percent of the buildings in downtown St. Paul.

(CCLRP0525) EngUT-1

Working Together - We understand the importance of collaborating with others to successfully bring important community projects to realization. It took extraordinary collaboration between government, businesses, institutions and community groups to form District Energy and its affiliate District Cooling to serve downtown St. Paul. Their creation has benefited the city and surrounding communities in numerous ways. Not only have we been able to moderate the cost of energy to downtown St. Paul, our use of clean, renewable energy has substantially reduced air pollution and the production of greenhouse gases. St. Paul and District Energy are now used as a model for other cities and communities to follow, especially given the escalating cost of energy, and the growing concerns over global warming. For the Central Corridor LRT Project to achieve its goals and reach its full potential will require a similar collaborative effort among all stakeholders, including District Energy and its customers. It is essential that the Central Corridor LRT Project not be achieved at the expense of critical infrastructure like District Energy that is already in place serving and benefiting the community and its businesses. Over the past twenty three years we have become a vital, sustainable energy solution for St Paul building owners, and an important part of energy planning for the State. However, as nonprofit corporations, District Energy and District Cooling do not have the revenue, capital, equity, or borrowing power to obtain the necessary financing for substantial relocation of our piping distribution networks. As non-profit companies any costs incurred as a result of LRT will be passed on to only 115 building owners in downtown St. Paul, and 300 low-income town homes at Mount Airy. A \$20 million relocation price tag would have a substantial, inappropriate, inequitable financial impact on those building owners and tenants. Therefore, we respectfully request that the Central Corridor LRT Alternative include in its budget and funding requests, costs for relocation of heating and cooling pipelines impacted by the LRT Alternative. We stand ready to work with any and all stakeholders and units of government to address the issues in downtown St. Paul, and also examine the opportunities to extend District Energy services along University Avenue. We look forward to participating in the preliminary engineering process to find mutually satisfying solutions to ensure the success of the Central Corridor LRT Project.

(CCLRP0191) EngUT-2

As a downtown St. Paul building manager I am concerned about the additional cost to our buildings for utility relocation that would result from the route currently proposed (Cedar and Fourth Streets). I would urge planners to consider moving the route one block east (to Minnesota Street) and one block south (to Kellogg Blvd.) to avoid relocating the major distribution lines of District Energy. This relatively small community non-profit utility has very few customers over which to spread the relocation cost. Downtown St. Paul commercial buildings are already at a competitive disadvantage with other

segments of the Metropolitan Area. The additional cost on our buildings would exacerbate that disadvantage and prolong the high vacancy rate for office space.

(CCLRP0525) EngUT-3

The approach of leaving District Energy's piping in place also seems to conflict with Section 6.8.2 Utility Impacts, on Page 6-48 of the DEIS. The paragraph on UNIVERSITY AVENUE LRT ALTERNATIVE states, "In general underground utilities that parallel the proposed LRT Alternative for some distance may need to be relocated." It goes on to state that manholes, vaults, etc., located in the LRT path will need to be "relocated or access restricted". This requirement needs to be clarified to assess the full impact on our systems. If underground utilities cannot remain parallel with LRT, most, if not all, of District Energy's piping along Robert, Cedar and Fourth Streets will need to be relocated. Limiting access to manholes, vaults, etc., is not acceptable in several locations given the critical nature of many of the buildings served.

(CCLRP0525) EngUT-4

DEIS Miscalculations.

Given the location and depth of our systems, the DEIS incorrectly minimizes the impacts the LRT Alternative will have on our distribution systems and our customers. It states the following concerning the project's provisions for District Energy's heating and cooling systems: "With respect to District Energy, the estimate includes the provision of a structural slab over shallow utilities to protect such utilities from the weight of the LR trains." Page 2-16, "Utilities" - "The proposed LRT Alternative is not expected to substantially impact shallow district heating and cooling distribution systems, which serve 75 percent of the downtown St. Paul area. The proposed LRT Alternative is not to extend more than 2-feet below the ground surface where these lines are installed" Section 6.8.2 Utility Impacts, Page 6-48, "Potential Impacts to Additional Utilities" - Installing a structural slab will not be sufficient for LRT to avoid a multitude of conflicts with our piping and associated structures. Even a structural system that extends no more than 2-feet below ground will encounter piping and structures in multiple locations.

(CCLRP0528) EngUT-6

The Rail Authority should consider alternative routes that leave as much existing infrastructure intact as possible. If project success depends on the relocation of infrastructure then project proposals should obviously allocate funds to pay for relocation. Forcing the

utility provider to absorb these expenses would result in increased costs to the customers served by District Energy and significantly erode the business climate in the area.

(CCLRP0525) EngUT-7

It is disconcerting that the DEIS does not reflect the results of several meetings and the dialogue that occurred between representatives from Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority (RCRRA), their consultant DMJM+HARRIS, and District Energy between September 2004 and January 2005. According to a draft August 8, 2005 report from DMJM+HARRIS to RCRRA and the Central Corridor Coordinating Committee, DMJM+HARRIS discovered during their utilities investigations that impacts to District Energy will be extensive. The report states, "Coordination and possible relocation of District Energy in downtown St. Paul will be a major undertaking." (DMJM+HARRIS Summary of Project Design Activities, Preliminary Recommendations Report, Page 22, Para 2.3.1 Key Findings of Utilities Investigation). We agree...it will be a major undertaking. The impact on District Energy and over 80 percent of all downtown buildings will be substantial, not minimal as suggested by the Draft EIS.

(CCLRP0525) EngUT-8

Downtown St. Paul will also be impacted by the substantial construction required to relocate piping in advance of LRT construction. The pipelines in Fourth and Cedar Streets are the critical arteries to the entire district heating and cooling system serving downtown. Their relocation to either a lower depth or another location would present, at best, extreme technical and economic impacts because of the flow of the distribution system, the building and pipeline interconnections, and the myriad of critical building loads requiring service 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. The complexity of the system is such that it could take up to two construction seasons to make the adjustments necessary to accommodate LRT along the proposed routing. The actual financial impacts and schedule requirements are dependent on the location of pipes to be moved, whether they are functioning as an artery to the rest of the system, and the criticality of the buildings being served. The critical nature of the buildings and their location on the system determines the extent temporary boilers and chillers will be required to serve the heating and cooling needs of customers while pipes and connections are being relocated.

(CCLRP0528) EngUT-9

In particular we're concerned about the costs of rerouting the underground heating and cooling lines used by District Energy - and who is expected to pay those costs.

(CCLRP0525) EngUT-10

Adverse Impacts. While we are supportive of the LRT Alternative, there are several major issues that need to be addressed regarding the impact it will have on District Energy and our 115 downtown customers. Among our concerns is who is responsible for the cost of utility relocation to accommodate LRT. Reviewing the DEIS, we find that the proposed routing of the University Avenue LRT Alternative from the State Capitol Complex through downtown St. Paul has the potential to impact up to 13,000 linear feet (6,500 trench feet) of District Energy's hot water piping and 7,000 linear feet (3,500 trench feet) of chilled water piping. We have estimated the costs associated with such impacts could approach \$20 million.

(CCLRP0525) EngUT-17

Other cost considerations include the location of District Energy manholes, the location of LRT stations, and the installation of mitigation measures needed to protect the piping systems from stray currents generated by LRT. District Energy also has communications conduits installed above both the heating and cooling pipelines. Those conduits contain numerous fiber optic and copper cables. These cables are not only used to control our satellite plants, metering, customer service, and monitoring of remote points for District Energy, but large portions of the fiber optic cables are also used by the State of Minnesota, Ramsey County and the City of St. Paul to carry vital communications and internet connectivity for the city, county and state. Finally we have concerns for the safety of our workers who regularly need to access and service the distribution systems which will be in close proximity to the LRT rails and stations.

(CCLRP0820) EngUT-18

We believe the DEIS has miscalculated the impacts of the systems. Its provisions for concrete slab over our systems would not be sufficient to avoid the multitude of conflicts with our shell piping systems. The county's consultants state in their August 2005 report that coordination and possible relocation of District Energy in Downtown St. Paul would be a major undertaking. We agree.

(CCLRP0475) EngUT-19

p. 6-48 District Heating representative testified that relocation of district heating piping could cost \$20 million.

(CCLRP0525) EngUT-20

The provision of a structural slab also assumes that it will be acceptable to leave existing underground utilities in place, directly below and in parallel with LRT for several hundred feet. We estimate that there are at least ten locations where District Energy's piping will parallel and be located below the LRT tracks for 200-feet or more between the Capitol Complex and Union Depot. There is one location on Cedar between 5th and 7th Streets, where two 16-inch cooling pipes will be located directly below LRT for approximately 1,100-feet. The DEIS does not address the impact that would occur to the LRT system, including the potential degradation of structural supports, when a pipe fails directly under or in close proximity to the LRT or one of its stations. The DEIS is also silent on the impacts LRT Stations will have on District Energy. Given their footprint, each of the stations from the Capital Complex to Union Depot will directly conflict with District Energy piping and related structures.

(CCLRP0525) EngUT-22

The severity of the impact to District Energy is directly related to the proposed routing of LRT through downtown St. Paul. Our hot and chilled water pipes beneath Fourth and Cedar Streets are critical arteries to the entire district heating and cooling system. The piping and associated structures in those streets are vital to the functionality of the entire piping network. Impacting them has the potential to affect 80 percent of the buildings in downtown St. Paul. As primary trunk-lines, the heating and cooling systems in those streets both have supply and

return pipes as large as 25-inches in diameter, running in parallel, at an average depth of two to four feet below ground surface. In congested sections of those streets, piping is located as shallow as 1-foot below ground surface. There are also numerous manholes, vaults and other structures located along the proposed LRT routing. Of particular concern are four large structures along Cedar between 10th and 12th Streets that are buried less than 1-foot below ground surface.

(CCLRP0407) EngUT-24

The Draft EIS states that "[t]he proposed LRT Alternative is not expected to substantially impact shallow district heating and cooling distribution systems [because] [t]he proposed LRT Alternative is not to extend more than 2-feet below the ground surface where these lines are installed." It is possible that the current alignment and design of LRT could still have major impacts on District Heating & Cooling.

Response EngUT-001. Modifications have been made to the AA/DEIS LPA in order to avoid some District Energy utility impacts. The Preferred Alternative alignment provides a diagonal path across the block from the Cedar Avenue/5th Street East intersection to the 4th Street East/Minnesota Street intersection. A new station on this diagonal replaces two AA/DEIS stations - the 6th Street and 4th Street stations. The project will continue efforts to minimize and mitigate impacts with existing utilities during final design. Private utilities will be required to relocate at their own expense in accordance with Minnesota Rules 8810.3300, subpart 3.

Issue Summary EngUT-003. [Impact on underground electrical utilities \(including Fitzgerald Theater and MPR\)](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0714) EngUT-5

Disruption to electrical and cabling under Cedar Street: Our operations are dependent on electrical and cabling infrastructure that supports our distribution system, which runs under Cedar Street to the Fitzgerald Theater, located at 10 East Exchange Street, where our satellite uplink is located. Our regional stations and the 700 stations around the country that we serve rely and depend on the content that is distributed through this infrastructure. Any disruption or damage to this system would be a serious issue for us. It would be costly to make changes to this technical infrastructure. In addition, this infrastructure serves as the backup to the public radio distribution system operated by National Public Radio.

Response EngUT-003. The CCPO has received information from MPR regarding their below-ground utilities. Surveying of these utilities has been completed and this information has been incorporated into the project's utility relocations plans. This information has been shared with MPR and coordination regarding the matter of utility relocation will continue into final design. The project will continue efforts to minimize and mitigate impacts with existing utilities during final design. Private utilities will be required to relocate at their own expense in accordance with Minnesota Rules 8810.3300, subpart 3.

Issue Summary EngUT-005. Relocation of 96 inch sanitary sewer at Oak Street near the proposed Stadium Village Station (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0435) EngUT-21

Sewers - The 96 inch sanitary sewer located at Oak Street near the proposed Stadium Village Station is a metropolitan interceptor, not a local sanitary sewer. When further information is available on the need to relocate the pipe, the project staff will need to work with the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services Division to have the proposed sewer relocation project approved.

Response EngUT-005. Impacts are no longer anticipated to a large 96-inch metropolitan interceptor sewer which crosses Washington Avenue at Oak Street Southeast. Any possible need to relocate this pipe would require the project staff to work with the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services Division and the City of Minneapolis to gain relocation approval. Utility impacts are discussed in Chapter 4 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngUT-006. Possible utility improvements (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0525) EngUT-23

University Avenue Opportunities. The LRT Alternative provides an exciting opportunity to bring the benefits of District Energy's services to University Avenue and the Midway area. We are very interested in exploring the possibility of simultaneously installing our distribution piping systems in University Avenue during construction of LRT. It is intriguing to envision the possibilities and community benefits that would be generated by the availability of affordable, sustainable, renewable energy along the Central Corridor.

Response EngUT-006. The opportunity for utility improvements through the corridor are understood and valued. Coordination with utilities will be necessary to complete the final design. A discussion of impacts to utilities is provided in FEIS Chapter 4, Section 4.9.

Issue Summary PlaTP-066. U of M would like to participate in selecting power system substations (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-247

Page 2-9, Power System - The University would like to participate in selecting the appropriate location and exterior design of the substations on and near campus.

Response PlaTP-066. TPSS locations have been publicly disclosed in the SDEIS. More specific information on their locations are included in the plan sets submitted to FTA with the FEIS. This information has been shared with the U of M and other stakeholders including the CAC and the general public.

Issue Summary ProHLP-016. Cost of project should include relocation utilities and distribution systems (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0540) ProFSt-002

We support the premise that funding for any relocation of District Energy distribution systems must be included in the cost of the project.

Response ProHLP-016. The cost of relocating utilities has been refined during preliminary engineering and is reflected in current project cost estimates. Private utilities will be required to relocate at their own expense in accordance with Minnesota Rules 8810.3300, subpart 3. This precedent has been established through court cases that have proceeded to the Minnesota Supreme Court.

Issue Summary ProProjBdj-001. Impact to non-profit utility piping and structures (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0525) ProProjBdj-001

Cost of DEIS Miscalculations; Early Start Requirements - By superimposing the proposed routing of LRT over our piping systems and analyzing the potential impact on a block-by-block basis, we have estimated the cost to accommodate LRT along Robert, Cedar and Fourth Streets could approach \$20 million. There have been discussions regarding absorbing all associated costs in the relocation of our piping and structures. Obviously, this is an inappropriate and inequitable burden on two small non-profit utilities. We are not an electric or gas company with billions of dollars in assets. Nor do we have millions of ratepayers to help share this cost. As nonprofit companies, any costs incurred as a result of LRT will be borne by our 115 downtown customers. Based upon their demand size, of those 115 customers, 32 will bear 80 percent of the cost! That impact could be devastating to some of the building owners and their tenants.

Response ProProjBdj-001. The cost of relocating certain utilities within the project area has been refined during preliminary engineering and is reflected in current project cost estimates. Private utilities will be required to relocate at their own expense in accordance with Minnesota Rules 8810.3300, subpart 3.

Section: 4.11 - Energy

Issue Summary SocEU-001. Environmental and energy benefits of LRT versus other modes of public transportation. (14)

Comments:

(CCLRP0241) SocEU-3

With our diversifying of options to be able to limit our reliance on foreign oil, Mass Transit makes way too much sense, and I do understand there is a heavy price tag, however, this is a long term investment, and it will create a major impact for not only people like me who live

in the city but potentially suburbanites, and tourists, as I being a tourist in Baltimore and DC can attest to.

(CCLRP0394) SocEU-4

Because of growing concern about fossil fuel consumption, global warming, and political instability surrounding oil supplies, it is extremely important to develop alternative mass transportation. The success of the light rail connection between the Mall of America and downtown Minneapolis needs to be repeated for downtown St. Paul and the University Ave. corridor

(CCLRP0857) SocEU-5

Light rail on University would be, in my opinion, a very dignified alternative to using a car or a bus on University or I-94, a clean and quiet option to increased auto congestion, pollution, and noise on Interstate 94 and surrounding communities.

(CCLRP0877) SocEU-6

I support the light rail alternative because I support a vision of the St. Paul-Minneapolis area that is urban and environmentally-friendly, a vision that does not conform to buses.

(CCLRP0006) SocEU-7

I also feel LRT will help address traffic congestion, and noise pollution disinvestment in our core cities and suburban sprawl. With the price of gas rising precipitously, I would like to use an LRT option for my many trips in between the two downtowns.

(CCLRP0455) SocEU-8

If Minnesota is really considering the environmental impact of various transit improvements, such as reducing the dependence on petroleum products, reducing greenhouse effects caused by vehicle exhaust emissions and reducing roadway congestion, light rail is the only option that addresses all three concerns. Any system that depends on buses does not address any of these concerns.

(CCLRP0100) SocEU-9

I believe it is very important for the Twin Cities to increase public transportation which is not dependent on oil based products.

(CCLRP0457) SocEU-10

Page S-4 (Section 2): Purpose and Need for Action Five Concerns listed to justify the need for a transit system should be increased to six and include "Energy". Transit systems have been shown to have a large role in creating a cleaner atmosphere. In addition, transit systems offer a more efficient use of our limited energy resources.

(CCLRP0652) SocEU-11

I think LRT is preferable over BRT because trains provide a more comfortable ride than buses and they are more cost-effective in the long run. I think it is significant to note that some of the North American cities with the highest concentration of petroleum engineers, such as Calgary, Houston and Los Angeles, have made significant investments in rail transit.

Petroleum engineers know that planning for a transportation system based on cheap oil is short-term planning, and a transit system that runs off the flexible fuels that can generate electricity is a smarter option (Calgary, for example, powers its light rail trains with a wind farm).

(CCLRP0243) SocEU-12

We are already well behind other major U.S. cities not to mention light years behind Europe in efficient public transportation. Let's help the environment by removing noise and pollution AND make transportation efficient!

(CCLRP0271) SocEU-14

Perhaps the most obscene waste of core city real estate in the Minneapolis/St. Paul area can be found at either end of the University of Minnesota busway. The busway connects 2 huge surface parking areas while bypassing the University area neighborhoods in between. The continuously running, weekday bus shuttle service for parking lot customers, not only facilitates wasteful land use, but is also a prime candidate for the Guinness Book of World Records for most gallons of wasted diesel fuel. Starting out on their westward journey to Minneapolis from the St. Paul Student Center, the large buses travel approx. mile (sic) around a large park area in order to return to the St. Paul Student Center. During this mile turn-around procedure, passengers are rarely, if ever, picked up or dropped off. The continuously running large buses then pass 2 unnecessary bus stops. Again, passengers are seldom picked up or dropped off at these 2 unnecessary stops. Finally, the large, continuously running, diesel guzzling vehicles reach the corridor which has been developed for transit, but unfortunately, is not used for such. When not shuttling drive-by polluters, driving in and driving out of the misplaced parking lots during peak morning, lunch and afternoon time periods, the filthy, wasteful buses are mostly empty.

(CCLRP0204) SocEU-15

and will reduce gas consumption by all of those who will be able to use light rail rather than driving individual cars. The reduced cost of parking in either downtown will be a great incentive to people to take public transportation rather than driving and parking.

(CCLRP0525) SocEU-16

Similar to LRT, District Energy St. Paul and its affiliate District Cooling St. Paul provide important economic, energy, and environmental solutions to St. Paul and the region. Both companies were formed as 501 (c)(3) nonprofit utilities " ... to lessen the burdens of government of the City of Saint Paul with respect to the energy and environmental needs of the municipal area and its citizens ...". District Energy is achieving that vision. Today we heat 80 percent and cool 60 percent of the buildings in downtown St. Paul and surrounding areas. Our customers have critical heating and cooling requirements, which demand a 24-hours-a-day, 365-days-a-year operation. We serve four hospitals (including their life sustaining environments), public safety buildings, residential buildings, commercial buildings, cultural and entertainment complexes, city and county facilities, and the State Capitol Complex. Our service reliability, which exceeds 99.99 percent, is essential to their operations.

(CCLRP0748) SocEU-17

The electric-powered LRT cars are more environmentally friendly than any Bus Rapid Transit.

Response SocEU-001. Comment noted.

Issue Summary SocEU-002. Concerns in regard to LRT energy consumption, and project impacts to pedestrians (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0916) SocEU-1

LRT will actually consume, according to the DEIS, more Btu's of energy than a bus system. LRT in the middle of University Avenue will prevent the possibility of widening the pedestrian space on the avenue and the installation of good street trees and planted medians.

Response SocEU-002. Comment noted. Updated information on energy consumption is discussed in Section 4.10 of the FEIS. The pedestrian environment is expected to improve with the selection of the Preferred Alternative. See Section 3.6 of the FEIS for details on impacts to visual quality and aesthetics, and Section 6.3 of the FEIS for a discussion of impacts to pedestrians.

Issue Summary SocEU-003. Concerns in regard to LRT energy consumption (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0475) SocEU-13

p. S-12 LRT has higher energy consumption than the baseline alternative or BRT, probably because it is so energy consuming due to immense weight, more than 50 tons per vehicle. When a light rail vehicle has only a few people on it, it will be very wasteful of energy, and consume more energy than if those people were driving alone.

Response SocEU-003. Comment noted. Updated information on energy consumption is discussed in Section 4.10 of the FEIS. LRT was selected as the Preferred Alternative because it best meets the purpose and need of the project. See Chapter 1 of the FEIS for further details.

Section: 4.0 - Report Corrections Needed

Issue Summary ProPM-019. Report corrections needed (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) ProPM-108

Note that a significant issue relating to reconstruction of existing streets in the Central Mississippi Watershed Management Organization area is currently being negotiated. The outcome could have impacts on costs of reconstruction.

(CCLRP0457) ProPM-259

Page S-12 (Table S.4-1): Environmental Effects "Energy Consumed vs. Baseline" should reference Table S.4-3 for further clarification of value stated.

Response ProPM-019. All chapters and sections of the AA/DEIS have been updated since publication of the AA/DEIS and selection of the AA/DEIS LPA. The Metropolitan Council has conducted and published an SDEIS to assess the impacts of necessary changes to key elements of the AA/DEIS LPA before selecting the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is fully described in Chapter 2 of the FEIS, and all chapters and sections assess the potential beneficial and adverse impacts of the Preferred Alternative and present mitigation strategies. The FEIS utilizes the latest information and analysis methods available for each section. It uses the most current data, studies, community plans, model outputs, and assumptions, and is based on the current design and engineering studies for the Central Corridor LRT.

Section: 5.1 - Economic Conditions

Issue Summary EcoEE-002. **Impact to business during construction** (7)

Comments:

(CCLRP0862) EcoEE-2

One of the most important themes in all of the meetings has urged the implementation of the University Avenue line in a way that minimizes harm to existing businesses so they'll be around when the line opens. They'll get the benefits, as they should, of LRT. This is indeed a critical task for planners and for policy makers.

(CCLRP0522) EcoEE-4

Businesses located along the Central Corridor must be subsidized - Several sections of the DEIS discuss the importance of new development along the Central Corridor, most notably in section 7.2.3, which supports LRT as "an incentive to intensification of commercial nodes" and a means "to allow higher intensity development near station sites." However, little information is provided in regards to the impacts and mitigations for currently existent businesses along the corridor, save for Section 3.3.2, which notes that the impact of reduced parking along the Avenue will be borne by local businesses (3-22). For example, section 6.10.4 fails to note that one "effect due to construction" may be the loss of revenue for current businesses.

(CCLRP0473) EcoEE-7

Many other small businesses between Lexington and Dale or even Rice would definitely feel the pinch of less business from customers (not to mention more taxes), since they could not get to the stores or restaurants without a serious modification of their normal travel habits light rail were in place.

(CCLRP0913) EcoEE-9

I suggest two things. You go to Lake Street and you talk to the businesses and the people over there and figure out how much time they're losing and then you can understand what's going to happen to University Avenue because that's been tore up. One businessman told me,

he said, "I lost half of my income. Then they close the street off completely. I lost all my business." And that's been my experience, that a dug-up street you can lose half of your income.

(CCLRP0164) EcoEE-62

First, it is essential that the small businesses, particularly immigrant and minority businesses, receive the help they need to survive the disruption of the construction process and the rising property values that we are already seeing along the corridor. These businesses, and the communities they serve, should rise on the tide of new development, not be swept away by it.

(CCLRP0152) EcoEE-91

Concerns are: 4. Business lost

(CCLRP0288) EcoEE-140

Businesses that are currently on University should not close solely because of LRT construction. These businesses make University great and I would hate to see them go away.

Response EcoEE-002. Roadway operations and parking, access to businesses, public utility services, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, along with short-term impacts to air quality, noise, and vibration are likely to be the most significant impacts experienced by the people and businesses located adjacent to or near the construction zones. Short-term impacts would be minimized by using standard construction BMPs such as dust control, erosion control, proper mufflers on equipment, and restricted times for construction. Maintenance of traffic and sequencing of construction would be planned and scheduled so as to minimize traffic delays and inconvenience. Access to all businesses would be maintained throughout the construction period. BMPs would include working with business-owners to provide alternative access, giving them adequate notice about construction plans and phasing, maintaining access to bus stops, and alerting the public to detours. The economic effects resulting from the construction and operation of the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Chapter 5.

Issue Summary EcoEE-003. [Include analysis of economic impact related to loss of University Avenue cross-traffic access](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) EcoEE-3

Perhaps most significant in this section is a lack of attention to the loss of cross-University Avenue vehicular access. Streets currently cross University Avenue approximately every 600 feet. LRT construction will limit such crossings to every 1/4 mile (every other block). In addition, a description of construction phasing options also causes concerns particularly to retailers along the Avenue. The City of Saint Paul recommends that detailed analyses regarding the economic impact of a loss of cross-University Avenue access, and of construction phasing options are essential to approval of the Preliminary Engineering by the City.

Response EcoEE-003.

Maintenance of traffic and sequencing of construction would be planned and scheduled so as to minimize traffic delays and inconvenience. Access to all businesses would be maintained throughout the construction period. BMPs would include working with business-owners to provide alternative access, giving them adequate notice about construction plans and phasing, maintaining access to bus stops, and alerting the public to detours. The economic effects resulting from the construction and operation of the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Chapter 5.

Issue Summary EcoEE-007. Project will have positive impact on future economic growth (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0654) EcoEE-11

The Twin Cities metro needs an integrated light rail solution for future economic growth and stewardship of resources. We need fewer cars on the road, and more transit options for citizens.

Response EcoEE-007. The purpose and need for this project has been established with broad community involvement and is discussed in the Chapter 1 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EcoEE-008. Project will have positive impact on area economics (107)

Comments:

(CCLRP0871) EcoEE-6

As a property and business owner I think light rail will improve the streetscape and foster additional streetscape improvements from the private sector. It will attract more consumers to visit University Avenue and shop. It will encourage my employees to use mass transit not only to work but between our offices by the State Capitol through the Midway and to Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0185) EcoEE-8

The history of University Avenue, once the primary connector between the cities, can be largely traced to automobile-based development along its alignment. Drive-thru restaurants, big box retailers with ample parking, etc. dominate the landscape as a result of decades of exposure to high levels of automobile traffic. And the recent revitalization along this corridor (in various spots) shows that University Avenue is sustainable as, quite literally, an automobile-fed economy.

(CCLRP0212) EcoEE-10

Improved transit provided by Light Rail along the Central Corridor will benefit my company. I have been with TKDA for 29 years. TKDA is a 220 person engineering, architectural and planning firm located in Downtown St. Paul. TKDA has been in St. Paul since 1910 and has a strong interest in the continued vitality and economic health of St. Paul. We have for all these years rejected enticing real estate deals to move to the suburbs in order to retain our downtown St. Paul location. We like it hear, this is home and because of our downtown

location, many of our employees are able to take advantage of the existing Metro Transit bus system to get to and from work. In 1998 TKDA was the first St. Paul firm to participate in the Metro Pass program. This program is one in which TKDA as an employer offers the use of Metro Passes at a reduced rate to our employees. Today 20% of TKDA employees take advantage of the Metro Pass program and take public transportation to work. Transit availability is an important factor in our long term decision to stay put in downtown St. Paul. Improved transit into and around St. Paul will improve our ability to attract and retain good employees.

(CCLRP0862) EcoEE-12

Now, on LRT versus Bus Rapid Transit, the ability of fixed transit systems to shape development has been thoroughly demonstrated in other metropolitan areas and now here in the Hiawatha Corridor but has not been commented upon so much.

(CCLRP0769) EcoEE-15

I know that there will be economic development. We're a 35-year-old family business. We've seen economic development on University Avenue for many years. I'm excited for what's going to happen coming up in the next couple of years, let alone ten or 20 years, and I feel that this is the very beginning of a lot of good things that could happen.

(CCLRP0300) EcoEE-21

What are we waiting so long for? This central corridor makes more sense for the urban region than any other transportation project on the boards. Let's get this done rather than waiting until the price tag is higher! University Avenue businesses will be fine. Let's face it, this isn't a highly attractive thoroughfare right now. Yes, it's home to many people and business, but the rail line isn't going to hurt them, it's going to help. This is reflected in the many comments that residents and business owners have expressed all along. And the downtown Saint Paul district needs this -- we need the vitality and connectedness that this train can bring.

(CCLRP0395) EcoEE-22

I have been following news regarding Light Rail Transit for the Central Corridor, and I am greatly in favor of these this expansion. Although it seems that Minneapolis and St. Paul like to pick at each other at times, in reality we are both part of the same economic entity. To me, the need for this link is huge, and obvious: If you ignore it, we will end up stunted, like a plant without enough sunshine; our central cities might survive, but will be crippled and unable to fully contribute to a better society

(CCLRP0306) EcoEE-24

As an employee working in downtown St. Paul, I recognize infrastructure improvements are fundamental to economic growth. Transit is no longer just about moving people from place to place--it is about strategically transporting people to places of business and recreation. The proposed Central Corridor line would better connect the Twins Cities and stimulate growth and economic development. It would also contribute to the future prosperity of the two downtowns, the Midway areas and other communities and businesses along the corridor.

(CCLRP0342) EcoEE-30

As a well-traveled life-long St. Paulite I have experienced Light Rail Transit in many other major cities in the U.S, Canada and Europe. To operate without LRT permanently keeps us in the bush leagues of cities and prevents the stimulation of growth and economic development. LRT would also contribute to the future prosperity of the two downtowns, the Midway areas and other communities and businesses along the corridor.

(CCLRP0245) EcoEE-32

Connecting the metropolitan areas with LRT will generate growth and prosperity for both communities.

(CCLRP0277) EcoEE-33

I think it's an important part of the revitalization of a once prominent commercial district of the Urban Core of the Twin Cities, not to mention the importance to efficient public mass transit in a world of spiraling energy demand and pricing. The rail link between the two downtowns of St. Paul and Minneapolis along with the University of Minnesota and a new U of M football stadium would be a great benefit to Cities, its citizens and the economic revitalization of an Urban Core that is currently showing signs of recovery from decades of economic decline.

(CCLRP0365) EcoEE-34

Public transportation is an important aspect of the prosperity of a large city or two cities in the case of Minneapolis/St. Paul. A connection between the two cities through the use of light rail would help to increase revenue to both. Although buses are also a good option for reducing traffic, they do not seem to be doing the job in attracting the single driver.

(CCLRP0678) EcoEE-37

With more businesses looking to the suburbs outside of Ramsey County to start and/or continue their growth, now is the time to get light rail between St. Paul and Minneapolis on track. Light rail will keep our downtown areas vital, and more reasons for business to start and grow in St. Paul, which will also keep Ramsey County's tax base diverse and not become overly dependent on residents.

(CCLRP0344) EcoEE-38

As a business member and as board chair of two organizations on the west side of St. Paul, I recognize that infrastructure improvements go hand in hand with economic growth. The hard working people of our cities need transit to get to their places of employment. I also recognize that transit is no longer just about moving people from place to place--it is about strategically transporting people to places of business and recreation. The proposed Central Corridor line would better connect the Twins Cities and stimulate growth and economic development. It would also contribute to the future prosperity of the two downtowns, the Midway areas and other communities and businesses along the corridor.

(CCLRP0409) EcoEE-39

There are very few initiatives where your direct impact will make a bigger difference to the long term growth of both downtown areas. Whenever I recruit new leaders to Ecolab, I tell them about the benefit of having two such vibrant and different cities available to them -- it is truly a wonderful and unique benefit of our urban community. The Central Corridor would benefit bring the richness of the two communities to an even broader base of people.

(CCLRP0773) EcoEE-45

Businesses will benefit from their employees being able to move in between the two Twin Cities and to the University of Minnesota in a much easier fashion and the light rail line will serve as the hub, as I mentioned, between the two Twin Cities, at the University of Minnesota Campus, and the emerging bioscience corridor to give our region a further edge in terms of economic development and accessibility and market.

(CCLRP0880) EcoEE-49

I support light rail 100 percent because people need -- Downtown St. Paul needs this economic boon to move workers into St. Paul and to move people and give people the freedom to work wherever they would like in the metropolitan area. The people who live along light rail or the Central Corridor who might have questions about it, I can understand their concerns, but this would give our future generations and our children an opportunity to live where they want to live and if they want to live in St. Paul and work all across the metropolitan area.

(CCLRP0258) EcoEE-50

LRT can play an important role in achieving more affordable housing in the area because LRT can eliminate the need for expensive underground parking. LRT can draw reinvestment to this important area of the Twin Cities.

(CCLRP0427) EcoEE-51

A light rail line between Minneapolis and St. Paul would also be beneficial for sports events, and arts and music events in both downtowns. It will also lead to potential development and revitalization along the new light rail line. I think it's very important to not allow areas of our city to stagnate. We should always be looking for ways to improve our community and access to all areas of it. The cost of building additional light rail lines will only increase with time. So, knowing that it will benefit our community, it is best to act as soon as possible.

(CCLRP0886) EcoEE-53

Transit is no longer just transporting people from Point A to Point B. The value of it is really about connecting people to jobs and job opportunity. That means opportunity for people in our community to be able to move around the region more affordably and more easily than they can with an automobile.

(CCLRP0326) EcoEE-54

This project has considerable value as a key element of the metropolitan area's transit system and will help to promote economic development of the corridor. Move forward!

(CCLRP0003) EcoEE-56

It really won't economically benefit the community; rather it will negatively impact it with higher living costs, higher taxes, gentrification, and pass through riders.

(CCLRP0633) EcoEE-65

I think it would greatly enhance our neighborhood and the commercial composition along University Avenue and would heighten overall appeal for the Twin Cities.

(CCLRP0207) EcoEE-66

And seeing the impact of the Hiawatha line on nearby business and residential development convinces me this will be a good thing for all of us living in St. Paul and the metro area.

(CCLRP0858) EcoEE-67

So that's an \$840 million investment and I'm sure a lot of other communities will open their arms up and embrace this. So I'm sure it's going to bring a lot of good things into St. Paul. So I am solely in support of light rail.

(CCLRP0873) EcoEE-68

I also think in fact, know it will spur development in a part of St. Paul that's near and dear to me, the Rice Street area. I've heard a lot of talk of many of the vacant buildings that are being considered for redeveloping now because they really feel that this will bring new vitality to the area as a feeder to the system, and as one that is just a little bit simpler in thinking, it's something that I would use.

(CCLRP0406) EcoEE-70

WHEREAS, major improvements in public transit planned and anticipated for the region will undoubtedly have a significant impact on the future development of Saint Paul and its neighborhoods; and

(CCLRP0855) EcoEE-72

LRT will generate positive residential, office, and commercial development along the avenue. It will bring people who live, work, play between two downtowns into our neighborhoods and to our businesses in exciting and positive ways far beyond what we are experiencing today. Perhaps most importantly it will ensure the economic vitality and livability in our community.

(CCLRP0231) EcoEE-73

Small business benefits from LRT because it will foster improvements, attract more visitors to stores and shops on University Avenue and reduce the traffic congestion. Merchants and businesses on University Avenue will benefit from LRT by assuring employees will have an affordable and convenient means of travel to and from work and play.

(CCLRP0757) EcoEE-74

And third, light rail also attracts more investment and development onto the area. The fixed lines are a commitment by the region and they're not very easily changed so businesses and developers see that commitment and are able to move in and spend the money in the area,

and this is primary for that investment and development between both of the main cities here of Minneapolis and St. Paul. Again, I fully support Light Rail Transit.

(CCLRP0406) EcoEE-77

It is through this lens of city building that this City of Saint Paul review is formed - a lens that sees "DOT" (development oriented transit) rather than "TOD" (transit-oriented development) as the primary objective. Any new substantial investments in transit in the Central Corridor must enhance city livability, maximize major investment opportunity, and promote community cohesion. Such investments, therefore, should be for helping build up the city, not merely move people.

(CCLRP0853) EcoEE-79

Real simply put, it would save me \$168 a day, \$40,000 approximately a year. That's a new job, another job. That's a way that I can add raises to the people that work for me today. It's a way that I can further ensure that they're going to be able to have the economic stability for us to continue to do business in Downtown St. Paul.

(CCLRP0868) EcoEE-81

Light rail infrastructure is a natural complement to the Port's redevelopment of the abandoned inner city manufacturing sites. It is exactly the type of infrastructure our customers desire to serve the needs of the high-density jobs they bring to St. Paul.

(CCLRP0777) EcoEE-82

Light Rail Transit is a major connector with the Twin Cities. It will stimulate growth, economic development, and strategically transport people to fill business needs for HealthEast and many other organizations.

(CCLRP0151) EcoEE-83

We will have cost of business.

(CCLRP0167) EcoEE-84

An LRT line would greatly increase the value of the real estate and hopefully lead to grander and more projects going up along the avenue. These projects should include a retail area that would rival that which is offered in Roseville. Also LRT would help stimulate more independent businesses.

(CCLRP0041) EcoEE-85

I vigorously support the Central Corridor project from the large, medium, and small business and the overall community development perspectives. I have a deep concern and desire to keep this wonderful community of ours flourishing and competitive for many years to come.

(CCLRP0749) EcoEE-86

Improved transit along the Central Corridor will contribute to the future prosperity not only of the two downtowns, but the Midway area and other communities and businesses along the corridor, the greater Twin Cities region, and overall economic growth of the state.

(CCLRP0167) EcoEE-90

An LRT line downtown would bring renewed economic development. In particular more people living downtown, an expanded and more vital retail district, an expansion of the sports and entertainment choices offered, and interest by companies in relocating to the CBD.

(CCLRP0083) EcoEE-92

The Central Corridor LRT is a major connector of the Twin Cities and will stimulate growth and economic development. This has certainly become obvious with the Hiawatha line.

(CCLRP0096) EcoEE-93

It will reinvigorate the University Avenue area by bringing new business opportunities as well as by supporting existing business ventures.

(CCLRP0846) EcoEE-94

Improved transit along the Central Corridor will contribute to the prosperity in both of the downtowns, the Midway area community and businesses along the way, and the greater Twin Cities area, and the State of Minnesota.

(CCLRP0436) EcoEE-95

In the Economic Impact Analysis section, improving the mobility and accessibility of residents who live along the corridor should be added as a positive economic impact. Also, in the Purpose and Need section, improving the safety, mobility and accessibility for low income, elderly, children, those with physical and cognitive limitations could also be stated as an objective

(CCLRP0009) EcoEE-97

It's time to expand our light rail and show support for economic development.

(CCLRP0083) EcoEE-99

Improved transit along the Central Corridor will contribute to the future prosperity of both downtowns, the Midway area, the University area, the Great Twin Cities region and overall economic growth of the state.

(CCLRP0081) EcoEE-100

The business will suffer for a while, but will profit later on.

(CCLRP0846) EcoEE-101

The Central Corridor Light Rail Transit is a major connector for the Twin Cities and will stimulate responsible growth and desirable economic development.

(CCLRP0167) EcoEE-102

However, the best reasons for choosing LRT is that it will have the greatest impact for economic investment for the area around the corridor in St. Paul that goes from downtown to the border with Minneapolis. An \$840 million investment, the majority of which would be in St. Paul, would be a much needed economic stimulus for a city that badly needs economic development. This large public investment would help stimulate private investment in

St. Paul's two main economic engines, University Avenue and the central business district.

(CCLRP0039) EcoEE-104

I am concerned that small businesses several blocks off the corridor are not being considered in terms of impact.

(CCLRP0650) EcoEE-105

It will also help draw reinvestment in the corridor along University and create housing or businesses in the vacant lots and buildings along the avenue. It is a crucial next step in linking our transit system throughout the metro.

(CCLRP0766) EcoEE-106

It's an opportunity for my employees to get to work. Because of the type of business I'm in our customers, I believe, also will come to the area. More customers will come to the area using the light rail.

(CCLRP0298) EcoEE-107

Business lost

(CCLRP0338) EcoEE-110

The path though the midway will undoubtedly spur economic development in an underdeveloped but lucrative retail area that has been in various states of renewal for the past 15 years.

(CCLRP0167) EcoEE-112

Despite some welcome recent investments along University Avenue (the new Frogtown Library branch, Lexington Commons, Western State Bank, etc.), the avenue is still in need of much more investment. Many stretches of the avenue look run down or contain empty lots. To the frustration of many citizens, business, and civic groups, University Avenue is not living up to its full potential as a retail and business street. Despite having a large and dense population near the avenue, most people find themselves shopping in Roseville, a suburb with a little more than 10% of St. Paul's population.

(CCLRP0286) EcoEE-113

I do believe it is important that neighborhoods along the corridor including Raymond/University and Lowertown be targeted for artists and be made affordable for artists.

(CCLRP0849) EcoEE-114

Benefits to Porky's which is definitely a part of the neighborhood...Also, the benefits to Porky's are in the long term pretty positive. More people mean's more money.

(CCLRP0073) EcoEE-115

Light Rail Transit has been proven to create jobs, foster economic development, and boost property values.

(CCLRP0345) EcoEE-116

As a member of the North End Business Association, I understand how the transportation choices we make today determine the future of our great cities. Small and medium sized businesses along the Central Corridor depend on a steady flow of customers to keep the local economy moving, and LRT offers an efficient way to address their needs, and the needs of individuals living in and traveling through the area. Merchants and businesses on Rice Street would benefit from LRT by assuring that employees have an affordable and convenient means of travel. LRT also fosters improvements to the streetscape, attracts more visitors to stores and shops along the corridor and reduces the traffic congestion plaguing our neighborhoods. Additionally, connecting the two downtowns would diversify the business customer mix, providing new opportunities for serving the needs of a larger number of people.

(CCLRP0289) EcoEE-117

This is a sensible mass transit project, with high residential and business density along the entire route. In light of the success of the Hiawatha line, light rail in the Central Corridor can only increase transit ridership, increase business along the route, and increase property values. This is a good investment in the future of our cities. Light rail is the superior of all options being considered for this corridor.

(CCLRP0167) EcoEE-118

In addition, LRT would help increase the value of housing in the area and lead to a revival of some of the more distressed areas such as Frogtown.

(CCLRP0770) EcoEE-119

In addition, the economic development potential of this, the opportunity to improve the streetscape on University Avenue, to attract new businesses, to support existing businesses like the many Hmong and Asian-owned businesses who have transformed this avenue in the last 15 years is incredible.

(CCLRP0042) EcoEE-121

The LRT project is an opportunity for investment.

(CCLRP0184) EcoEE-122

Development - A survey by Louisville's TARC (Transit Authority of River City) reported \$2 billion in development along Portland, Oregon's, first light rail line and just \$300 million along Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania's, East Busway. But of that \$300 million, just \$176 million could be considered true TOD. This investment, which took place over 13 years, is swamped by the \$700 million in TOD occurring at just one station, Bloomington Central, on the Hiawatha Corridor Light Rail Line. At an April 25, 2006 workshop in Austin, Texas, Todd Hemingson of San Antonio's VIA (transit agency) acknowledged that the evidence of "BRT" - related TOD was "not overwhelming at this point."

(CCLRP0204) EcoEE-123

In fact, our neighborhood is surrounded by new, high-density housing, which people are buying in anticipation of getting to work in either of the two downtowns via light rail. Light

rail will have a positive economic development impact on University Avenue

(CCLRP0799) EcoEE-124

I really, really truly believe that a lot of the businesses along the avenue, having had the opportunity to walk up and down the avenue and speak to them, truly will benefit from this system.

(CCLRP0754) EcoEE-125

The other reason is because the LRT has a much greater potential to spur development. Bus systems just don't create the interest of developers and property owners to improve their property.

(CCLRP0139) EcoEE-126

No buy-out on development

(CCLRP0780) EcoEE-127

Third is regional economic competitiveness. My business takes me to places like Salt Lake City and Denver. They're building transportation systems that include rail. It seems to me that we're going to be at a competitive disadvantage in years to come if we don't catch up with what a lot of other communities are doing.

(CCLRP0194) EcoEE-131

I am also enthusiastic about the redevelopment opportunities that light rail will help bring about.

(CCLRP0167) EcoEE-132

The LRT line into downtown St. Paul would help this area as well. Although downtown St. Paul has seen much investment over the past 10 years, its momentum for further gain seems to have stalled during the administration of former Mayor Randy Kelly. Office vacancy rates are too high and one hears talk again about the central business district being dead. This needs to change.

(CCLRP0156) EcoEE-133

Further, the LRT stations/tracks provide the permanence that is required to encourage developers to build TOD (Transit Oriented Development), that is not found with a bus line.

(CCLRP0010) EcoEE-134

As an investor and resident in the area we need the LRT line to promote development and economic expansion.

(CCLRP0077) EcoEE-135

After a period of turmoil, the net socioeconomic effects will be VERY beneficial, with revitalization of this Central area of both cities.

(CCLRP0048) EcoEE-138

It also provides a long-term investment in the adjacent land in the corridor

(CCLRP0856) EcoEE-141

Light rail also complements the redevelopment mission of my employer, the St. Paul Port Authority. We help businesses expand near their work forces by redeveloping polluted and abandoned inner city land.

(CCLRP0166) EcoEE-142

LRT will draw reinvestment in the corridor, providing more opportunities for housing and jobs on vacant sites such as the empty Saxon's Ford blocks at the east end of University Avenue.

(CCLRP0162) EcoEE-144

That way the small businesses along the Avenue would not be forced out of business!

(CCLRP0415) EcoEE-146

This represents a critical opportunity to continue to build the infrastructure of St. Paul and it's surrounding areas, as well as highlight a major attraction for further residential growth in the city.

(CCLRP0439) EcoEE-149

Light rail on University Avenue directly supports the economic development goals of the Saint Paul Port Authority.

(CCLRP0749) EcoEE-152

The Central Corridor LRT initiative is a major connective for the Twin Cities and will stimulate growth and economic development.

(CCLRP0845) EcoEE-154

The Port Authority's mission is to create and retain jobs for St. Paul residents by assisting the business growth. One of our four lines of business is to help stem urban sprawl by recycling land into productive job centers throughout St. Paul and this way expansion-minded businesses are not forced to locate further away from their work force.

(CCLRP0288) EcoEE-155

Lightrail also encourages development because businesses know it will always be there - it's hard to remove it once it's there.

(CCLRP0407) EcoEE-156

The overall economic situation in downtown Saint Paul should be re-evaluated within the structure of the New Starts Application and the City's Development Strategy planning process.

(CCLRP0270) EcoEE-157

The Central Corridor must also include transit oriented development for people of all incomes. This will provide dense housing as well as retail that is key to making transit even more successful. It also gives people a choice to leave the cars behind and walk, bike, or take the train. The corridor is a perfect candidate for that - the large empty parking lots and

other vacant buildings near key intersections like Rice, Snelling, and more could be key locations for new development, and if done right it won't price the existing neighbors out of their homes.

(CCLRP0167) ProALT-390

In conclusion, I fully support LRT as the transit mode for the Central Corridor. LRT is the best option for stimulating economic development in St. Paul. However, I am also concerned that LRT be designed in a thoughtful way that benefits the existing businesses and also promotes pedestrian and other non auto traffic.

(CCLRP0247) EcoEE-26

(CCLRP0246) EcoEE-35

The Central Corridor LRT is a major connector of the Twins Cities and will stimulate growth and economic development. Improved transit along the Central Corridor will contribute to the future prosperity of the two downtowns, the Midway area and other communities and businesses along the corridor, the Greater Twin Cities region and overall economic growth of the state. Transit is no longer just about moving people from place to place. It is now about strategically transporting people to fill business needs for employees, and to foster new economic development around jobs, housing and infrastructure. In most metro areas around the country, business has been the leader in efforts to secure transit for its citizens. Infrastructure improvements are fundamental to economic growth.

(CCLRP0305) EcoEE-109

(CCLRP0332) EcoEE-23

(CCLRP0334) EcoEE-25

(CCLRP0627) EcoEE-27

(CCLRP0353) EcoEE-28

(CCLRP0354) EcoEE-29

(CCLRP0352) EcoEE-31

(CCLRP0351) EcoEE-36

(CCLRP0350) EcoEE-40

(CCLRP0639) EcoEE-41

(CCLRP0335) EcoEE-42

(CCLRP0314) EcoEE-43

(CCLRP0307) EcoEE-44

(CCLRP0279) EcoEE-46

(CCLRP0304) EcoEE-48

(CCLRP0276) EcoEE-52

(CCLRP0348) EcoEE-55

(CCLRP0349) EcoEE-88

(CCLRP0347) EcoEE-89

(CCLRP0205) PlaTE-181

As a business member, I recognize infrastructure improvements are fundamental to economic growth. Transit is no longer just about moving people from place to place--it is about strategically transporting people to places of business and recreation. The proposed Central Corridor line would better connect the Twins Cities and stimulate growth and economic

development. It would also contribute to the future prosperity of the two downtowns, the Midway areas and other communities and businesses along the corridor.

Response EcoEE-008. The Preferred Alternative is expected to have positive effects on commercial and residential development. It is anticipated that the Preferred Alternative will contribute economic benefits by encouraging and supporting higher-density residential and commercial land uses around transit stations. The Preferred Alternative will provide increased mobility to both residences and businesses within the Central Corridor and is expected to support future growth. New transportation capacity could create competitive advantages for businesses located in the corridor. See Chapter 5 of the FEIS for anticipated economic effects.

Issue Summary EcoEE-009. [Impact to businesses and property taxes](#) (20)

Comments:

(CCLRP0531) EcoEE-1

The construction and operation of new "Central Corridor" public transit must cause no harm (either directly or indirectly) to University Avenue small businesses. Remediation or preventive legislation must be enacted by the City to deal with major tax and rent increases caused by increased property values that are not offset by increased income to existing businesses. Direct financial compensation for income loss during construction must be provided to University Avenue small businesses. Assistance should be provided so that small businesses may buy the property in which their business is now located.

(CCLRP0899) EcoEE-13

Secondly, we want you to take into consideration what kind of compensation are we going to get when land values increase and many of us are going to be taxed out of the neighborhood?

(CCLRP0215) EcoEE-14

However, as a small business owner also, I am concerned about those who are there now and I hope this project will work to make sure they are not hurt and are not driven out by increasing property values along the route.

(CCLRP0793) EcoEE-17

The federal government just give you the lump sum to do the light rail, to build the light rail, but you have to look for the property tax. So with that truly great impact on landowner. We very fear about how to run a business on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0284) EcoEE-18

LRT will increase the value of homes in the surrounding neighborhoods. Since my home is my primary investment, I want and need the value of my home to increase. While affordable housing is a serious issue in the Twin Cities, it is unhealthy and poor public policy to concentrate all "affordable" housing and/or rental properties in one or two neighborhoods. Negative comments relating to the expected increase in home values due to LRT are unfair to the families who have already invested a considerable amount of time, effort, and money in their home, and are expecting to use the equity in their home for retirement.

(CCLRP0932) EcoEE-19

Another concern that ACORN was directed to bring to your attention has to do with property taxes that will result from the very real possibilities that property values will increase. One of the purposes of light rail is to encourage development. Our members who live along the corridor, either renting or owning, could be priced out of their homes if the property tax increase or speculated as they begin to buy a property. St. Paul must develop a way to minimize property tax increases. The city gives tax breaks to businesses who wish to locate in the city. The City must give breaks to citizens to remain in their homes, just as they give tax breaks to the businesses.

(CCLRP0178) EcoEE-20

The DCC recommends that mechanisms be instituted for minimizing the impacts of burgeoning property values and tax assessments based on them, likely a program of phased-in assessments to mitigate the rapid increase in asset values and preserving the historic character of residential neighborhoods.

(CCLRP0189) EcoEE-57

I was drawn to purchase a home in this area because of its affordability. I believe that LRT will in the long run drive home and business owners of modest means out of the area. Therefore, lessening chances of single-parent and working class folks to realize an American Dream of owning a home.

(CCLRP0183) EcoEE-58

The minority businesses that have revitalized University Avenue in St. Paul should not be at risk because of LRT. The Pioneer Press' cover story on April 24th ("In Grip of a Land Rush") showed the danger to small businesses of rising property values and possibly pricing them out of the market. Disruption during the construction phase should be minimized as much as possible. Maintaining existing small businesses along University Avenue that have helped turn around a depressed area should be a primary goal of any successful LRT planning.

(CCLRP0790) EcoEE-59

And the other question I have is the property tax. It goes up every year as of right now even before we put the train on, and also I would like to know if there's any compensation for all these business owners and all these residents that live in this neighborhood because due to the light rail on the University you know there's going to be property tax going up and I don't think it's fair for the residents and the business owners have to pay for these property tax.

(CCLRP0902) EcoEE-60

Land value, rent, property taxes will escalate pricing out many long-standing African-American families, seniors, religious or social institutions. Real estate speculators would entice property owners to sell, dissolving for the second time in our longstanding cultural roots as occurred when I-94 was built. If LRT doesn't protect, preserve, enhance, restore, and heal the Rondo community it should not be built.

(CCLRP0042) EcoEE-61

The impact of LRT has on land use property costs, affordable housing patterns, and business growth is a critical as the line itself.

(CCLRP0531) EcoEE-64

We must act now to minimize property tax increases on commercial and residential areas surrounding the proposed line. Working class citizens of Saint Paul created the historic character of the neighborhood. Those residents should not be forced out because property tax valuations skyrocket on the mere speculation of a Light Rail line. Residents and small-business owners must be assisted in saving the value they helped to create on University Avenue through purchase options, limited market value programs or other options to preserve their investments.

(CCLRP0056) EcoEE-76

The Central Corridor project is going to be a big impact on the community and others around District 7. The tax would go up, angering customers.

(CCLRP0407) EcoEE-108

The City of Saint Paul is also deeply concerned with the potential impact of rising property values on current businesses and residents who own or rent property along the Avenue. Although this is not exclusively, nor even primarily, related to the potential for LRT along University Avenue, these issues must be considered in both the Preliminary Engineering and Development Strategy work over the next 2+ years.

(CCLRP0230) EcoEE-128

At the same time, I hope the concerns of those who oppose the light rail will be taken into account. Small business owners who would very much benefit from the increased traffic may not if rents price them out of the area.

(CCLRP0109) EcoEE-130

must include plan to mitigate increased real estate taxes for current residents

(CCLRP0131) EcoEE-136

It's a no brainer... property values will hit the roof on the line, as soon as it is approved.

(CCLRP0934) EcoEE-147

I have some real reservations about the light rail being proposed for this area without discussing the impact that it is going to have on the local businesses, especially the small businesses in the area. Also, any other proposal to help either expansion proposal or any capitalization for the infrastructure for the small businesses here, and yet we are talking about a light rail proposal and I think that was a set back, if anything, for the small businesses in the area here without talking about the infrastructure of the business and how we can help those businesses grow rather than putting light rail in front of it, which we don't know the impact that will have on the small businesses here.

(CCLRP0423) EcoEE-148

Economic reasons, the booming development will increase the city tax base.

Response EcoEE-009. Property taxes are assessed by the appraisal district in each respective county. In an effort to control property values, which may increase after the implementation of the Central Corridor LRT as a result of market forces, the City of Saint Paul adopted the Central Corridor Development Strategy (October 2007). The strategy includes the implementation of Transit Opportunity Zone overlay districts (TOZ) that would guide new development in station areas, an Inclusive Housing strategy that is intended to mitigate the potential displacement of low-income individuals and families from the corridor as property values rise, and strategies for home ownership assistance.

Issue Summary EcoEE-010. Reduction in overall fuel use will have positive economic impact (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0408) EcoEE-47

This would offer not only me the ability to avoid driving in traffic and save on fuel, but more importantly, it would assist in building up our inner city communities and making them more accessible and therefore more prosperous. If I can more easily maneuver between the two cities without the pains of traffic and paying for parking, I am certainly more apt to purchase theater tickets downtown Mpls, make dinner reservations downtown St. Paul, or make a shopping trip to either of the downtowns. I believe the benefits of the Central Corridor project to be far reaching.

Response EcoEE-010. The Preferred Alternative optimizes travel time for the LRT while meeting other goals as established for the overall project, as outlined in Chapter 1 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EcoEE-011. Project contracts should be given to minority businesses as required by law (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0485) EcoEE-69

Enhancement measures that support community cohesion and wealth creation: 1. Minority contracting requirements: require minority contracting set asides on construction and non-construction related opportunities (i.e. including soft contractual opportunities such as marketing, legal services etc.). Require these businesses generate job opportunities for local residents. Require large contracts be broken into smaller size contracts to give small firms a better opportunity at being awarded a contract. Hire a staff person who can provide coaching assistance through the process (identical to what was done with the minority contracting program in Portland). 2. Local Hiring Strategies: require that jobs created by the project and subsequent development go to local residents. 3. Minority incubation opportunities: require that new opportunities for small business development be set aside. 4. Community Development Investment Fund: require that funds be set aside either through developer exactions, real estate tax transfers or extractions from parking or transit fairs to help impacted

EJ communities realize their development aspirations within the impacted area. 5. Cultural/Historical Center Developments: set aside funds to assist with the development of Cultural/historical centers to help designate and value areas of the corridor as cultural destinations. 6. Bond sale: incorporate tools to assist community members in pooling resources to purchase government bonds associated with development on or near Central Corridor to assist with community investment and wealth creation. 7. Home fix-up funds: provide grants to help current EJ homeowners fix up their properties and add to the improved quality of life for the impacted area. 8. Affordable housing development: set aside rental and home ownership options within market rate developments that are affordable to current EJ residents at all stages of their life cycle.

(CCLRP0903) EcoEE-71

We're excited about the high paying jobs that will be created due to construction and development alongside the corridor. We desire that these jobs be filled by workers who are representative of these communities, our communities. In order to ensure that this will happen we will work with the cities and the county.

(CCLRP0139) EcoEE-137

Minority business development.

Response EcoEE-011. The Metropolitan Council is required to incorporate federal procurement and contracting standards in the implementation of this project. Additionally, Metropolitan Council has programs in place that include small and minority business participation as part of contracting procedures. Economic effects of the project are discussed in Chapter 5 of the FEIS. Metropolitan Council's DBE goal and program for the Central Corridor LRT Project are discussed in Section 3.8 of this FEIS. Additional information on contracting opportunities is available from the Metropolitan Council website and offices.

Issue Summary EcoEE-012. Project will have positive impact of providing construction jobs to community (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0050) EcoEE-139

This would create many jobs for engineers, contractors, designers.

(CCLRP0893) EcoEE-75

Finally, construction of the Central Corridor presents a fantastic opportunity for work force development within our community. Construction of the corridor should provide training and high-paying quality construction jobs to low-income marginalized people. My faith teaches that we must have a preferential option to move forward and we have the opportunity not only to strengthen our physical community but to strengthen and support the people within it by providing opportunities for quality employment.

Response EcoEE-012. Section 5.1 of the FEIS describes anticipated economic effects both during construction and for long-term operation of the Preferred Alternative.

Issue Summary EcoEE-015. Report corrections required in Chapter 5 (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) EcoEE-103

ECONOMIC IMPACTS (Section 5) - The beginning of the Draft EIS discussion on economic impacts is dated and needs some major updating to reflect economic development potentials. This is true for:

- The listing of current developments (p5-2)
- The ratings of infill potential, redevelopment potential, and overall TOD rating for the Westgate, Raymond, Fairview, Lexington, Dale, and 6th/4th stations are dated and generally too low (see below). The City will continue to work with the Metropolitan Council to reflect current development conditions in the New Starts Application, which will be submitted to the FTA at the end of June.
- The Westgate Station overall TOD rating should be "very good" instead of "good." Redevelopment potential south of University Avenue has exceeded all expectations of 4 years ago.
- The Raymond Station infill potential should be "moderate" at least, given the Johnson Liquor site redevelopment.
- The Fairview Station overall TOD rating should be "very good" instead of "good" given the amount of redevelopment potential in the northwest quadrant of the Station Area.
- The Lexington Station overall TOD rating should be "very good" instead of "poor" given the redevelopment already happening on the southwest quadrant and the potential of substantial redevelopment on the southeast quadrant.
- The Dale Station overall TOD rating should be "good" instead of "fair to good" given the southwest corner redevelopment, Western Bank building and potential redevelopments on the other three corners.
- The Athletic Club block, if it is to host an LRT station, should have an infill rating of "high", a redevelopment potential rating of "high" and an overall TOD rating of "excellent."
- The Union Depot station infill/redevelopment potential should be "moderate/high," given the air rights development potential over the platform area and the redevelopment potential of the Diamond Products facility.

(CCLRP0443) EcoEE-159

Section/page/table is 5.1.1, page 5-2, ECONOMIC CONDITIONS, Central Corridor: A bullet point should be added to the list of development projects regarding the University's planned on-campus football stadium and surrounding research facilities, as well as the proposed public/private research park.

Response EcoEE-015. Economic effects presented in Chapter 5 of the FEIS have been updated to reflect the selected Preferred Alternative, project related spending, and potential development effects.

Issue Summary EcoEE-018. Projections for property tax increases (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0086) EcoEE-143

What are the projections for property tax increases over the next 20 years based upon a \$125,000 taxable value home?

Response EcoEE-018. The FEIS does not speculate on the value of land around stations. However, positive benefits to residential and commercial properties are anticipated. With regard to property tax, the Metropolitan Council does not set these rates. Property taxes are assessed by the appraisal district in each respective county. The property tax is based on the appraised value of the property on the date the property is inspected and appraised. Chapter 5 of this FEIS discusses anticipated economic effects of the Preferred Alternative.

Issue Summary EcoEE-019. Method used to determine the cost-effectiveness (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0271) EcoEE-145

Dick Wolsfeld, Yale University certified HIGHWAY engineer for the Central Corridor road construction project, explained at the last Central Corridor Coordinating Committee meeting the method used to determine the cost-effectiveness of federally-funded transit projects. According to Mr. Wolsfeld, the Federal Transit administration's cost-effectiveness index (CEI) is the costs for construction and on-going operation and maintenance compared to the hours of time saved by transit riders.

Response EcoEE-019. Comment noted. The CEI is critical for New Starts Projects, however, it is not typically associated with the NEPA process.

Section: 5.3 - Development Effects

Issue Summary PlaTE-017. Concerns in regard to impact on businesses (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0060) PlaTE-2

I think that the light rail track is going to mess up all the (unreadable) store in University. This is really one of my thoughts that I thought about the most. Why? Because this is where most of the low quality stores are at. So what I think is that the light rail track is good but at the same time also bad for all the low quality stores.

Response PlaTE-017. Economic Impacts to businesses are discussed in Chapter 5 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProPM-002. Reservations regarding economically beneficial project impacts (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0271) ProPM-204

With the exception of a relatively small number of big businesses led by Securian Insurance, Park Midway Bank, and Piper, Jaffrey, Inc. - the self-proclaimed "Central Corridor Partnership" - no one will benefit from the road construction project. The big businesses that are backing the road construction project undoubtedly have attorneys who will assure that

their clients are "mitigated" a.k.a. "paid off" for any disruption the road construction project may cause. The Central Corridor neighborhoods, transit riders, small independent business owners not represented by the Chambers of Commerce, and the taxpayers who pick up the \$billion tab, are all big losers if the concrete monstrosity gets built.

Response ProPM-002. Benefits and impacts of the project are documented in many sections of the AA/DEIS, the SDEIS, and the FEIS. The increased access to the neighborhoods brought by transit improvements and the siting of LRT stations may act as catalysts for new investment in the University Avenue corridor. Proposed stations would also be considered community amenities that would benefit adjacent neighborhoods and serve as focal points of daily activity. Concentrations of pedestrians at stations would also create new opportunities for businesses. Potential infill development would increase the amount of potential patrons for businesses located near stations.

Section: 5.0 - Report Corrections Needed

Issue Summary ProPM-020. Report corrections needed (9)

Comments:

(CCLRP0457) ProHLP-048

Chapter 5 - Economic Impact Analysis: Page 5-1 (Section 5.1-1): Existing Economic Activities and Developments: Page 5-1: An update Table 5.1.1 is needed: Hormel Foods are not headquartered in the Twin Cities but in Austin Minnesota; it's likely that Northwest Airlines position in the Fortune 500 ranking of corporate revenues has slipped significantly and others must have changed.

(CCLRP0443) ProHLP-077

Figure 5.2.6 The University requests that the LRT location be modified to reflect continuation of the University Transitway. The figure does not show the transit way being retained.

(CCLRP0443) ProHLP-087

Figure 5.2.5 The University requests that the Stadium Village Station and LRT alignment reflect 2004-05 alignment and station location.

(CCLRP0443) ProHLP-090

Figure 5.2.4 Figure should reflect 2004-05 configuration of East Bank Station, as shown in the Technical Memorandum: Tunnel Evaluation at University Campus, April 11, 2005.

(CCLRP0457) ProHLP-102

Page 5-2: Central Corridor The list of Central Corridor development projects on page 5-2 needs to be updated to reflect newer projects.

(CCLRP0443) ProHLP-103

Figure should reflect 2004-05 configuration of West Bank Station, as shown in the Technical Memorandum: Tunnel Evaluation at University Campus, April 11, 2005.

(CCLRP0443) ProPM-043

Section/page/table is 5.2.3 Page 5-31 University of Minnesota a: Language should be modified to reflect the revised station locations and designs noted elsewhere in these comments.

(CCLRP0443) ProPM-061

Section/page/table is 5.2.4, page 5-37 - MITIGATION MEASURES FOR STATION AREAS Paragraph 3 -- Language should be modified to reflect the revised station locations and designs noted elsewhere in these comments.

(CCLRP0436) ProPM-190

The dates throughout the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) are not consistent. The title page indicates April 3, 2006; the table of contents has two dates, March and April 2006; executive summary footer shows July 8, 2004; graphics are dated April 2002; section 6.0 transportation impact analysis is dated August 1, 2003. The disparities in dates should be corrected and/or explained.

Response ProPM-020. All chapters and sections of the AA/DEIS have been updated since publication of the AA/DEIS and selection of the AA/DEIS LPA. The Metropolitan Council has conducted and published an SDEIS to assess the impacts of necessary changes to key elements of the AA/DEIS LPA before selecting the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is fully described in Chapter 2 of the FEIS, and all chapters and sections assess the potential beneficial and adverse impacts of the Preferred Alternative and present mitigation strategies. The FEIS utilizes the latest information and analysis methods available for each section. It uses the most current data, studies, community plans, model outputs, and assumptions, and is based on the current design and engineering studies for the Central Corridor LRT.

Section: 6.1 - Transit Effects

Issue Summary NR-007. Improve bus service on key routes and streets (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0131) NR-48

The city is pushing for Central LRT in the mean time get METRO Transit to improve services on these key routes and streets. Robert St the buses should run more often hourly is too long at night in the West Side, #68 the busiest bus line across the river. #63 Grand Ave /E 3rd St the buses should run every 30mins not hourly on Sunday. #94 express should run every 30mins at night not hourly. Sat about 20mins midday with connection to buslines at Dale St, near Midway Shopping Center to rte 16/50. They can eliminate duplication and consolidate routes to pay for these improvements such as reducing rte 134 commuter route by

deleting some early and late trips. LRT and 4-5 lines serve this area. Consolidate rte 68/71 North End since they are 4 blocks apart with overlapping. Reduce COMO #3 to 15mins rather than running every 10mins use larger buses if overcrowding. Also rte 16 run 10mins rather than 8mins when rte 50 also runs on UNIV AVE. They can add rte 67 Minnehaha on UNIV Ave instead of Thomas to supplementing services on rte 16.

Response NR-007. Comment noted. Section 6.1 of the FEIS, discusses changes to the existing bus network serving the corridor with the addition of LRT. Although changes to the existing bus service would be made along University Avenue to accommodate the LRT, the Metropolitan Council and Metro Transit plan to implement feeder bus service to provide connections to the LRT and area transit service to the public helping to ensure mobility and access to destinations.

Issue Summary NR-012. Concerns that people's attitudes towards using mass transit are not serious (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0906) NR-20

And that's really all that I have to say except I am puzzled by the people who say I will not ride the bus, but I will ride the light rail. Just what sort of promise is that? What is their reason for it? What sort of a toy is it to them?

Response NR-012. There are groups of transit users that do not feel comfortable riding the bus because those that are unfamiliar with the system may not know where all of the bus stops are, where the bus routes go, and/or the frequency of service. With rail transit, the guideways and stations are fixed, and oftentimes the route maps and service frequencies are posted at the stations, making such determinations easier.

Issue Summary PlaPla-001. Recommended list of factors/issues to include in Preliminary Engineering (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) PlaPla-1

- The City endorses inclusion of the following factors/issues in Preliminary Engineering:
- Station location options, particularly at Western, Victoria, Athletic Club block, Union Depot, Snelling, Capitol East;
- Station design, including 300 foot platforms, corridor-wide approach and individual station designs;
- Sidewalk area design, including bus stops, sidewalk width, landscaping, street furniture, accommodations for bicycles, and decorative lighting;
- Pedestrian and bicycle access from the neighborhoods to the station areas
- Final typical cross-section design;
- Potential of pedestrian barriers between the LRT tracks;
- Pedestrian, bicycle, and motorist safety with a focus on design, education and ongoing maintenance;
- Parking, including station area-specific analyses of potential loss of on street parking, park & ride facilities, and informal park & ride activities;
- Improvements to the other transit service in the corridor;
- Block group-by-block group strategies for construction phasing and mitigation;
- Project scope, including reconstruction of sidewalks along University Avenue;
- Aesthetics of the overhead electrification system;
- Assignment of the

degree to which LRT is promoting increases in property values; and •Traffic operations at major intersections and stations.

Response PlaPla-001. The issues and factors mentioned in this comment have been included during Preliminary Engineering. The results of the analysis of these issues and factors are detailed throughout the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaPla-004. Relationship between transit customers and parking lot customers (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0271) PlaPla-5

Transit service and the parking business operate at cross-purposes. For the most part, transit riders are not parking lot customers and parking lot customers are not transit riders.

Response PlaPla-004. Comment noted.

Issue Summary PlaTE-010. Ridership forecasts (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0184) PlaTE-135

Surveys have shown that 40% of Hiawatha's riders would be driving alone if it weren't light rail which translates into a 66% increase in ridership. Ridership on Portland, Oregon's Interstate Corridor light rail line is over 90% higher than ridership on what was previously one of the regions most popular bus routes. It has been estimated that only 10% of the riders on LA's Wilshire Blvd. BRT system are actually new riders. Experience in Portland, Oregon, Provides a good comparison. Between 1999 and 2004, no new light rail lines were opened and the Frequent Service Network, similar to the Primary Transit Network proposed for Minneapolis, was in place. During that time period, bus ridership grew by 1.5% per year. LRT grew at 9% per year. The overall system grew at 3.64% per year. Given a bus only system, ridership would double in 46 years. With an LRT only system, ridership would double in 10 years, and with a multimodal system, ridership would double 21 years.

Response PlaTE-010. Comment noted. The Metropolitan Council uses approved FTA methodology in developing their ridership forecasts through 2030.

Issue Summary PlaTE-029. Bus route 50 travel time (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0031) PlaTE-19

I take the 50 bus downtown every day and if I were to use LR it will take 10 minutes longer!

Response PlaTE-029. The end to end travel times for route 50 ranges from 41 minutes to 49 minutes. The end to end travel times for Central Corridor LRT Project is estimated to take 40 minutes.

Issue Summary PlaTF-012. Ridership estimates (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) PlaTF-14

Table 6.3-1, which suggests that only 2-car trains would be needed, may understate the true needs for service. First, the projected ridership has increased substantially since 2002 (from 38,100 to 43,300). Second, the experience with the Hiawatha Corridor may suggest that ridership will actually exceed ridership projections in the first few years of operation. Third, the City believes that the estimate of ridership on the future Route 16 Table 6.4-1) underestimates that ridership. And fourth, the estimations of redevelopment done in 2002 may substantially understate the ultimate redevelopment potential of the Central Corridor, particularly west of Snelling. All these factors should lead to reconsideration of the operating assumptions detailed in this discussion.

Response PlaTF-012. The Preferred Alternative includes the construction of 3-car platforms to accommodate the projected ridership. Estimates of ridership, development potential and changes in land-use are all taken into account in the Metropolitan Council 2030 Regional Travel Demand Model, which was approved by the Federal Transit Administration. In addition, since completion of the AA/DEIS, the City of St. Paul undertook a comprehensive land use planning process for the Central Corridor which resulted in a number of planning documents, including adopting the Central Corridor Development Strategy (2007). This land use planning process is discussed in more detail in Chapters 3 and 5 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-046. Concerned that system will handle future population growth (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0875) PlaTP-210

One of the things I have learned tonight sitting here is the whole notion that, you know, the rapid bus system, the capacity isn't there and we look at the numbers that were put up and everything that I've read, by all estimations of the Met Council and every other organization that does statistics out there, but in the year 2030 we are supposed to have a million more people within our community and metropolitan area. If that's true then the bus, the rapid bus system, is obsolete before it's even built.

(CCLRP0787) ProALT-002

Second, transit oriented development will be better supported by light rail than by Bus Rapid Transit.

Response PlaTP-046. The LRT system is designed to provide sufficient capacity to handle the 2030 growth projected within the study area

Issue Summary PlaTP-083. Twin Cities' transit improvements must connect seamlessly with the Twin Cities' transit system. (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0461) PlaTP-070

Union Depot plays a key role in the future of Downtown and Saint Paul. Multi, mobile transit is important and it's critical that that the Central Corridor extend all the way from downtown Minneapolis to the Union Depot. To maximum transit usage, Twin Cities transit improvements must connect seamlessly with the Twin Cities' transit system. The multi mobile transit center is critical for linking the numerous transit lines planned to intersect in Downtown St. Paul at Union Depot.

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-258

Finally, the routing and station locations should always keep in mind the other transit corridors that may intersect or connect with the Central Corridor: Hiawatha; Riverview; Rush Line; Red Rock; Robert Street; and possible eastern Corridor. Most of the Metro East corridors should intersect at the Union Depot.

Response PlaTP-083. Comment noted. Transit connections to existing and potential future transit improvements were an important consideration and were taken into account in the development of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative will be able to accommodate smooth connections between the existing transportation systems and future transit systems.

Issue Summary PlaTP-089. [Issues related to station design](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-081

STATION DESIGN (Section 2) - There are at least five critical issues related to Station Design to be reconciled within Preliminary Engineering: • What are the safety accommodations for transit patrons? • What is the capacity (length) of stations? • Should there be a uniform design for stations or should each station be distinct? • How will the stations be differentiated to reflect the local character, history and aspirations of the neighborhood? • What is the appropriate level of maintenance?

Response PlaTP-089. Safety is discussed in Section 3.7 of the FEIS. As documented in the FEIS, LRT stations have been designed and will be constructed to accommodate three-car trains, or approximately 270 feet in length. The configuration, location, and distance of the stations are noted in the appendices of the FEIS, which provides preliminary engineering plans for the Preferred Alternative. Station design during the course of preliminary engineering was set to provide a uniform system of station elements, as noted in this comment and based on the experiences learned from Hiawatha LRT of the difficulty of maintaining stations with custom components. The basic station design will be differentiated to reflect the local neighborhood character and history by the public art program for the project that the Metropolitan Council is proposing, as summarized in Chapter 2 of the FEIS. The system will be maintained in a manner similar to that used for the maintenance of the Hiawatha LRT system.

Issue Summary PlaTP-106. [Consider the potential impact of LRT at Saint Paul Union Depot](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0526) PlaTP-117

CPR is concerned that this limited scope does not adequately consider the potential impact of LRT at Saint Paul Union Depot. The Draft EIS makes passing reference to ongoing studies of SPUD and the heavy rail operations that converge there. The plans for the rail infrastructure at SPUD are very preliminary and the design has the potential to impact a vast number of daily train moves through Hoffman Avenue. If the existence of LRT has the potential to place constraints on options for design and operations of the heavy rail infrastructure behind SPUD then we believe those constraints should be identified and discussed in this document.

Response PlaTP-106. The Central Corridor Project Office worked closely with Ramsey County Regional Railroad during preliminary engineering to accommodate a potential future connection of LRT to Union Depot concourse and associated multi-modal connections planned by the County, as noted in this comment. The Preferred Alternative does provide for the future ability to serve the Union Depot concourse while not interfering with heavy rail operations.

Issue Summary PlaTP-107. 3. Granary Park Drive must be constructed before the Central Corridor construction begins (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0539) PlaTP-118

3. Granary Park Drive must be constructed before the Central Corridor construction begins. This is especially important with the addition of the new U of M stadium.

Response PlaTP-107. The construction of Granary Park Drive is not part of the proposed Central Corridor LRT project. It is a part of the City of Minneapolis' long-range transportation plan; however, it is not currently programmed for construction.

Issue Summary PlaTP-112. Concerns about lack of benefits to persons living in/near the corridor (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0867) PlaTP-131

Really what are we getting out of it? We live in that area. I hear everybody talking about what's happening Downtown St. Paul and what's happening in Minneapolis and how I get from Minneapolis to St. Paul, but what about us that live in the area?

Response PlaTP-112. Benefits and impacts of the project are documented in many sections of the FEIS. The purpose and need of the project is described in Chapter 1 of the FEIS. Specific transit user benefits have been documented in Section 3.8 and Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-114. Concerned about negative impact to residents and transit

riders (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0271) EngRW-7

Building an 8-lane concrete thoroughfare on University Avenue, similar to the 8-lane MNDOT mess on Lake Street and HWY 55 in Minneapolis, is not something that will improve the lives of Central Corridor residents and transit riders. Take a look at the Lake Street and Highway 55/Hiawatha mess if you don't think that's what is being proposed for University Avenue. It's the same MNDOT, Met. Council, U of M Parking, City and County road construction folks responsible for the 8-lane mess on Lake Street that want to build a much bigger mess on University and Washington Avenues.

Response PlaTP-114. Chapter 2 of the FEIS stated that the Preferred Alternative includes LRT running at-grade along University Avenue, with two thru lanes in each direction. There are no plans to provide additional thru lanes along University. The purpose and need for this project has been established with broad community involvement. Transit improvements are needed in this corridor. The FEIS documents impacts associated with the proposed project. Projects undertaken outside the purview of this project are documented as cumulative effects and are presented in Chapter 9 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-124. Concerned that future community development and growth is not evaluated properly (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0524) PlaTP-174

2. These demographic statements are used by the DEIS to support the LRT option, but they do not appear to be consistently used in the location of stations, the reductions of walk time to stations, and an integrated bus service. Reducing bus service (as suggested in 3-22) without reasonable access to stations seems inconsistent with "neighborhood cohesion" and runs the risk of isolating and marginalizing populations used to justify the project. Why specifically is most of the population in the corridor deemed not capable of supporting a "good base" of riders? (5.2.1) Why does the report state "The Central Corridor has all the significant demographic characteristics to suggest extremely strong transit rider ship in the future." and yet the location of the stations is predicated on existing, not future development potential. (As noted by the City of St. Paul in their response to the DEIS, development around proposed stations is evaluated improperly (p 23).)

Response PlaTP-124. Effects on community cohesion are discussed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. All ridership forecasts and other elements associated with forecasts of usage of the Central Corridor LRT were based on Metropolitan Council Regional Model output, which does take into account future development, as noted in local comprehensive plans.

Issue Summary PlaTP-134. Miscellaneous in regard to mass transit (6)

Comments:

(CCLRP0475) NR-49

p. 6-27 LRT 43 minutes for 11 miles is 15 mph. The 94BCD express bus is faster. The existing University Ave. buses could be faster than they are if they had honor system of payment. It's a double standard, if honor system is unreliable then they shouldn't use it on LRT. If it's okay for LRT, why not try it on some buses to see how much faster they run. Also if they had adequate recovery time at each end of the run for University Ave. buses. DEIS claims University Ave. buses are becoming: unreliable due to high ridership. They had higher ridership in 1988 before various service cuts and fare increase. I have heard that recovery times have been reduced so much that there was a driver hot line to report where the problems were greatest, so they could add some recovery time back.

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-180

The City of Saint Paul recommends that the routing and station locations "do no harm" in terms of connecting with other transit corridors.

(CCLRP0152) PlaTP-190

Concerns are:

3. Bus-stop connection

(CCLRP0526) PlaTP-248

The second comment is offered to improve clarity. In Section 6.6.1 under the AMTRAK paragraph, the document correctly refers to the Empire Builder as "one train daily in each direction". However earlier in this section in discussing CP's Merriam Park subdivision the document refers to a "once a day Empire Builder. We believe the phrasing in the AMTRAK section is preferred and should consistent throughout this discussion.

(CCLRP0230) PlaTP-249

Design considerations should minimize conflict between other services and light rail. Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the discussion.

(CCLRP0361) PlaTP-250

Regarding the Central Corridor project, IF the project would to go forward and LRT were used to connect St. Paul with Minneapolis as presented yesterday at a program at the Como Campus hosted by the Midway Chamber of Commerce, my question or comment would be how would the Minnesota State Fair located north of University Ave on Snelling Ave be connected with the LRT? Almost 1 in 3 of our State Fair guest used public/charter mass transit (buses) to attend the fair in 2005. If LRT or BRT were located on University Ave it is very important that it be easily transferred or some how connected with northbound Snelling Ave to gain access to the Minnesota State Fair.

Response PlaTP-134. The Preferred Alternative will allow for easy connections between buses and LRT. Additional north-south buses and other route changes will be made to increase mobility throughout the corridor area. See section 6.1 of the FEIS for additional details.

Issue Summary PlaTP-135. Ridership experience of other regions (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0302) PlaTP-010

Without the memorandum detailing ridership forecasts, it is difficult to parse out if the actual ridership experience of other regions is reflected in the ridership projections used in the DEIS. If the ridership amounts resulted from the Metropolitan Council's regional travel demand model, it would be helpful to have some explanation of how it was used in predicting Hiawatha's ridership and whether or not the Council subsequently re-calibrated it in light of Hiawatha's success and the experience of other regions with BRT.

Response PlaTP-135. Estimates of ridership for the various modes were developed from the Metropolitan Council 2030 Regional Travel Demand Model, using a methodology that was approved by the Federal Transit Administration. These estimates were updated during preliminary engineering and are discussed in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProHLP-023. Concerned about lack of good connection to Amtrak station (system) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0929) ProHLP-024

I am wondering why there is not exit scheduled for Cleveland Avenue where the Amtrak station is. If this is a rail line, why are we not trying to connect railroads. We have a working railroad running through St. Paul. It is Amtrak. It takes people all over the Country and we have scheduled this Central Corridor statement to make many stops, but not at the Amtrak line. It is absolutely ridiculous to offer this line without connecting it to Amtrak. I would like to know why that was not scheduled. Thank you.

Response ProHLP-023. Ramsey County has plans for moving the Amtrak station to the Union Depot as part of its plans for the Union Depot Multimodal Transit Center, which will include a connection to the Central Corridor LRT. Visit The Ramsey County Regional Rail web page (www.regionalrail.org) for more information.

Issue Summary ProProjBdj-013. The relative fare prices (of LRT and BRT) should be stated up front and clearly (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0040) ProProjBdj-028

B. In the literature that I have seen so far, there is no mention of the cost of LRT vs. BRT fares. I am assuming (1) there are projections or relative costs and (2) that LRT will be higher. I feel that the relative fare prices should be stated upfront and clearly.

Response ProProjBdj-013. The fares for LRT and BRT (as analyzed in the AA/DEIS) would have been the same. The fares to ride Metro Transit buses and the Hiawatha LRT are the same and free transfers are available. The fare to ride Central Corridor LRT and Metro Transit buses will be consistent with existing fare policy.

Section: 6.1 - Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections

Issue Summary PlaPla-009. [Suggestions about fares and ridership projections](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0475) PlaPla-11

p. 2-6 Baseline peak frequency for Rt. 16 and Rt. 94BCD buses is lower than it was before money for Hiawatha LRT was approved by the state legislature. If these frequencies were increased to what they were before bus service was restructured to feed future LRT and service hours reallocated, the baseline ridership projections would be higher. Another odd thing is that in the Twin Cities peak LRT fare is \$2.00 while peak express bus fare is \$2.50 even though LRT costs more for O&M. The differential between regular and express bus fare had been \$0.15 at one time then \$0.25. If both LRT and express peak bus fare were modeled at \$2.25, ridership projections would be different and more favorable for baseline. Actually LRT fare should be considerably higher than regular and express bus fare.

Response PlaPla-009. The ridership forecasts were modeling using methodology and fare structures approved by the FTA. One can ride the Hiawatha LRT from one end to the other, however the same distance will cost more on some express buses.

Issue Summary PlaPla-010. [All major transportation trip generators should be considered](#) (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) PlaPla-12

Major Trip Generators: In addition to the major trip generators already referenced, the DEIS should note the University of Minnesota Physicians clinics, high density residential developments in the area, the planned on-campus football stadium, and the proposed public-private research park.

(CCLRP0806) PlaPla-9

Question is -- which I shouldn't pose here -- who has the technical background and experience?

Response PlaPla-010. All ridership forecasts and other elements associated with forecasts of usage of the Central Corridor LRT or BRT options were based on Metropolitan Council Regional Model output, which does take into account future development, as noted in local comprehensive plans. Updated ridership forecasts for the Central Corridor LRT project, based on the Preferred Alternative, are presented in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTF-002. [Appendix 9.12 should be included in EIS](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0302) PlaTF-1

The DEIS refers to ridership forecasts set out in a memorandum dated March 21, 2002, and included as Appendix 9.12. MCEA notes that the memorandum is not attached to the DEIS.

As a result, it is not certain from the DEIS w the ridership levels for BRT and LRT were established. This is important because the experience in other regions shows that the additional ridership potential of various forms of BRT is significantly lower than LRT.

Response PlaTF-002. DEIS Appendices are available by contact the Metropolitan Council or your local library.

Issue Summary PlaTF-004. Comment on modeling of LRT ridership data from the EIS
(1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0457) PlaTF-7

- Ridership Assumptions: Please re-evaluate the TAZ data that is being fed into the regional model. New housing in Downtown Minneapolis and near the U of M has been constructed in the last 5 years that has far outpaced original projections due to market demand. Plugging these new values into the regional model will improve ridership and will improve the cost-effectiveness index.

Response PlaTF-004. FTA requires that ridership forecasts should be based on regionally approved demographic and land use forecasts. The current model took two years to secure FTA approval. Any modifications to the TAZ data are made by the metropolitan Council based on plans for future land uses as indicated in the local Comprehensive plans.

Issue Summary PlaTF-005. Comment on U of M ridership forecasts. (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0744) PlaTF-6

About one-fourth of the projected ridership on the Central Corridor will be to or from the University of Minnesota. The Central Corridor will pass through a campus that attracts 80,000 people on a typical day.

Response PlaTF-005. Comment noted. Updated ridership forecasts for the Central Corridor LRT project, based on the Preferred Alternative, are presented in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTF-009. Comment on calculation of transit time saved amount (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0913) PlaTE-115

We continually see this manipulation in numbers. The number that is terribly wrong that they're doing is they have to meet a number called \$25 per hour of transit time saved, but they never measure the transit time lost. I have a friend of mine who loses three hours per week because of the Hiawatha Rail Line. All those people that have ever lost time doing this I never counted.

Response PlaTF-009. The total travel time savings estimated by the travel model programs represent the net savings. They do include the negative benefits (time lost by certain

passengers).

Issue Summary PlaTP-051. Report has lack of discussion about coordination with other transportation systems (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0232) PlaTP-216

There seems to be no mention of the Intercity Bus Terminals (Greyhound, etc) or coordination of the transportation systems with them. - Likewise no mention of the St. Paul Airport or coordination of the transportation systems with these transport companies.

Response PlaTP-051. The Preferred Alternative will allow for easy connections between other modes of transportation. Additional details are discussed in Chapter 6 of the FEIS..

Issue Summary PlaTP-062. Disagrees with estimates of travel times (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0475) PlaTP-235

I think the travel times for Rt. 94BD are not quite correct. LRT speed of 35 minutes is not from end to end but from the core of one downtown to the other (LRT is 43 minutes end to end) and yet I think the times for Rt. 94BD may be quoted from end to end. It's not an apples to apples comparison. A more just comparison would be Rt. 94BC from 4th and Minnesota in downtown Saint Paul to 4th and Nicollet in downtown Minneapolis which would be 24 minutes and 33 minutes. LRT alternative proposes to cut express bus service except during the peak period so SLOWER travel times downtown to downtown would be provided in this method forcing riders onto LRT. Mobility would be lessened, particularly for households without cars.

Response PlaTP-062. The end-to-end travel time of Central Corridor LRT is expected to take 40 minutes. All information regarding forecast travel times for LRT and for bus routes are derived from the Regional Model and using methodology approved by the Federal Transit Administration.

Issue Summary ProALT-018. Ridership forecasts (4)

Comments:

(CCLRP0776) PlaTE-160

We're looking at 31 vehicles on a light rail line, 47 bus vehicles eliminated. This is according to the Environmental Impact Statement. So essentially you're actually losing some seating capacity. I figured it was somewhere on the order of 60 seats. So for \$840 million you're carrying less seated passengers than you would with the baseline alternative.

(CCLRP0302) ProALT-081

The DEIS acknowledges differences between bus rapid transit (BRT) and light rail transit (LRT) but then either discounts or dismisses them. As a result, the DEIS tends to

underestimate the benefits of LRT and overestimate the benefits of BRT. This weakness is most evident in the consideration of ridership potential and its concomitant effect on such issues as transit-oriented development.

(CCLRP0475) ProALT-380

The baseline and BRT alternatives would have had higher ridership projections if some assumptions used to project ridership were changed to be fairer, rather than skewed towards the LRT alternative. It would be better if we used our state and local share of the proposed LRT alternative towards improved bus service. I am requesting that the Federal Transit Administration give this project a not recommended rating.

(CCLRP0475) ProALT-460

p. S-6 to S-8 Assumptions about BRT stations cause BRT to not connect to commuter rail stations in downtown Minneapolis or downtown Saint Paul, even though LRT does. Also BRT does not stop at one of the most popular destinations in Central Corridor, Coffman Union at University of Minnesota. The ridership projections need to be recalculated with BRT being given a stop at Minneapolis multimodal station and at Saint Paul Union Depot and University of Minnesota Coffman Union.

Response ProALT-018. All ridership forecasts and other elements associated with forecasts of usage of the Central Corridor LRT or BRT options were based on Metropolitan Council Regional Model output, which does take into account future development, as noted in local comprehensive plans.

Issue Summary ProALT-019. LRT travel time calculations (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0084) ProALT-029

Those objectives will not be met if a light-rail train has to navigate at slower speeds down University and be subjected to numerous cross walks and traffic lights. You will have a large number of agitated riders if the system is slower than a bus ride.

(CCLRP0101) ProALT-229

3. LRT speeds 40-45 mph when possible (express). 6. Have express LRT service. Rush hour and days. No stops between Stadium Village and Snelling; Snelling and Rice. 7. Have LRT service 24/7 (min 20 minutes)

(CCLRP0239) ProALT-280

If the system is being designed to deliver a commute time between Minneapolis and Saint Paul of over 35 minutes, it is flawed at its design. I would love to use the system if it had time comparable to driving my automobile. Tripling the time would not have the desired effect of generating more mass transit users. It would only take people off the current bus system. If that is the case, take the billions of dollars used to build the system and add more busses.

Response ProALT-019. The Central Corridor LRT system was designed to serve the

downtown area and many users in between. Details of the purpose and need of the project is discussed in Chapter 1 of the FEIS. Travel time has been calculated using accepted methodology as approved by the FTA. The results of this analysis were reported in the AA/DEIS and the SDEIS and have been updated to reflect the changing project definition in the FEIS. See FEIS Section 6.2.

Issue Summary ProPM-003. Concern regarding calculation of travel time in the AA/DEIS, SDEIS and FEIS (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0642) ProPM-281

Within Objective 3C, on page 7-21, travel time savings are graded best for the LRT and worst for the Baseline. In earlier drafts of this EIS, the projected travel time for LRT was 43 minutes while the existing 50 express bus is only 39 minutes. One must ask how (or why) the latest draft EIS projects a travel time of 35 minutes for LRT? Stops do not seem to have been eliminated. So, does this change reflect altered physical assumptions? Or does it merely reflect the political will to fashion a more appealing response to earlier critiques?

Response ProPM-003. Travel time has been calculated using accepted methodology as approved by the FTA. The results of this analysis were reported in the AA/DEIS and the SDEIS and have been updated to reflect the changing project definition in the FEIS.

Section: 6.1 - Bus System Impact

Issue Summary NR-014. Concerns about negative impacts to bus routes (34)

Comments:

(CCLRP0652) NR-9

I live in Minneapolis in a household that does not have a car. I depend on public transit year-round to get around. I use the 16 and 50 bus routes frequently to get to the University of Minnesota and various locations in St. Paul.

(CCLRP0786) NR-10

Along with that we want to make sure that bus service we understand is going to be a way I hear a lot of people saying I will get out of my car to get on light rail for this and if parking isn't going to be the solution and we expect people to be able to access light rail, I want to make sure that buses are still going to be funded and that those bus routes are still available because that's -- we've heard people say tonight there are many people without cars and we don't want them driving over to use the light rail.

(CCLRP0045) NR-11

My concern is that much money and attention will be diverted away from the necessary neighborhood oriented bus routes and toward the light rail. Cutting routes is not a good decision for the health of the public transportation system. Light rail will be most successful when a solid, wide and convenient network of buses can channel people to the rail lines.

(CCLRP0190) NR-16

1) The central corridor light rail NOT be a replacement for the 16A bus line. This is a vital means of connecting many transit riders with convenient access to businesses and residences along and near University Ave.

(CCLRP0154) NR-18

1. Removal of the Midway detour from Route 21 has been anticipated since the completion of the Selby bridge over the Short Line and is a welcome improvement. 2. Establishment of a Fairview Avenue route (designated #67) is a necessary compliment to the Fairview station. 3. The Hamline-Victoria loop (Route 60) should be extended north to Pierce Butler Route and south into Highland Park as far as possible. 4. The Lexington Avenue Route #83 is the most urgently needed enhancement to North/South service in the area. However, there is a widely held view that Lexington's designation as a parkway prohibits bus operations. The D-EIS would do well to dispel this misconception.

(CCLRP0045) NR-21

I'm supportive of LRT, but don't want to have major cuts to routes be the sacrifice. Changes to the lines that share the Central Corridor are understandable. Make certain that other routes can get people to the LRT and still network through neighborhoods.

(CCLRP0183) NR-22

The travel time for LRT between downtown Mpls and downtown St. Paul is projected to be the same as the time for the 50 bus - and perhaps less under LRT when weather conditions are bad. The success of the Hiawatha Line suggests that light rail would work on University Avenue as well. If we want to get people out of cars, they may be more willing to use a train than a bus. Unfortunately, the bus is seen as an undesirable option for traveling by some. The current plans, as I understand them, would still continue the 94 express bus and the 16 bus. These are still better options than the train for some people - especially since the 94 has a shorter travel time between downtowns and the 16 is needed for shorter trips and for street corners where the LRT wouldn't stop. All three options are needed.

(CCLRP0406) NR-23

OTHER TRANSIT SERVICE IN THE CORRIDOR (Section 6.2) "The Study Area has one of the highest percentages of population that have zero-car households, persons living below poverty level, persons with mobility limitations and minorities in the Twin Cities" (pl-3). It is clear that Central Corridor residents could greatly benefit from a major transit investment such as LRT. However, it also means that residents are somewhat more vulnerable to cutbacks in current transit service. Therefore, the future of current transit service in the Central Corridor is essential to the success of LRT and of the neighborhoods. Not too many years ago, LRT planners thought that all transit in the Central Corridor must be funneled into the LRT, and that LRT would carry the vast majority of transit patrons in the corridor. That meant, among other things, that retention of the Routes 16 & 94B/D were not necessary. However, in the past decade, Metro Transit and transit planners nationally have come to realize that there are three distinct east/west transit markets in major transit corridors such as the Central Corridor: • Local trips that want stops every block or two (Route 16); • Express

trips from downtown to downtown or to the University •of Minnesota (194 Express); and • Limited-stop service that has stops every 1/2 to 1 mile (LRT). A testament to this theory is that the introduction of the Route 50 has not diminished ridership on the Route 16 or Route 94 B/D. In addition, surveys done by Metro Transit show that the average trip length along University Avenue (including the Route 16) are in the 3 to 4 mile range. An average trip length of 3 to 4 miles is logical given the high number of destination areas (i.e. residential, retail, services, and education) throughout the Corridor. Given that there are different market segments that will use the local (Route 16), limited stop (LRT) and express (94 Express), what is the appropriate amount of service that is called for in the Corridor? • Route 16: This service will be particularly important to those who cannot easily walk long distances - the very young, the very old, those who are transporting goods (i.e. groceries and some durable goods) and/or children, and those who are transit-dependent with physical limitations. Although not uniformly true, most of these patrons need service more during the day, and on weekends; rather than during the peak hours. The Draft EIS calls for cutting service for all hours of operation by 2/3rds. This is a serious underestimation of demand. Table 6.2-5 should be amended to show continuation of non-peak and weekend service at current levels. If it is shown that after LRT begins operation such frequency is not in such demand, a schedule cutback could be considered. • Route 94 B/C/D: The Draft EIS (Table 6.2-4) shows elimination of the Routes 94 Band C and elimination of all but peak-hour service for Route 94D (20 minute frequency), to be replaced by a 94 Express route. It is not clear from the analysis as to the demand for such service after LRT is built. North/south bus service has continued to see cutbacks, with more cuts likely in the future unless a dedicated funding source for bus system operations is established. Current bus service on Rice Street is 30 minutes during the peak hours (Route 62), on Dale Street is 30 minutes (Route 65), on Lexington Avenue is non-existent, on Snelling Avenue is 15 minutes (Route 84), on Cleveland Avenue south is 30 minutes (Route 87), and on Raymond Avenue north is 30 minutes (Route 87). In order to take best advantage of LRT such north/south "feeder service" should be at the same frequency as the LRT (7.5 minute frequency) or half the frequency (15 minute) during the peak hours. This suggests a major improvement to the north/south bus service on the 6 streets listed above. The Draft EIS shows NO IMPROVEMENTS to north/south bus service. Special needs of the transit-dependent between University Avenue and I-94 are also not acknowledged in the Draft EIS. With the elimination of the Route 76 service in 2005, there is currently no service to the senior and low-income high rises in this area. The Route 76 service provided mid-day access to those populations and could easily be reconstituted to bring transit dependent patrons to selected University Avenue LRT stops. The City of Saint Paul recommends: • Retain current Route 16 service in the non-peak and on weekends (10 minute frequency). • Enhance bus service, at no less than 15-minute frequency during the peak hours, of Routes 62, 65, 84, and 87. • Re-establish service on Lexington Avenue/Parkway at no less than 15-minute frequency during the peak hours. • Reconstitute/reconstruct east/west bus service in the area bounded by Lexington, University, St. Anthony and downtown to serve transit-dependent populations.

(CCLRP0781) NR-24

In closing, TLC asks Ramsey and Hennepin County and the Metropolitan Council to consider the following items: substantially expand north-south bus service connections to the University Corridor;

(CCLRP0475) NR-27

One alternative which was not modeled in the DEIS was giving the bus route 50 the honor system of fare payment, which would give it faster travel without even having dedicated lanes, and creating other bus routes in the corridor which have fewer stops along University Ave., or travel on streets other than University Ave. Some of these routes actually existed for many years, but have been cut over the past several years, including an express route from downtown Saint Paul to University of Minnesota, a route running on Minnehaha Ave. (north of University Ave.).

(CCLRP0183) NR-28

Bus Route 16 should run as frequently as it currently does, even after LRT is finished. People of low incomes and people with disabilities depend on its frequent stops and its ability to get them closer to their destination than LRT will.

(CCLRP0045) NR-29

Adding routes and expanding others in the neighborhoods poses financial hurdles, I understand, but doing so can ensure that the whole system is integrated and successful. Let's make sure that LRT and buses serve more than just suburban park and ride demographics.

(CCLRP0906) NR-31

Someone said and my only experience with other cities is New York City that they use the public transportation there all the time. Yes. Because it was frequent. You don't have to consult schedules. You just go and you pick it up and that means every -- not more than six or seven minutes. The 16 is -- I don't know about Minneapolis like the 5 on Chicago Avenue, but in St. Paul the 16 is the only route that has anything like a reasonable frequency and even then it's never been better than eight minutes.

(CCLRP0032) NR-32

N-S buses must run frequently on Sunday mornings and late afternoons to serve the many churches in the area. Many congregants come from outside the immediate area and the Central Corridor will be an ideal transit option for churchgoers if the N-S buses run frequently enough (15 minutes) to get them to their final destination.

(CCLRP0461) NR-33

They recommended that the 12 minute bus times with Route 16 remain during rush hour and 15 minute maximum headway. Non-rush hour headway should not exceed 20 minutes in order to provide reliable service along the line. With Route 94 they are concerned that the post reductions are too severe so they are recommending and agreeing with the DEIS that Routes 94B and C be eliminated and keep 94D at the current headways and making sure that there are buses at least every 30 minutes throughout the early morning to the later evening hours to Downtown Minneapolis and back. They are concerned about the bus alignments on Cedar Street and want to examine the impact of re-routing local and express service of Nos. 16, 50 and 94.

(CCLRP0549) NR-34

The current 10- to 15-minute frequency of the #16 bus should be maintained to accommodate transit riders getting on or off between LRT stations, especially if the stations are more than 1/2 mile apart. If more LRT stations are added, the proposed reduction in service to 20 minute intervals may be adequate.

(CCLRP0141) NR-35

And this WILL reduce the number of buses along the corridor.

(CCLRP0004) NR-36

Transportation should be improved. The 16 bus should continue to run on a 10 minute schedule. There needs to be more north/south bus routes.

(CCLRP0478) NR-37

1. The current plan will cause worse public transportation for the many people who will suffer from the proposed reduction in bus service along University Avenue, but who live much farther from a proposed LRT station than they currently are from a bus stop.

(CCLRP0471) NR-42

Even if limited mobility users live close enough to the LRT stops that they can actually get there, the LRT won't stop close enough to these users' destinations. Their choice will be to take LRT to the stop closest to their destinations, then wait for up to 30 minutes for the bus to come and take them the remaining few blocks. Faced with the choice between transferring between the bus and LRT or taking the slower bus that doesn't require a transfer, the physical challenges faced by this user group will lead most of them to take the bus.

(CCLRP0485) NR-43

H. Bus Service Reduction - The proposal suggests a reduction in bus services specifically the Route 16 from its current rate of frequency to that of 20 minutes during peak hours and 30 minutes during off peak hours. See DEIS table 2.3-2. This area has a high concentration of transit dependent populations who utilize the bus service for a lot of short distance travel trips within the corridor. Reduction in bus service in effect disproportionately and adversely cripples the transportation access of a "non choice" rider population and presents a major transportation hindrance certainly during the winter months. This impact is exacerbated with proposed LRT stops being a mile apart. EJ communities must not be doubly jeopardized and denied benefits on both ends of the distribution of services spectrum. It appears that operation funding from bus routes frequently utilized by transit dependents is being diverted in support of operation money for the rail line or the creation of new feeder routes for more "choice riders". Again, such a proposal is not supportive of Goal 3: Objective C of the Project which is as earlier identified to "enhance the existing transportation infrastructure to serve the high number of transit dependent persons in the Central Corridor." See DEIS, p. 7-2. As a mitigation alternative, maintain the level of service currently performed by route 16 after the completion of LRT.

(CCLRP0139) NR-45

7. No more bus route cuts in these areas

(CCLRP0911) NR-47

Minneapolis has already experienced the impact of LRT including the destruction of the sacred Lakota ceremonial site. Also, one of the side effects of Light Rail Transit in Minneapolis was that some bus service was cut in spite of the fact they told us that they were going to increase bus service. Also, some routes were actually manipulated so that

people were forced to use the light rail in order to boost ridership statistics. with that. So I wasn't too happy.

(CCLRP0018) NR-52

Many in our neighborhood depend on the bus to get around. They need frequent stops along University. I want to make sure there is still some sort of transportation option that makes more frequent stops.

(CCLRP0232) NR-54

Bus transportation connections seem to be dealt with by saying that the 16 and 50 routes would be cut. What routes become feeders to the system and are enhanced? No budget or economic or environmental study is done to enhance bus service or coordinate

(CCLRP0532) NR-55

Even with the addition of light rail, Bus Route 16 should continue to run and stop just as frequently as it does today. People are willing to wait a maximum of 10 minutes for the bus. Since the light rail may only stop at three places in our neighborhood, the busses need to continue to run frequently in order to connect people to other non-LRT intersections.

(CCLRP0271) NR-58

The \$billion road construction project on University and Washington Avenues, will immediately upon completion, reduce the every-block 16A bus service by one-half. According to HIGHWAY engineer Wolsfeld, the wait-time for riders of the every-block 16A service will double after the completion of the road construction project. (SEE ATTACHED VIDEO CLIP). Also after the completion of the \$billion Central Corridor road construction project, the 94 express bus service will likely be drastically reduced or eliminated. The travel time for 94 bus riders will increase significantly after the completion of the Central Corridor road construction project. The train on University and Washington Avenues would have stops approximately 1 mile apart. The 16A stops at every block. That's a 12 to 1 reduction in the convenience/accessibility of the 16A service. That's in addition to the already mentioned 2 to 1 reduction in the frequency of the every-block service.

(CCLRP0756) NR-60

As a resident living a mile or so south of University Avenue, I would also encourage the planning efforts include enhanced north-south bus routes in order to extend the usefulness of the Central Corridor LRT to other nearby attractions such as the U of M St. Paul Campus, the State Fairgrounds, Como Park, Grand Avenue, and the many nearby college campuses.

Thank you.

(CCLRP0523) NR-61

It is stated in section 3-22 that bus service along the corridor will be reduced. This will be very detrimental to the people in the neighborhoods who are fully transit dependent. It is one thing for a healthy, young person, in nice weather, to walk one-half mile to a rail stop. It is an entirely different story altogether, for a wheelchair bound person or parent with two small children or an elderly man with a bag of groceries to walk that far, particularly during the December to April months. The #16 bus, in particular, is of significant importance to the people of the corridor and it must be maintained at its current level.

(CCLRP0180) PlaTE-108

Metro Transit data currently reflects that the highest ridership is on University Avenue. The current schedule runs every 10 minutes moving riders to work and school in a timely manner. Given MTC's current financial status, it has been stated that the current schedules will not offer riders that same reliable service. Therefore, asking these riders to find alternatives to catch light rail will truly present an employment, educational, and financial burden to those with the highest public transportation dependency.

(CCLRP0458) PlaTP-240

Mr. Schweigert outlined nine issues, concerns, or potential benefits raised by the district councils, in consultation with each other and their constituents, that have to be addressed or included in this project: ...2) efficient transit connectors, cross-street transfers, circulator buses, shuttles, concurrent bus service, and resolution of park and ride issues; 3) good pedestrian, bicycle, and disability access and safety both along the avenue and crossing the avenue,

(CCLRP0145) PlaTP-254

Concerned about other stops being obsolete due to the light rail.

(CCLRP0075) ProALT-562

Light rail provides worse service for those transit riders who are trying to do neighborhood transit, which is the majority of the riders at this time. Very few people actually ride all the way from one downtown to the other. While light rail is a great public transportation option for further distance commutes, such as from a suburb into a downtown area, it is not well adapted to neighborhood travel, which is what the current bus routes along University Ave are used for. Most of the people currently riding the bus line along University Ave. (either the 16 or the 50) do NOT have a need to travel all the way from one downtown to the other. Rather, this route is used by people doing errands, making multiple stops, or students going from one part of campus to another (filling in where the campus commuter can't satisfy their needs).

(CCLRP0532) ProHLP-023

However, we also realize that many District 7 community members rely heavily on public transportation. Given this fact, we will support current plans for three stops (Lexington, Dale and Rice) ONLY if there are no cuts to Bus Route 16.

Response NR-014. Section 6.1 of the FEIS discusses changes to the existing bus network serving the corridor with the addition of LRT. The Metropolitan Council and Metro Transit plan to implement feeder bus service. The proposed bus feeder routes along the corridor will reduce headway times between the Route 16 bus, thereby reducing the wait time for passengers and improving mobility in and around the corridor. Additionally, figures in Section 6.1 illustrate user benefits and their distribution regionally. More information regarding project impacts to transit-dependent people and environmental justice issues are discussed in section 3.8 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary NR-017. [Not in favor of buses on Lexington Parkway](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0180) NR-62

We have to look seriously at the proposed Lexington Avenue stop as Lexington Avenue is a parkway, and its parkway status should be taken into consideration. The discussion of buses on Lexington Parkway has not been well received. The residents are not in favor of buses on Lexington Parkway.

Response NR-017. Currently, buses run on Summit Avenue to Lexington Parkway. Lexington Parkway bus service is being instituted to provide a connection to future the LRT station. The proposed plan for route 83 will provide bus service connecting with the Central Corridor along Lexington Parkway.

Issue Summary NR-018. [Concerns and suggestions for Bus Route 94](#) (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0474) NR-38

I learned that the 94 bus would not operate outside of the morning and afternoon rush hours. I feel strongly that the 94 bus should run all day between downtown Minneapolis and downtown St. Paul. The 94 bus will provide a much faster trip between the 2 cities as opposed to LRT or BRT. Many people depend on this faster service at all hours of the day.

(CCLRP0545) NR-56

We would also recommend that there be some stops at Snelling by express buses along I-94. In addition, we want to make sure that feeder lines from the local neighborhood are well-coordinated with the new transit line and that, for example, the elderly population living at the Hamline High Rise have adequate access.

Response NR-018. Route 94 express bus service will not be changed.

Issue Summary NR-021. [Restore the MTC 76 bus route](#) (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0298) NR-2

5. Restore the 76 bus!!

(CCLRP0153) NR-8

Bring back #76 bus.

(CCLRP0113) NR-15

Would like the 76 bus. (Unreadable) likes to go around the hi-rise. (Unreadable) easier access to University Avenue and Downtown St. Paul.

(CCLRP0112) NR-46

Should put 76 MTC bus for high rise to all them. It's very hard. People with disability help problem. Doctor appointments, shopping, out with family. Very help hard people around.

(CCLRP0152) NR-50

We need the #76 bus restored.

Response NR-021. There are no plans at this point to restore the original Route 76 bus route. Section 6.1 of the FEIS discusses changes to the existing bus network serving the corridor with the addition of LRT.

Issue Summary PlaTE-011. Concerns about negative impact to bus system (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0183) PlaTE-137

??There should be good integration of traffic that intersects with University from the North and South. I'm concerned that if people are waiting in buses too long at this intersection, they will not ride them, and any gains in ridership from LRT may be offset by decreased rider ship elsewhere. Perhaps there could be some financial or other incentives to riding the North-South buses, too, because increased ridership there could increase LRT ridership.

Response PlaTE-011. Section 6.1 of the FEIS, discusses changes to the existing bus network serving the corridor with the addition of LRT. The Metropolitan Council and Metro Transit plan to implement feeder bus service to provide connections to the LRT and area transit service, helping to ensure mobility and access to destinations. Fares for the buses and LRT will be consistent with existing Metro Transit fare policies.

Issue Summary PlaTE-013. Concerns about impacts to bus network (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0775) PlaTE-55

I'm a bus-dependent senior citizen living in the Midway area. The 16 bus is a lifeline. It stops frequently and connects with all the major bus lines. The light rail will only stop at Snelling, Lexington, Dale, and Rice. Supposedly there will also be buses, but at a much reduced time and rate and there will be no 50 or 94 buses at all.

(CCLRP0427) PlaTE-156

The current bus system could be improved to help support light rail expansion. Buses only come every half an hour for most routes, which makes it much harder to plan your commute. Being able to walk or drive a few minutes to a light rail station adds much needed flexibility to a person's schedule.

(CCLRP0895) PlaTE-162

Blind rider coming down Cedar Avenue had to stop taking his easy bus downtown that ran at least 15 minutes or whatever. They tried diverting every other bus to the light rail.

(CCLRP0775) PlaTE-186

What happens to a majority of the passengers who live between these stops? The 20-minute trip may end up taking an hour if you have to make bus transfers.

(CCLRP0192) PlaTE-196

I live in Roseville, but frequently do business in Midway. If you make it less convenient for me, I'll go elsewhere, like to the northern suburbs I hear others talking about.

Response PlaTE-013. Section 6.1 of the FEIS, discusses changes to the existing bus network serving the corridor with the addition of LRT. The Metropolitan Council and Metro Transit plan to implement feeder bus service to provide connections to the LRT and area transit service, helping to ensure mobility and access to destinations.

Issue Summary PlaTF-010. Concern of the number of LRT stops and the elimination of bus service along University Avenue. (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0035) PlaTP-214

I am in favor of the LRT concept, but I am concerned about buses being discontinued (some are vital for people in assisted living).

Response PlaTF-010. There are no plans to eliminate bus service completely from the University corridor. Section 6.1 of the FEIS discusses changes to the existing bus network serving the corridor with the addition of LRT. The Metropolitan Council and Metro Transit plan to implement feeder bus service to provide connections to the LRT and area transit service, helping to ensure mobility and access to destinations.

Issue Summary PlaTP-047. Concerns about decreased seating capacity (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0839) PlaTP-211

The light rail alternative adds 31 light rail vehicles and removes 47 bus vehicles. So essentially you're losing seating capacity. I figure it was about 69 seats

Response PlaTP-047. Light rail vehicles allow for greater seating capacity than buses, so that there will be increased capacity overall, while operating fewer numbers of vehicles.

Issue Summary PlaTP-057. Concern that LRT service will not be as fast as Bus Route 16 (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0272) PlaTP-226

I ride the 16 bus and do not wish to arrive later at my destination if I have to use LRT.

Response PlaTP-057. Benefits including faster ride time and improved service reliability of the Central Corridor LRT have been quantified in various cost-effectiveness calculations and discussed in the Chapter 5 of the FEIS. Local bus service (Route 16) will continue on the University Avenue corridor. The frequency of Route 16 will be reduced. See Section 6.1 of the FEIS for further details.

Issue Summary PlaTP-061. Bus 16 Routes should be maintained and improved to access LRT stations (7)

Comments:

(CCLRP0192) PlaTP-054

1. Most riders of the 16 bus are poor people going a couple of miles to get groceries and such (between Snelling at downtown SP). The train will not alleviate a lot of that traffic. If the train would be so great, there'd already be many more people taking the 50 instead of the 16.

(CCLRP0462) PlaTP-101

The No. 16 bus should be continued at its current 10 minute intervals to assist transit riders access to light rail stations along University Avenue.

(CCLRP0141) PlaTP-115

How would an elderly resident who, say, lives near Dale Avenue walk all the way to Rice Street or Lexington Avenue in July heat, let alone bone chilling January weather?

(CCLRP0313) PlaTP-145

The frequencies of the connecting bus service shown in the DEIS are not adequate, at least in Market Area I. A cost-effective way to solve this problem would be to add short turn trips on the north-south crosstown buses on Rice St., Dale St., Lexington, Snelling Ave., etc. to cover the areas south of Como Ave. and north of Randolph or Grand Avenue. The plan should be to schedule a bus for every train during most hours of operation in this market area. To fail to do this would certainly exacerbate the "hide & ride" problem near the stations. Route 16 is a special case. With stations all one mile apart, it becomes essential for there to be a bus for

every train, at least in the areas of heaviest residential settlement. With stations more 1/2 mile to one mile apart, this becomes less of a concern, unless trains were to be operated on an alternating A-B schedule.

(CCLRP0545) PlaTP-148

6) That transportation options are preserved. We recommend that the number 16 bus continue at a frequency close to its current schedule until it is clear that accessibility for local residents is not impaired by a less frequent schedule.

(CCLRP0178) PlaTP-181

2. Transit Connectors - Cross-street transfers/circulators/shuttles/concurrent bus transit service. A. The DCC supports maintaining the present service level of the 16A bus route along University Avenue, at least until ridership surveys subsequent to full operation of the light rail line justify a reduction. B. The DCC supports the continuation of an I-94 express route with a stop at Snelling Avenue. C. As illustrated in Figure 2.3-4 of the DEIS, the DCC supports major improvements for all connecting and crossing arterials, maximizing local bus service, both along the entire Corridor and its crossing arteries, developing new, renewed, and improved bus connections and frequencies along major streets (Rice St., Dale St., Lexington Parkway, Snelling Ave., Fairview Ave., Prior Ave., Cleveland Ave., Cretin/Vandalia, and Raymond Ave., including the addition of the extension of proposed Route #60 running north to Pierce Butler and south to Randolph Ave., plus appropriate connectors to Minneapolis arterials between St. Paul and Cedar/Riverside) and connecting to the rail line. D. The DCC supports a system of circulator vehicles and shuttles operating in concert with Metro Mobility, but on a regular schedule, weaving in a through the residential and commercial neighborhoods adjacent to and beyond the Central Corridor to facilitate linkages to the disproportionately aging, disabled and transit-dependent populations therein, all geared to boosting ridership on all modes. The system should include shuttles addressing event-oriented ridership increases for the State Fair and a circulator connecting Como Park.

(CCLRP0088) PlaTP-232

2. Bus routes on University Ave should maintain their current schedule. For example, the 16 bus route needs to continue to run every 10 minutes to ensure users have a multitude of options.

Response PlaTP-061. The frequency of Route 16 will be reduced, however the Metropolitan Council and Metro Transit plan to implement feeder bus service to provide connections to the LRT. The proposed bus circulator routes along the corridor will reduce headway times between the Route 16 bus, thereby reducing the wait time for passengers and improving mobility in and around the corridor. A plan for the Central Corridor bus route network is discussed and depicted in Section 6.1 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-084. Improve bus route 94 (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0630) PlaTP-071

In the meantime Metro transit should improve route#94 to preclude LRT with more frequent services on weekends and night adding 2 more stops and connecting to bus lines @Dale Terminal @ near XCEL CENTER to serve more riders for big events. UNION depot will only serve the neighborhoods

Response PlaTP-084. The plan for the bus route network as part of Central Corridor LRT, as depicted and discussed in Chapter 6 of the FEIS does not include the requested changes to I-94 bus service. The I-94 bus service will continue to operate under its current capacity. The purpose and need for Central Corridor LRT service is described in Chapter 1 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-108. Will Bus Routes 87, 16, and 50 still be in service? (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0132) PlaTP-122

2. I frequently use the current 87 bus from my residence--it gets to University at Prior, turning a block later onto Cleveland. Will that bus still be in operation for traveling on Cleveland on the Raymond and thus to Roseville? The nearest LRT stop appears to be Fairview and then Raymond--nothing between, presumably meaning to find alternative bus routes to get to the LRT. Multiple transfers consume time, and during winter for us elderly is a problem. Will the #16 & #50 buses on University still be in service?

Response PlaTP-108. The Route 87 bus will continue to operate as it does currently when Central Corridor LRT is operational. Route 50 will be eliminated, and the frequency of Route 16 will be reduced. Additional details are discussed in Section 6.1 of the FEIS.

Section: 6.1 - Supporting Bus Service

Issue Summary PlaTP-036. LRT needs good supporting (feeder and local) bus system (19)

Comments:

(CCLRP0545) PlaTP-066

We strongly suggest that authorities study potential use of the line by commuters outside the adjacent neighborhoods, and that park and ride sites be negotiated with inner-ring suburbs. This will necessitate good feeder lines from park and rides to transit stops.

(CCLRP0652) PlaTP-067

It is also important to build up the north south bus routes that will feed into the Central Corridor. I rarely take a transit trip that involves only one ride.

(CCLRP0044) PlaTP-086

I think that a Central Corridor light rail will need more North-South feeder buses, so a bus on Cleveland Ave that runs more often will be needed. Also, there should be a bus going from the Dinkytown stop to well into the neighborhood of Northeast Minneapolis. This area has grown considerably as an art and entertainment area since the North Central reorganization of transit in 2000, and the current options for travel there from West-Central and Southwest St. Paul are not very good.

(CCLRP0033) PlaTP-090

I support the development of a light rail transit system along the Central Corridor - as long as it is generously supported by an improved bus system that links to it.

(CCLRP0045) PlaTP-095

Urban riders need to have a system that works without having to drive and park. Bus service as we have now doesn't quite fulfill that need. The network is thin and inconvenient.

(CCLRP0436) PlaTP-111

Also, routes north and south and crossings on University are important to determine to integrate into preliminary engineering.

(CCLRP0462) PlaTP-119

It is also important to provide access to light rail to people living north or south of the corridor and there should be a network of connecting bus service.

(CCLRP0088) PlaTP-161

1. It is critical to expand connecting north-south bus routes. Currently, there is no reliable north-south route between Snelling Avenue on the west and Rice Street on the East. Adding service along Lexington Pkwy for at least a portion of it, and increasing service along Dale Street should be a top priority.

(CCLRP0532) PlaTP-164

- There should be a shuttle that runs up and down University Avenue to connect people to the light rail Stops from various points along the street.

(CCLRP0742) PlaTP-171

The goal is to get people to use light rail instead of their cars and in order to do that we need to have -- also, one of the considerations needs to be that there needs to be good connecting routes from the neighborhoods to the light rail line. All neighborhoods have to have really good access.

(CCLRP0280) PlaTP-183

4. Transit Connections. We support the expansion of north/south feeder routes to LRT, and the maintenance (as much as possible, of the capacity of existing bus lines paralleling the LRT route. LRT should not be viewed as a replacement for existing public transit, but rather as an augmentation.

(CCLRP0549) PlaTP-188

3. The Merriam Park Community Council believes that we need a complete network of bus service so that residents can get to a station on the LRT line without driving and needing to park. Such a network would include north-south bus service on all avenues with LRT stations.

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-191

However, changes would be needed to adequately connect bus service. Primarily, the Route 84 (Snelling Avenue) bus would need to be rerouted to guarantee direct connection to the LRT station.

(CCLRP0787) PlaTP-227

Second, it is important to provide people with access to light rail living north or south of the corridor. The Council supports a network of connecting bus service so that people may access light rail without driving and parking at or near a station.

(CCLRP0531) PlaTP-229

St. Paul must act to insure that Metropolitan Transit Commission does not diminish the bus service on lines 21 and 95. St. Paul must act to insure that Metropolitan Transit Commission operate any light rail line on University Avenue as a segment of a mass transit system; • Bus routes to provide north-south connections to and from University Avenue must be added. Provision of rider transfers between buses and light rail must encourage use of the transit system.

(CCLRP0407) PlaTP-243

The Draft EIS should be amended to reflect more current transit improvements needed in the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0484) PlaTP-245

Other mass transit routes need to be able to feed into the LRT line. Provide ability to bring a bicycle on the LRT. Until LRT is a vast grid, it will be important that the existing bus lines are maintained and even increased and that the busses themselves are well maintained.

(CCLRP0829) PlaTP-252

Two, substantially expand the north-south bus service connections to the University Avenue Corridor.

(CCLRP0251) ProALT-221

During peak hours (rush hour), I could definitely see both LRT and bus service being available. In off peak hours, the LRT by itself would be ideal. And, the availability of both express (few stops between the cities) and standard service (every stop) during non-peak hours would address concerns regarding the time it takes to travel from end to end.

Response PlaTP-036. The importance of local and north-south bus routes feeding into the Central Corridor LRT system are part of the plan for a comprehensive network of routes in the Central Corridor area developed by Metro Transit. Transfers will be possible (and are currently possible) between buses and LRT. See Section 6.1 of the FEIS for further details.

Issue Summary PlaTP-094. Consider "park-n-ride" on the western side of downtown Minneapolis. (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0243) PlaTP-093

As life turns out, I now live in the Western suburbs, but yet work in downtown St. Paul. I myself know that public transportation from West to East is deeply lacking in our metro area. The Central Corridor project will be a key for future building blocks to a metropolitan rail system. Please consider "park-n-ride" opportunities on the Western side of downtown Minneapolis for those of us who have no express bus service to the east today.

Response PlaTP-094. Construction of a park-and-ride facility at the western end of the joint HLRT and CENTRAL CORRIDOR line in downtown Minneapolis is not part of the Preferred Alternative. Bus and heavy rail connections will be possible at the Northstar Commuter Rail Multi-modal Station in downtown Minneapolis.

Issue Summary PlaTP-097. Consider using articulated buses (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0130) PlaTP-103

As a related matter, if articulated buses were used for midday, evening, and weekend operations, capacity could be increased, economies of vehicle size could be achieved, and Metro Transit could make more intensive use of its existing fleet of artic, which currently are used almost exclusively during weekday peak periods.

Response PlaTP-097. The purpose and need for the Central Corridor LRT Project is described in Chapter 1 of the FEIS. Serving the forecast demand with a fleet of articulated buses in the corridor was examined in part as part of the BRT alternative in the AA/DEIS and was not adopted as the Preferred Alternative to meet purpose and need.

Issue Summary PlaTP-098. Improve north-south bus service on weekends to allow persons to get to worship services (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0893) PlaTP-104

In order to serve these communities we must make sure that there is adequate north-south bus service on Saturday afternoons and on Sundays, particularly in the morning and late afternoon. Because services are scheduled for various times at different churches, bus service should run at least every 15 minutes. The region has quickly grown and we can no longer afford to reduce bus service on weekends.

Response PlaTP-098. Bus service frequencies are calibrated in large part to meet levels of existing demand.

Issue Summary ProALT-047. Favors LRT with improvements to existing/potential connecting lines (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0878) ProALT-260

What I do recommend is that you approve the baseline alternative with specific improvements to the existing line and a fast track, the Red Rock, and rush line commuter lines. Those will be changing the community. Those will be positively affecting the congestion issues we have.

Response ProALT-047. The Central Corridor Project Office worked closely with Ramsey County Regional Railroad during preliminary engineering to accommodate a potential future connection of LRT to Union Depot concourse and associated multi-modal connections planned by the County, as noted in this comment. The Preferred Alternative does provide for the future ability to serve the Union Depot concourse with commuter rail operations that will not conflict with LRT operations.

Section: 6.1 - Travel Time

Issue Summary PlaTF-008. Concern about LRT travel time, purpose and need (8)

Comments:

(CCLRP0075) PlaTE-131

Finally, as illustrated in a recent Star Tribune article, light rail would not reduce the travel time by very much between the two downtowns, and it would make local neighborhood use of the transit system worse because stations would be further apart.

(CCLRP0752) PlaTP-069

Third, and this is the difficult point, I think it's a foolish, shortsighted mistake to put the proposed line on the street at grade on University Avenue. It will not be rapid transit. The planners admit this, that it will be about the speed of a Number 50 bus.

(CCLRP0828) PlaTP-098

I'm concerned that the plans for the Central Corridor Line are building in obsolescent features into the design. It's important that travel times be fast.

(CCLRP0482) PlaTP-132

Projected travel time is suspect. This is an 11 mile line compared with a 12 mile line (Hiawatha). There are going to be at least 5 more stops, with a second downtown to pass through, as well as a route along the middle of a major arterial. Speeds are said to be limited to 35 mph with no signal preemption, as compared to speeds up to 55 mph with signal preemption on a route that is mostly isolated from nearby streets. There is no chance that this LRT line could average the same speed as the Hiawatha.

(CCLRP0792) PlaTP-152

Now I can understand why there's a system to propose on University, but I strongly recommend -- and as a veteran rider of mass transit, speed is important. Getting to work on time is important. Getting to your appointments on time is important. And if you're riding a train down the middle of a street and the train has to honor lights and pedestrians and worry about traffic, you're really defeating the purpose of trying to speed up travel to make people not drive their cars and also to not take a taxi, also get off the bus.

(CCLRP0913) PlaTP-222

I actually do statistics and I study them. The travel time inventory for the Twin City area, which I looked at two years ago -- I haven't checked it in the last two years had not increased between -- you could make the same trip in the same time.

(CCLRP0898) PlaTP-259

We're looking at a system here that is not rapid transit. If it's going to stop at every stoplight along Snelling, Lexington plus it's going to stop at every stop to pick up people, it is not a mass -- it's a mass transit system, but it's not a rapid transit system.

(CCLRP0741) ProHLP-012

Light rail certainly looks preferable, but as good as it looks it cannot, in my opinion, be called first class because for most of its journey it would travel on the surface and that means that it would be too slow to meet the ultimate needs of this corridor as well as the whole metropolitan area.

Response PlaTF-008. Travel time has been calculated using accepted methodology as approved by the Federal Transit Administration. The results of this analysis were reported in the AA/DEIS and the SDEIS and have been updated to reflect the changing project definition in the FEIS. Signal timing along the corridor has been optimized to provide preference for LRT, extending the green cycle to allow an LRT train to pass through an intersection with preference while minimizing disruption to cross-street traffic. The Preferred Alternative optimizes travel time for the LRT while meeting other goals as established for the overall project, as outlined in Chapter 1 of the FEIS.

Section: 6.1 - LRT System Design

Issue Summary PlaPla-002. Recommended list of issues to include in Preliminary Engineering from City of St. Paul (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) PlaPla-2

The City of Saint Paul recommends community-based analyses that are done as part of Preliminary Engineering include cooperative and thorough investigation into these issues: • Route refinements; • Station locations, including potential for roughing in utilities for potential future LRT stations at Western, Victoria and Hamline. • Design of station platforms with considerations of safety and aesthetics; • Pedestrian access to stations and bus

stops; • Lighting and other security elements at platforms, at bus stops and along pedestrian paths to the platforms/stops • Streetscape design and funding; • Public art; • Aesthetic design of track beds, overhead wiring and support poles; • Loss of on-street parking; • Park & ride facilities, in any; • Construction mitigation; and • Apprenticeship programs.

Response PlaPla-002. The adopted Preferred Alternative includes an alignment and routes that meet the purpose and need most efficiently and minimize project impacts, and it includes future stations at Western, Victoria, and Hamline with all subsurface infrastructure for these stations to be built. Access to the stations and bus stops will be ADA compliant for pedestrians. The Section 3.7 of the FEIS, Safety and Security, describes safety considerations, lighting, and other related design elements. Three to five artists will be selected to consult with Metropolitan Council's Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee in the development of station designs. Further, the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis are working with the Metropolitan Council in the development of plans to achieve specific neighborhood goals around stations. These plans are documented in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, and Chapters 5 and 6 of the FEIS. The Central Corridor Project Office surveyed businesses and conducted an analysis of on-street parking impacts. No park and ride facilities are proposed for the Central Corridor LRT project. An inventory of University Avenue parking supply and impacts is summarized in Section 6.3 of the FEIS. Roadway operations and parking, access to businesses, public utility services, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, along with short-term impacts to air quality, noise, and vibration are likely to be the most significant impacts experienced by the people and businesses located adjacent to or near the construction zones. Short-term impacts would be minimized by using standard construction BMPs such as dust control, erosion control, proper mufflers on equipment, and restricted times for construction. Maintenance of traffic and sequencing of construction would be planned and scheduled so as to minimize traffic delays and inconvenience. Access to all businesses would be maintained throughout the construction period. Metropolitan Council does not have apprenticeship programs.

Issue Summary PlaTP-041. Central Corridor LRT should have same operating hours of service as Hiawatha line (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-197

Page 2-10, Operating Hours and Frequency - LRT is proposed to operate from 5:00 AM to 12:30 PM. Consideration should be given to a 1:00 AM end time, as on the Hiawatha line.

Response PlaTP-041. The operating hours of service for Central Corridor LRT will be the same as those for the Hiawatha LRT.

Issue Summary PlaTP-044. Address efficient traffic control and system routing (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0458) PlaTP-206

Mr. Schweigert outlined nine issues, concerns, or potential benefits raised by the district councils, in consultation with each other and their constituents, that have to be addressed or included in this project: ..., 4) efficient traffic control and system routing;

Response PlaTP-044. Signal timing along the corridor will be optimized to provide preference for LRT, extending the green cycle to allow an LRT train to pass through an intersection with preference while minimizing disruption to cross-street traffic. Traffic control and routing associated with the Central Corridor LRT project is discussed in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-074. Design of bus shelters (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-050

Finally, there should be a focus on the design of bus shelters as well, with respect to issues of location, safety, uniformity and differentiation.

Response PlaTP-074. Design of bus shelters was not part of the proposed Central Corridor LRT project and is part of separate planning processes overseen by Metro Transit Engineering and Facilities.

Issue Summary PlaTP-079. Recommendations for bus stop design (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0466) PlaTP-063

... move all bus stops to the far side of the intersection so as not to hinder right turns of motorized traffic, invest in newer modular buses that would feature direct boarding and disembarking access so there would be no steps that would be required for passengers to access the bus, and also feature accommodations of other needs such as wheelchairs, walkers and bicycles. The bus stops should be elevated to be above the sidewalk grade to facilitate easy ingress and egress for the passengers. The clearing of the bus stop areas, including intersection curbs, should be a priority during snow emergencies.

Response PlaTP-079. Bus stops were examined as part of developing the proposed Central Corridor Bus Route Network, as documented in Chapter 6 of the FEIS. Bus stops were reconfigured, as needed, to provide the best transfer capability from LRT to bus. Metro Transit has no plans to elevate the bus stop above the existing sidewalk grade as this could pose challenges for ADA access and for pedestrians walking along the sidewalks.

Issue Summary PlaTP-080. Stations should accommodate 3-car trains (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) PlaTP-064

The City of Saint Paul recommends that station areas be planned and built to accommodate 3-car LRT trains.

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-084

Section/page/table is 2.3.2 page 2-7 Vehicles All stations should be designed for three-car trains, including a tail track area east of the Stadium Village Station and close to the east Loop (Metrodome Station) to accommodate event loading.

(CCLRP0753) PlaTP-153

and what I would like to see happen is that each station be able to handle at least three cars, not the two that is designated down the Hiawatha location for several of the stations, but I also would like to see some of the stations go underneath the major intersections like Snelling, Lexington, Dale, and Rice Streets the speed-up time as well for those areas.

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-166

Station capacity is essential to meeting the transit demands in the corridor. The Draft EIS specifies that station design will accommodate 2-car trains (Section 2.3.2 p2-8). However, given the great success of the Hiawatha Corridor in this region, and the ridership projections for the Central Corridor line, it seems short-sighted to limit the initial construction of stations to a mere 200 feet

(CCLRP0313) PlaTP-233

In the Hiawatha corridor, unique station architecture and station art were made a higher priority than making the stations long enough to serve 3-car trains, and ordering a large enough fleet to run 3-car trains. This was a mistake that I hope is not repeated in the Central Corridor! A prudent LRT plan for the Central Corridor must plan for a fleet sufficient to operate 3-car trains on University Ave.

Response PlaTP-080. The Preferred Alternative includes 3-car train platforms and a tail track near the HLRT connection to accommodate event loading. Stations will be at-grade along the entire corridor. These elements are described in Chapter 2 of the SDEIS and the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-086. Propose alternating A-B schedule between U of M Stadium and Rice St. (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0313) PlaTP-077

With an alternating A-B schedule, route 50 BRT or LRT would run more often than described in the DEIS, say every 5 minutes. Every other train would stop at every other station between the U of M Stadium and Rice St., except all trains would stop at Snelling - Pascal St. station. The "50A" trains would stop at the A Stations, and the "50B" trains would stop at the B Stations. After 9 PM or in the early mornings, the trains would carry no letter and trains would stop everywhere. Passengers would need to read the overhead signs. Yes,

this would take a larger fleet to operate. A cost-benefit of this concept should be done. Faster travel times should be possible. Please see attached description.

Response PlaTP-086. Comment noted. The operating plan as described in section 2.3 of the FEIS does not include the kind of alternate express and skip/stop services as noted in the comment as it was not found to be the most cost effective means of meeting forecast demand.

Issue Summary PlaTP-110. [Include specific listed accommodations for maximum passenger comfort and ease](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-126

Finally, accommodations for maximum passenger comfort and ease of use should include: • Heating in the winter; • Bicycle lockers (either in or near the stations) and potential community bicycle services; • "Real-time information" on both the LRT and connecting bus service; and • Weather information.

Response PlaTP-110. LRT station design will include sheltered passenger waiting areas, including heating elements. There are no plans to provide bicycle lockers on station platforms. Additional information services in and around station areas, such as real-time information on arriving trains and weather, will be determined during final design.

Issue Summary PlaTP-126. [Uniform station design with distinguishing colors/art](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-177

In Minneapolis, the community opted for having very individualized station design along the Hiawatha Corridor. ... when station locations were discussed as part of the City of Saint Paul Riverview Corridor analysis, there was a good deal of community sentiment for having a more unified design for bus stations. This may suggest a different option for LRT stations in Saint Paul. One variation discussed during the Riverview Corridor analysis was that the basic structural elements could be uniform, with colors and/or public art being the distinguishing characteristics among stations. In any case, this is an issue that needs thorough discussion during Preliminary Engineering.

Response PlaTP-126. Station design during the course of preliminary engineering was set to provide a uniform system of station elements, as noted in this comment and based on the experiences learned from Hiawatha LRT of the difficulty of maintaining stations with custom components. Further details of station elements will be determined during final design.

Issue Summary ProALT-014. [Central Corridor LRT fares collection system](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0232) ProALT-042

- Lack of coordination between the present LRT fare system and the current bus fare system was not discussed, specifically the confusing fare system of the LRT that does not accept prepaid bus fare cards and other user difficulties with the current LRT system.

Response ProALT-014. As discussed in the AA/DEIS, the fares to ride Metro Transit buses, the Hiawatha LRT, and the Central Corridor LRT will be the same and free transfers are available.

Issue Summary ProALT-024. Signal Timing (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0313) PlaTP-239

The way to make the enhanced Route 50 run smoothly is to be sure that the signals progress along University Ave and Washington Ave at a rate which is compatible with the actual average speed of each train. Then, the only delays would be for passengers. If signal progression would be adjusted based on actual train travel speeds, then the perception (and that is very significant in making travel choices) would not be affected much by the exact number of stops made for passengers, or the spacing between stops.

(CCLRP0178) ProALT-041

4. Traffic Control and System Routing - turns, tunnel, adjacent and cross traffic. A. The DCC recommends that measures be taken to keep the transit system infrastructure from impeding normal traffic flow along and turning within the Central Corridor, especially University Avenue, DCC recommends that left-turn signaling better accommodate the actual flow of traffic through those intersections than it does at present. B. The DCC recommends straightening the alignment through downtown St. Paul, thus reducing the number of 90-degree turns currently planned and mitigating known "wheel-squeal" when trains turn and reducing the need for at least one station in the Loop. C. The DCC supports inclusion of the planned Stadium Village tunnel running under Washington Avenue and the University of Minnesota, with the stipulation that the University of Minnesota should pay for any tunnel extension required to accommodate the new Gophers football stadium.

Response ProALT-024. Signal timing along the corridor has been optimized to provide preference for LRT, extending the green cycle to allow an LRT train to pass through an intersection with preference while minimizing disruption to cross-street traffic resulting in the fastest reasonable train times. Central Corridor LRT trains will not be given signal priority at most intersections along the corridor. The Metropolitan Council has worked closely with St. Paul in developing the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative consolidates two stations, as disclosed in the SDEIS and FEIS into one station on the diagonal block of 4th, 5th, and Minnesota streets in downtown St. Paul. The Preferred Alternative provides for an at-grade alignment of the Central Corridor LRT through the U of M's East Bank campus. During early stages of preliminary engineering, the Council determined that a tunnel alignment at this location would not be a cost-effective solution.

Issue Summary ProProjBdj-002. Encourage proper funding of this vital infrastructure in the future so that U-Pass prices can be kept down (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0738) ProProjBdj-005

I also want to encourage everyone in this room and I will do so myself to encourage proper funding of this vital infrastructure in the future so that U-Pass prices can be kept down, so that other prices for using public transportation can be kept down, and our infrastructure can be maintained.

Response ProProjBdj-002. Comment noted.

Section: 6.1 - LRT Park and Rides

Issue Summary PlaTP-105. Need park and ride at train stations (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0482) PlaTP-114

11) Supposed "LRT bias" is false - Metro Transit's last survey showed a majority of the responses were that they rode because of free parking. There is no free parking planned along this route. Those who proclaimed at public hearings that they won't ride the bus but would ride a train will not ride a bus to get to a point where they can transfer to the train.

(CCLRP0016) PlaTP-179

My only suggestions would be to put in some neighborhood park-n-rides (Possibly elevated) (Hiawatha line helped us learn this) and some over (or under) passes so the train won't slow down traffic as much.

Response PlaTP-105. The unique characteristics of the Central Corridor were noted in the project purpose and need. A proposed bus network that will provide feeder and connecting service to the LRT was discussed and depicted in section 6.1 of the FEIS. The provision of park-and-ride facilities adjacent to the Central Corridor is inconsistent with the City of St. Paul's Central Corridor Development Strategy and the provision of park-and-ride facilities is not part of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for the Central Corridor LRT will remain at-grade along the corridor with no over- or underpasses of street intersections.

Issue Summary ProALT-034. Not in favor of park and rides (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0045) ProALT-224

We don't need expensive park and rides. We need a networked system that gets people around in the communities in which they live and work.

Response ProALT-034. No park-and-ride facilities are included in the Preferred Alternative. A network of local bus routes will provide feeder service to riders wishing to access LRT who will not be biking or walking to LRT stations.

Section: 6.2 - Effects on Roadways

Issue Summary EngRW-003. Automobile safety concerns in regard to rail (6)

Comments:

(CCLRP0753) EngRW-3

I also believe that along the University Corridor that curbs be built to six inches because I've seen it down Fifth Street where cars would travel along and accidentally go over that. So I believe also in the six-inch curbs.

(CCLRP0849) SocSS-5

Trains moving slowly near lots of cars is a good idea. It would result in fewer cars getting hit by trains.

(CCLRP0472) SocSS-22

Think: In addition to those 25 intersections with traffic lights, there are many, many more intersections without lights. Will there be a barrier arm at everyone of those intersections?

(CCLRP0406) SocSS-23

The third important area is to ensure safety of the motoring public. There have already been a few major accidents with the Hiawatha Corridor line. And although they apparently were the fault of the motorists, safety must be preserved through excellence in signal design and motorists' education.

(CCLRP0428) SocSS-33

Also, the DEIS notes that emergency vehicle access to the LRT railway will be possible by a simple maneuver many SUV drivers might consider when frustrated in congested traffic settings. It is not clear that such access is necessary for providing emergency service to the transit facilities; a higher barrier might afford a safer separation from traffic.

(CCLRP0766) SocSS-58

I think, just to be real honest, folks will come to the area, go to the restaurants, go to the bars, and go home safely. Drinking and driving on University Avenue happens every night. It's kind of a dangerous corridor for that. So that would be very beneficial.

Response EngRW-003. The Twin Cities Metropolitan Council follows safety and security policies that establish requirements for each of the project subsystems and operations based on local, state, and national codes or standards. The roadway safety channelization and protection treatments will be designed to discourage automobiles and pedestrians from crossing the tracks except in legally permitted areas. Further details are described in Sections 3.7 and 6.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngRW-010. Concerns over reduced available roadway width (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0188) EngRW-16

The University Ave. corridor in Minneapolis is already narrow because of street parking and bike traffic. I can't imagine how there will be room for a rail line. The traffic (especially trucks) down the street is already hard on the local residents, I am very concerned that access will be further hampered by a rail line going down the center.

(CCLRP0192) EngRW-29

3. Traffic is bad enough with 2 1/2 lanes in both directions. What will happen when there are only 1 1/2 lanes? 4. Where will the snow be plowed to?

Response EngRW-010. The Right-of-Way along the University Avenue Corridor allows sufficient space for two tracks, two lanes of thru-traffic in each direction, as well as maintaining left-turn lanes and some on-street parking. Vehicles will be able to cross University Avenue at signalized intersections, spaced at approximately 1/4 mile intervals. Further details are described in Section 2.2 and Section 6.2 of the FEIS. Snow removal will continue to be managed as it currently is for each of the responsible agencies.

Issue Summary EngRW-012. Concerns about Prior and University Avenue Intersection (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0849) EngRW-23

There are other local businesses such as Menards which recently moved in and if there's no stop at Prior and University, the industrial zone can get its trucks out of there and the distributor, the beer distributor on the other side who uses a lot of trucks, can get them out.

Response EngRW-012. The intersection of Prior Avenue and University Avenue will continue to have signalized access with the implementation of Central Corridor LRT.

Issue Summary EngRW-015. Special accommodations for emergency vehicles (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) SocSS-48

Finally, there needs to be special accommodations for emergency vehicles. Signal preemption will be available to emergency vehicles. In addition, the design calls for mountable curbs separating the LRT guideway from mixed traffic, allowing emergency vehicle crossing, but discouraging illegal crossings by motorists.

Response EngRW-015. Emergency vehicles will have the ability to pre-empt the traffic control signal systems for both automobiles and LRT. The roadway safety channelization and protection treatments will be designed to discourage automobiles and pedestrians from crossing the tracks except in legally permitted areas. Further details are described in Section

2.2, Section 3.7, and Section 6.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngTI-014. Concerns about traffic impacts to Pascal and Hamline Avenues (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0470) EngTI-16

The third goal is "Transportation and Mobility," and one objective listed is to "Expand opportunities for all users to move freely to, through, and within the Central Corridor. Building LRT on University Avenue will not meet this goal for residents of my neighborhood. With LRT, no one will be permitted to cross University Avenue except at signalized intersections, and the signalized intersection at Albert Street will be removed. The traffic counts for that intersection were done in 2001, which was when there was a vacant K-Mart store to the southwest of this intersection. Since that time, a Wal-Mart store opened in the former K-Mart location which greatly alters the traffic pattern for this intersection. All traffic for this intersection will be routed onto two nearby streets - 75% of the traffic will go to Hamline and the remaining 25% will go to Pascal. Even using 2001 data, the level of service (LOS) for both of these intersections will be reduced with LRT (see table 6.1-4 on page 6-11 of DEIS). Pascal will go from LOS B to C, while Hamline will go from C to E! These calculations do not take into account the increase in traffic since Wal-Mart opened. The bottom line for anyone who wants to cross University Avenue on either Hamline or Pascal is that it will take a whole lot longer than it does now. This reduction in mobility limits free movement through this portion of the Central Corridor, and clearly doesn't meet the objective to expand opportunities for all users. The DEIS clearly states on page 3-22, paragraph 3, "The movement of LRT vehicles through intersections will present an additional vehicular barrier to pedestrians and bicyclists... II This is not acceptable to our community.

Response EngTI-014. The Preferred Alternative demonstrates the highest ridership, lowest cost, and best ability to qualify for Federal funding. Vehicles will be able to cross University Avenue at signalized intersections, spaced at approximately 1/4 mile intervals, including Pascal and Hamline Avenues. Using updated traffic counts (2007), congestion is expected to increase in the area with or without the LRT project. The LOS at Pascal and University Avenues is expected to change from LOS "B" to LOS "C" in 2030. The LOS at Hamline and University Avenues is expected to change from LOS "D" to LOS "E" in 2030. There are several strategies that may be employed to help mitigate these impacts. The new signal control systems and track systems will be integrated to provide extended "green" signal times to promote the efficient movement of trains along the corridor, while minimizing disruption to automobile traffic. The lengthening of turning lanes for some intersections may also be incorporated. Further details are described in Section 2.2 and Section 6.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-102. Pre-empting signal cycles will cause major congestion problems (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) PlaTP-110

The City of Saint Paul is firm in asserting that LRT trains will not be able to pre-empt signal cycles, believing it is not necessary for smooth operations of LRT, yet if instituted would

cause major congestion issues. This is both an operational issue and a safety issue.

Response PlaTP-102. There are no plans for signal preemption in St. Paul. Signal timing along the corridor has been optimized to provide preference for LRT, extending the green cycle to allow an LRT train to pass through an intersection with preference while minimizing disruption to cross-street traffic.

Issue Summary PlaTP-136. Construct Greenway Park Drive Road before LRT (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0807) PlaTP-202

Three, the Greenway Park Drive Road which is proposed in the land planning process must be constructed before the Central Corridor construction begins.

Response PlaTP-136. The Greenway Park Drive Road is not a part of the Central Corridor LRT project.

Issue Summary ProPURP-006. Project must improve mass transit system for larger numbers of riders (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0271) ProPURP-020

The train on University and Washington Avenues replaces one limited-stop bus service, the #50. The relatively small number of limited-stop bus riders on University and Washington Avenues are the only current transit riders who could conceivably benefit from Mr. Wolsfeld's concrete project.

Response ProPURP-006. The current 2030 ridership projection for the Central Corridor LRT line is 42,170 average weekday boarding's.

Issue Summary SocSS-006. Project should include defined safety goals (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0549) SocSS-037

Plans for University LRT should include defined safety goals, agreed upon by the community. In areas of less traffic, retaining current levels of safety might be the goal. In more dangerous areas, the goal must be to achieve improved safety and a reduced number of accidents.

Response SocSS-006. Pedestrian safety of both the transit patron and area pedestrians all along the Central Corridor LRT is a concern. As described in Section 3.7 of the FEIS, system safety and security oversight for the Central Corridor LRT project would be achieved through Metropolitan Council implementation of the Safety and Security Management Plan (SSMP). The SSMP ensures that safety and security are considered when designing and constructing the project. The plan would also include requirements for development of a Metro Transit Security and Emergency Preparedness Plan (SEPP) to ensure continuation of

safety and security during Central Corridor LRT operations. Normal precautions for pedestrians would be specified in the SSMP and SEPP and would be overseen by the Metropolitan Transit Police.

Section: 6.2 - Report Clarifications Updates and Corrections

Issue Summary EngRW-017. Report corrections needed (4)

Comments:

(CCLRP0436) PlaTP-068

At a number of places throughout the document it is stated, "...shoulder lanes have been implemented on I-94." The wording "shoulder lanes" should be replaced with "bus-only shoulders." The shoulders used by buses are not lanes.

(CCLRP0436) PlaTP-176

• Pages 6-3, 6-4: Include updated information on the Hiawatha LRT.

(CCLRP0443) ProHLP-016

Section 6.6.2, page 6-40, LRT/BRT RAILROAD INTERFACE - This language should reflect the potential interface with the Red Rock Commuter Rail line near campus.

(CCLRP0443) ProPURP-032

Section/page/table is S.2.2, page 1-3, Jobs by Employment Centers - Employment projections for 2030 for the University of Minnesota are 20,000. Employment projections for the Westgate area are unknown to the University.

Response EngRW-017. Many of the corrections and suggestions in these comments have been incorporated into the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngTI-012. Need information on impacts and mitigation for major highway crossings (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0436) EngTI-14

Impacts to Trunk Highways - A potential at-grade crossing that should be identified in the DEIS is TH 5 in downtown St. Paul. The corridor also crosses Minnesota Trunk Highway (TH) 280. Mn/DOT would like to see information concerning both the impacts and mitigation at these locations.

Response EngTI-012. A traffic analysis has shown that intersections in downtown St. Paul continue to operate at an acceptable level-of-service with LRT. The TH 280 bridge will be retrofitted to accommodate LRT. See section 6.2 of the FEIS for further details.

Issue Summary EngTI-015. Need detailed traffic and signal analysis for downtown Minneapolis (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0457) EngTI-21

A detailed traffic and signal analysis must be performed for Downtown Minneapolis to ensure that the Central Corridor Line will not adversely impact the transportation grid.

Response EngTI-015. The frequency of trains in downtown Minneapolis will approximately double. The traffic signal timing will be redone as the City of Minneapolis plans to upgrade to a new signal controller system. The new signal control systems and track systems will be integrated to provide extended "green" signal times to promote the efficient movement of trains along the corridor, while minimizing disruption to automobile traffic. See section 6.2 of the FEIS for further details.

Issue Summary EngTI-016. Need analysis of traffic impact to nearby residential streets
(1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0545) EngTI-30

Preliminary engineering should also address the issues of how traffic can be controlled from spilling over into residential streets, endangering our children and degrading the quality of our neighborhoods.

Response EngTI-016. Traffic congestion is expected to increase in the area with or without the LRT project. Central Corridor LRT will cause some intersections to operate at a decreased level of service. There are several strategies that may be employed to help mitigate these impacts. The new signal control systems and track systems will be integrated to provide extended "green" signal times to promote the efficient movement of trains along the corridor, while minimizing disruption to automobile traffic. The lengthening of turning lanes for some intersections may also be incorporated. Additional "off-corridor" intersections were studied to determine impacts to various streets and intersections in local neighborhoods. Specific details are described in Section 6.2 of the FEIS. Neighborhood issues are discussed in section 3.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngTI-018. Concerns over impact of LRT on regional congestion and VMT (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0475) EngTI-34

p. S-22 LRT alternative removes 2,000 daily automobile trips out of baseline 544,050 or only 0.37%. LRT alternative removes 2,200 daily VMT out of 23,815,800 or 0.0092%. Even 10 LRT lines would only remove 0.09%.

Response EngTI-018. The Preferred Alternative optimizes travel time for the LRT while meeting other goals as established for the overall project, as outlined in Chapter 1 of the FEIS. Updated numbers on the reduction in daily automobile and VMT are available in Section 4.10 and 6.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngTI-019. Need comparisons of expected average left turn waiting times to baseline waiting times (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0478) EngTI-35

(a) What is the maximum expected waiting time to make a left turn from University onto a north-south street during rush hour? Compare to Baseline.

(b) What is the maximum expected waiting time to make a left turn onto University Avenue from a north-south street during rush hour? Compare to Baseline.

Response EngTI-019. The Metropolitan Council's ESC performed an updated Synchro Analysis of the corridor in September 2008. The maximum expected waiting time to make a left turn from University onto a north-south street during rush hour (PM peak) in 2014 is 221.8 seconds from Westbound University onto Southbound Lexington. Under 2014 No-build conditions, this wait time is 70.9 seconds. The maximum expected waiting time to make a left turn from a north-south street onto University Avenue during rush hour (PM peak) in 2014 is 95.5 seconds from southbound Snelling Avenue to eastbound University Avenue. Under 2014 No-build conditions, this wait time is 91.0 seconds. See section 6.2 for further details.

Issue Summary EngTI-024. Should include Granary Road in analysis (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0457) EngEng-4

The City of Minneapolis supports the future construction of Granary Road through the SEMI redevelopment area. The benefits of Granary Road connecting to the Pierce Butler and Phalen corridors in St. Paul need to be better recognized as mitigation measure to traffic operations limitations and challenges along University Avenue created by Central Corridor LRT. The Granary corridor will provide operation and capacity relief to University Avenue and will provide a viable detour route as the project is constructed. This corridor has been designated as an A-minor Augmenter by the Metropolitan Council and will eventually connect I-35W to I-35E. An adjacent trail corridor will provide a direct regional connection between the Stone Arch Bridge and the Gateway Trail.

Response EngTI-024. The Granary Road project is part of the City of Minneapolis' Capital Improvement Project plans. The construction of Granary Road is not part of Central Corridor LRT mitigation. However, Metropolitan Council, the U of M, the City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and the HCRRA have agreed to commit to pursuing the full funding and completion of the project in the July 2008 Memorandum of Understanding, Mitigation measures in the U of M area have been identified in section 6.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-003. Need to update traffic impacts to downtown St. Paul streets (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) PlaTP-003

On p3-24, the Draft EIS asserts specific impacts on downtown streets; specifically Cedar Street and 4th Street: "Cedar Street between 7th and 5th Streets would be reduced to a single drive lane. 4th Street would be reduced from its current two-way traffic to a single lane with traffic moving west, and closed between Minnesota and Robert Streets at the station area." The City recommends that these findings need updating given potential changes in routing and station locations discussed earlier.

Response PlaTP-003. Traffic impacts in downtown St. Paul have been updated due to changes in station locations and configurations as noted in the SDEIS. Traffic impacts in downtown St. Paul are discussed in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-008. [Need to update the traffic analysis](#) (7)

Comments:

(CCLRP0436) PlaTP-008

Page 6-4: The traffic volumes and geometry were collected in 2001. We suggest there needs to be a statement to assist those looking for any updated information on changes since 2001.

(CCLRP0436) PlaTP-009

Page 6-11: The Level of Service (LOS) "existing" analysis is 5 years old (page 6-10). We question whether the University/Snelling intersection existing (2001) LOS is/was LOS C in the PM peak.

(CCLRP0436) PlaTP-135

Traffic Data/Operational Assessment - The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) numbers are not current. The (DEIS) states that Lexington is more heavily traveled than Snelling. Traffic counts from 2004 (the most recent counts available) indicate otherwise. Snelling's ADT is 43,000 south of University Avenue, and 40,000 north of University. In contrast Lexington Avenue (a Ramsey County road) is 25,000 ADT north of University Avenue and 31,000 south of University.

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-155

Traffic Operation Report - The University recommends that the Central Corridor update the April 5, 2002 Traffic Operations Report during the PE and FEIS preparation.

(CCLRP0436) PlaTP-157

Mitigation - Section 6.1.6, page 6-19: Discusses mitigation measures and states, "however, no analysis of improvements or mitigation is intended to be conducted for the DEIS." Rather, such analysis is to be put off to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). This section should mention the ongoing/current additional capacity analysis of the Snelling/University Ave. intersection (see earlier comment). The traffic mitigation analysis for the FEIS needs to be developed in coordination with the Mn/DOT Metropolitan District.

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-160

Section 6.1.3, page 6-10, Existing Traffic Analysis, More current traffic volumes should be used rather than 2001. The University recommends that the Central Corridor update the April 5, 2002 Traffic Operations Report during the PE and FEIS preparation.

(CCLRP0407) PlaTP-228

The City of Saint Paul recommends that detailed traffic operations analyses be done for each major intersection and reserves approval of the approach until these analyses are completed to the City's satisfaction during Preliminary Engineering. Such analyses should include the demand for left turning movement and determine the length of left turn lanes accordingly.

Response PlaTP-008. The data for the traffic analysis was updated to include the latest information available and incorporates changes as a result of the Preferred Alternative. See Chapter 6 of the FEIS for details.

Issue Summary PlaTP-072. Clarify traffic modeling done for Washington Avenue Bridge (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0436) PlaTP-260

Alternative Analysis - Section 2.3 (Alternatives): This section does not explain whether a new bridge across the Mississippi River will be needed in the Washington Avenue area, or whether LRT or BRT will operate on the existing Washington Avenue Bridge. Constructing a new bridge will be expensive, and will likely have many other hurdles. However, placing LRT on the existing bridge will reduce traffic capacity from an important river crossing, presumably forcing traffic onto other roadways, such as I-94 and I-35W. It is unclear if a new bridge or reduced capacity of the existing was considered in the traffic modeling.

Response PlaTP-072. The existing Washington Avenue Bridge will be used to operate Central Corridor LRT, with the two rail tracks in the center of the bridge and one automobile lane in each direction remaining on the outside lanes. Traffic analyses have been completed based on these changes to the bridge and looking at the impact of changing patterns generally at the University of Minnesota East Bank area. Information on these analyses is included in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-101. Check ADT values used between TH 280 and Lexington (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0436) PlaTP-107

Page 6-13: The baseline 2020 ADTs for University Ave between TH 280 and Lexington, including the area at Snelling Ave, appear low. Also, all the ADT's are the same (29,700).

Response PlaTP-101. In the FEIS, traffic forecasts were updated to account for proposed changes in the locally Preferred Alternative and to provide forecasts for 2030 volumes. This information is provided in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Section: 6.2 - Congestion

Issue Summary EngRW-002. Concerns in regard to disruption of traffic by LRT (9)

Comments:

(CCLRP0132) EngRW-5

I dread it in the future is the LRT has highest priority and everyone else waits and waits and waits. This problem has yet to be solved with the Hiawatha Line. 4. I'm uncertain about the effect that the LRT will have on automobile traffic-it certainly will not be eliminated. How will left and turns be handled--now, except for delays it's not too bad.

(CCLRP0104) EngRW-10

My second comment is related to this, and concerns the increase in the number of intersections operating at lower standards with the implementation of the proposed LRT line. I certainly hope that this can be improved. I believe that the off-the-record fashion in which the anticipated traffic problems on Hiawatha Avenue was handled is not necessary for this project-the success of the Hiawatha Line has shown that traffic does not need to be impeded to result in high ridership. All efforts should be aimed toward improving the flow of traffic to increase the total number of people who can move through the corridor, rather than simply forcing people to change modes.

(CCLRP0484) EngRW-13

Good timing of lights and LRT to minimize disruption of traffic crossing the LRT line: cars, bikes, pedestrians.

(CCLRP0473) EngRW-14

I have also witnessed how much traffic is impacted by light-rail trains between the airports and Mall of America. Cars and buses can be left waiting at traffic signals quite a long time because light rail is moving through the area. Believe me the impact to "normal" traffic patterns at Lexington, Dale and Rice would be great, particularly during rush hour. The impact to Snelling traffic would be enormous at nearly anytime of the day, not just rush hour. At State Fair time; forget it. During that time, the traffic on Snelling can be so bad that light-rail trains moving through University would just exacerbate it.

(CCLRP0130) EngRW-17

A related matter of cost that is not addressed in the DEIS summary is the effect of signal prioritization on traffic. This was a major hidden cost of the Hiawatha project that was kept out of the sight of the public until after the project had been improved. The result was an increase in delays, fuel consumption and emissions at intersections along Hiawatha. These things have economic value and should be included in any project evaluation. This is especially important, since the DEIS identified 34 signalized intersections along the Central Corridor route that could potentially be affected by either of the build alternatives.

(CCLRP0927) EngRW-18

Regarding Central Corridor, my concern is traffic congestion and traffic going perpendicular to University Avenue.

(CCLRP0038) EngRW-20

7. Blocking of cross streets due to LRT. 8. Elimination of left turns at key intersections.

(CCLRP0287) EngRW-24

To summarize for your 'environment impact' concerns: If you don't stop at intersections with traffic, you will make crossing University Avenue virtually a nightmare.

(CCLRP0075) EngRW-28

While the Hiawatha light rail line has been successful, that location is a very different set-up than University Avenue. For example, along Hiawatha Avenue, there are every few cross streets, often only one every 4 blocks or so. Despite this small number of crossings, there have been numerous issues with traffic congestion and confusion for the cross traffic along this rail line. University Avenue has hundreds more crossings than Hiawatha - driveways, businesses and schools that all access directly onto University Ave. The traffic snarls that would result from a light rail line would be ridiculous.

Response EngRW-002. Central Corridor LRT will run at-grade and be given signal priority along the entire alignment. The new signal control systems and track systems will be integrated to provide extended "green" signal times to promote the efficient movement of trains along the corridor, while minimizing disruption to automobile traffic. Left-turn lanes at signalized intersections will be maintained. Additional mitigation strategies, such as the lengthening of turning lanes for some intersections, may be incorporated. Further details are described in Section 2.2 and Section 6.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngRW-004. General Traffic Comments (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0050) EngRW-15

It would reduce traffic on our highways.

(CCLRP0443) EngRW-4

Section/page/table is S.3.1 page S-5: Bus congestion on the University campus only occurs with mixed traffic. The University's Transitway is very efficient.

(CCLRP0072) PlaTP-139

With the existing traffic and parking along University, there are strong technical challenges which can be met successfully by detailed planning and fore thought.

Response EngRW-004. Comment noted.

Issue Summary EngRW-005. Impact and mitigation for left turn lanes (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0532) EngRW-6

Left turn lanes need to accommodate more cars and the left turn light/arrow should be timed so as to allow more cars to turn.

(CCLRP0478) EngRW-9

Driving on University Avenue as well as on north-south streets near the University Avenue intersection will suffer substantially (especially at the crucial rush hour times, where left turns onto University Avenue, and left turns off of University Avenue will be greatly impeded by LRT.

(CCLRP0532) EngRW-21

There must be left turn lanes at the main intersections where there are currently left turn lanes (Lexington, Victoria, Dale, Western and Rice).

Response EngRW-005. Existing left-turn lanes will be maintained along the corridor. Possible mitigation strategies include lengthening of some left-turn lanes and signal timing optimization. In addition to maintaining existing lights and turn lanes, the project will add 7 lights and extend the length of turn lanes. All left turn lanes will have green arrows instead of yield on green. Further details are described in Section 2.2 and Section 6.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngRW-008. Community Advisory Committee (CAC) to help overcome potential project issues (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0485) EngRW-11

1. Traffic Congestion - Besides cars being backed up along north/south routes, school buses transporting students to nearby educational facilities will also get backed up. Also, emergency vehicles within the area would have a reduced response time getting across University Avenue due to the frequency of LRT travel times. As a mitigation alternative, synchronize traffic lights to prevent excessive back up. Ensure the early creation of a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) to help design ways of overcoming these adverse affects. Recruit those from the impacted EJ community to serve on the CAC.

Response EngRW-008. The new signal control systems and track systems will be integrated to provide extended "green" signal times to promote the efficient movement of trains along the corridor, while minimizing disruption to automobile traffic. Additional mitigation strategies, such as the lengthening of turning lanes for some intersections, may be incorporated. Emergency vehicles will have the ability to pre-empt the traffic control signal systems for both automobiles and LRT. The Community Advisory Committee was created in January 2007, and has talked about traffic studies. Further details are described in Section 2.2 and Section 6.2 of the FEIS. Community outreach activities are described in Chapter 11 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngRW-011. Concerns about impacts to traffic and safety (7)

Comments:

(CCLRP0531) EngRW-12

University Avenue plans for light rail must continue to provide for semaphores at all intersections where they currently exist so as to maintain the current level of opportunity for pedestrian and vehicular use of those intersections.

(CCLRP0741) EngRW-19

It would interfere with local traffic and even pedestrians trying to cross the street.

(CCLRP0939) EngRW-22

If it is truly going to be a local mode of transportation, then there needs to be mobility across University.

(CCLRP0086) EngRW-31

10. In Minneapolis, access across the rails is limited to certain areas, how would this work in busy residential areas (Rice St. to Snelling Ave.)?

(CCLRP0940) EngRW-32

Crossing Hiawatha is pretty much unbearable right now and I would hate to see more limited north south access in St. Paul. It is already very difficult.

(CCLRP0143) SocSS-39

Intersection after intersection with lights and gates makes University Ave too crowded and would only detract from University Ave's, safety record.

(CCLRP0899) SocSS-46

What are we going to do about increased traffic and public safety?

Response EngRW-011. Section 6.3 of the FEIS reports that the Central Corridor LRT uses a fixed-guideway with semi-exclusive rights-of-way allowing vehicular cross street traffic at signalized intersections only. Traffic signals will be located at approximately 1/4 mile intervals along the corridor. The new signal control systems and track systems will be integrated to provide extended "green" signal times to promote the efficient movement of trains along the corridor, while minimizing disruption to automobile traffic. Additional mitigation strategies, such as the lengthening of turning lanes for some intersections, may be incorporated. Pedestrian crossings will be possible at most signalized and unsignalized intersections, approximately every block or 1/8 mile. The current configuration of University Avenue poses a barrier to pedestrian movements. Adding LRT would not degrade conditions further. Incorporating desired system elements such as non-signalized pedestrian crossings and secondary station platform access would provide clearly defined crossing areas and connections along the corridor, enhancing the overall pedestrian environment and promoting community cohesion. Additionally, various safety treatments and/or landscaping may be installed to hinder pedestrian movement outside of legal crossing areas. Each of these design elements would improve pedestrian safety.

Issue Summary EngRW-014. Concerns about increased traffic congestion and related issues (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0878) EngEng-7

What light rail will do is it will cause additional congestion and parking issues and noise that will ripple into the surrounding residential areas.

(CCLRP0154) EngRW-26

In SE Minneapolis, two turning movements should be eliminated by allowing the train to remain on University Avenue east of Washington Avenue.

(CCLRP0185) EngRW-30

This leads me to my biggest concern regarding the impacts of a line along University Avenue as currently identified in preliminary engineering: its ROW with traffic, encountering numerous cross-streets and controlled intersections, with tightly spaced stations attempting to serve everyone along the route are sure-fire limitations on the success of the line.

(CCLRP0078) EngRW-33

Would cause increased traffic congestion through University of Minnesota and along University Avenue unless it is Subway.

(CCLRP0067) SocSS-53

Light rail should be separated from street traffic to avoid conflicts and accidents, and to make LRT faster.

Response EngRW-014. The Preferred Alternative alignment was determined while weighing a considerable number of options and factors. The proposed alignment represents the optimal combination of supporting the project objectives of economic opportunity and investment, the preservation and enhancement of communities, regional goals for cleaner air and water, a safer and healthier environment, and mobility. See Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 for additional details. Traffic impacts are discussed in Chapter 6 of the FEIS. The new signal control systems and track systems will be integrated to provide extended "green" signal times to promote the efficient movement of trains along the corridor, while minimizing disruption to automobile traffic. Additional mitigation

strategies, such as the lengthening of turning lanes for some intersections, may be incorporated.

Issue Summary EngTI-001. Concerns in regard to traffic congestion and access (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0482) EngTI-1

5) There will be major increases in congestion along University Avenue - The county's predictions predict an afternoon rush hour backup from Rice Street to Prior Avenue with only two or three short blocks free of backup. And that's only considering backups of AT LEAST 1,000 feet (50 cars.) The backup at Marion Street alone is 3/4 mile. They predict an additional congestion loss of 1,830 hours to vehicles caused by LRT in just one hour. Some intersections are predicted to have extra delays of at least an hour PER VEHICLE. 6)

Diversion of buses to LRT - This can be a major problem to those with mobility issues. A blind bus rider living on Cedar south of 38th Street in Minneapolis used to be able to take a single bus straight downtown. When the LRT started running, Metro Transit diverted every other bus at 38th Street to boost LRT ridership. Riders could have transferred to the 38th Street bus if they wanted to get to the LRT.7) LRT blocks the Avenue - The county's DEIS says that pedestrians, bike riders, and vehicles will only be allowed to cross the tracks at "designated signalized intersections" while not saying anything about whether this mean EVERY signalized intersection. If you are two blocks east of University at Chatsworth, you would have to walk to Lexington or Victoria, cross the Avenue, and then walk back to Chatsworth. In many cases, it will take a 1/2 mile walk to cross University Avenue. This will cut down on drive-up customers for businesses. Traffic that used to cross the Avenue or turn left across it will need to go further down the Avenue to the next traffic signal and make a U-turn and then drive back. Wasted time and fuel, increased pollution, also more exposure to accidents due to the U-turns.

Response EngTI-001. Traffic congestion is expected to increase in the area with or without the LRT project. The Preferred Alternative will cause some intersections to operate at a decreased level of service. There are several strategies that may be employed to help mitigate these impacts. The new signal control systems and track systems will be integrated to provide extended "green" signal times to promote the efficient movement of trains along the corridor, while minimizing disruption to automobile traffic. The lengthening of turning lanes for some intersections may also be incorporated. There will be very minor changes to the bus system in the Central Corridor. Route 16 service would be reduced from 10 minute peak-period headways to 20 minutes (peak) and from 20 minute off-peak headways to 30 minutes. Route 50 service would be eliminated but would essentially be replaced and enhanced with Central Corridor LRT operations. Vehicles will be able to cross University Avenue at signalized intersections, spaced at approximately 1/4 mile intervals. Pedestrians will be permitted to cross at 1/8 mile intervals, which is nearly every intersection. Further details are described in Section 2.2, 6.1 and 6.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngTI-004. [General concerns about traffic congestion](#) (7)

Comments:

(CCLRP0763) EngRW-27

Interstate 94 and University Avenue have become increasingly congested and trips between the two cities can be very undependable and vary in time depending upon what the traffic is of the day. I should know. I've missed meetings or I've been late just because of it.

(CCLRP0909) EngTI-9

I also wanted to say that I live about a mile from the corridor. I have a chance to drive through this corridor every day back and forth to work and the periods of congestion are getting longer and longer in the corridor; and as we think about 20 years from now, this is an investment that's going to be looked back at as a very smart investment.

(CCLRP0868) EngTI-18

The huge amount of time lost in commuting in traffic is becoming more and more unacceptable to businesses trying to make a location or relocation decision.

(CCLRP0752) EngTI-24

There's a profound difference between Hiawatha Avenue and University Avenue. Hiawatha line is rapid transit. It causes problems for cross traffic and automobiles at intersections, but in the distance between Lake Street and Highway 62 there are eight stoplights. On University, which is a busy city street unlike Hiawatha, there are 25 stoplights in between Huron and Rice Street and there are many additional intersections without lights, at least that many more.

(CCLRP0476) EngTI-29

The Twin Cities faces severe traffic problems. Traffic gridlock dominates as busy productive people waste time each morning and evening in longer and longer traffic jams. The Hiawatha rail line was an effort to solve this problem. It is considered a success because there are more passengers than originally anticipated. However, traffic gridlock has not been reduced and very few passengers arriving or departing from the airport and very few shoppers at the Mall of America use it. Really, honestly, this is not success.

(CCLRP0240) EngTI-33

I drive I-94 each day (Golden Valley to Downtown St. Paul). I don't know what will happen if this stretch continues to become more congested and am very concerned about this.

(CCLRP0445) EngTI-46

While it is true that there is a lot of traffic on the roads between the two downtown cities, this traffic does not terminate at Minneapolis or St. Paul. Rather, the traffic continues and goes THROUGH the downtown cities. Therefore, there is little likelihood that an

LRT route will reduce traffic because few people will be inclined to climb on a train that terminates at a location short of their destination.

Response EngTI-004. The Preferred Alternative selected is consistent with and supports the transportation goals and objectives of the Central Corridor LRT project. The Preferred Alternative will improve the transportation system by providing the Central Corridor with more travel choices and faster travel times between residential areas, major destinations, and employment centers.

Issue Summary EngTI-010. Concerns that LRT will cause more congestion and pollution (19)

Comments:

(CCLRP0895) EngTI-7

Read the DEIS and it says there's less than a half a percent change in pollution by their own forecasts. They say less congestion. It says more congestion.

(CCLRP0878) EngTI-11

Light rail will not reduce the congestion on University Avenue and the EIS admits as much.

(CCLRP0895) EngTI-12

It forecasts that during one hour of the rush hour that people in vehicles will lose 1830 hours due to delay in the congestion that will stretch from Robert Street all the way back to Prior with only a couple blocks left open.

(CCLRP0038) EngTI-17

2. Traffic backups due to congestions caused by LRT.

(CCLRP0772) EngTI-19

My other concern is that the environmental impact study is rather vague on the impact upon traffic, both traffic along University and the traffic that has to cross University, and I would hope that the final version allows more information on that, particularly the 100-pound gorilla of the route, what happens at University and Snelling.

(CCLRP0001) EngTI-20

Traffic Congestion concerns me too. The video shown at Central was misleading. It showed only one train running silently and peacefully. No cars nor pedestrians were shown. Be real - show what it will be like with two trains running, one going east and one going west, and insert the multiple automobiles that will be traveling at the same time.

(CCLRP0038) EngTI-22

On page 7-11, LRT is said to "reduce auto congestions while improving air quality and reducing noise". How does removing 2 to 3 lanes of traffic in the middle of a busy street "reduce congestion"? LRT will cause more congestion and pollution on University Ave. due to crowding and traffic back up. Also, on busy cross streets like Snelling & Lexington, the backups will be horrendous. Some of the auto traffic will leave University and go south 2 blocks to I94 and make the freeway more congestive and polluted.

(CCLRP0018) EngTI-23

Finally, I want to make sure congestion along University does not increase. Those who live nearby need to get across and along University often.

(CCLRP0436) EngTI-25

Appendix 9.8: Traffic Operations Report, pages 4 and 5 roadway segments (table 2) and intersections (table 3): Table 2 shows that 5 out of the 14 roadway segments listed have a decrease in the level of service between the baseline and LRT. Table 3 shows that 15 out of 34 listed intersections have a decrease in level of service between the baseline and LRT. Mitigation measures are mentioned on page 6. It appears that these mitigation measures have not been applied to the levels of service mentioned in the tables. The Hiawatha LRT resulted in some substantial problems for vehicle traffic operations on Hiawatha Avenue. It would appear that the LRT alternative will likely increase vehicle traffic congestion in the corridor, similar to Hiawatha. The Hiawatha experience needs to be reflected in the study.

(CCLRP0428) EngTI-26

1) Traffic impacts are our greatest concern for this project. The DEIS indicates that relieving congestion could be a benefit from this project, yet both build alternatives will result in a worsening of intersection Level of Service (LOS).

(CCLRP0407) EngTI-27

TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS (Section 6) - There are numerous issues related to transportation impacts that must be detailed in Preliminary Engineering. In particular, congestion at critical intersections need further detailed "level of service" analyses to ensure that traffic issues and traffic conflicts with LRT operations will not lead to unacceptable levels of congestion and accidents.

(CCLRP0780) EngTI-28

The congestion is getting worse almost per second in a day-to-day way and it needs to be addressed. I noticed one of your graphics shows that you're anticipating a 70-minute travel time between the two downtowns. That's unacceptable and that has to be addressed.

(CCLRP0263) EngTI-31

What would be done to alleviate the backup of traffic along north/south roads such as Snelling, Hamline and Lexington?

(CCLRP0132) EngTI-32

In short, it seems to me that there has not been an overall traffic analysis, but rather a decision that there be LRT, and hopefully the other concerns re traffic and pedestrians can somehow be resolved.

(CCLRP0287) EngTI-37

Back to University Ave: Everywhere one wants to go north of there from I-94 requires crossing University! If your light rail works the same there as on Hiawatha it will ruin it for people that want to cross University Ave! I heard that one of your plans is to have the light rail stop at stop lights like regular traffic; this would reduce/eliminate the problem of crossing University. (Whew!) But since plans often/usually change, I have no faith that this is what 'we' will end up with.

(CCLRP0020) EngTI-40

2. North South traffic will be worse than the East West congestion on Hiawatha. A five minute wait is not unusual at a light on Hiawatha Ave. Imagine the future congestion at Snelling, Lexington, Dale.

(CCLRP0839) EngTI-41

As far as congestion, it has been documented extensively in the EIS that light rail will increase congestion.

(CCLRP0236) EngTI-44

I would like to give my opinion on the Central Corridor transit project. I am a U of M student who might not use it. One of my concerns is how the favored rail line would affect traffic,

particularly along University Ave. I have seen that the intersection of University and Snelling is busy as is and I believe a light rail line would only make it worse. I have ridden the Hiawatha Line and I noticed traffic getting slowed up at the places where the line crosses.

(CCLRP0475) EngTI-47

p. 6-11 At 13 intersections LOS is worse with LRT. Only at 2 is LOS better and 1 of those is due only to removal or restricted turn movements.

Response EngTI-010. Traffic congestion is expected to increase in the area with or without the LRT project. Central Corridor LRT will cause some intersections to operate at a decreased level of service. There are several strategies that may be employed to help mitigate these impacts. The new signal control systems and track systems will be integrated to provide extended "green" signal times to promote the efficient movement of trains along the corridor, while minimizing disruption to automobile traffic. The lengthening of turning lanes for some intersections may also be incorporated. The current configuration of University Avenue poses a barrier to pedestrian movements. Adding LRT would not degrade conditions further. Incorporating desired system elements such as non-signalized pedestrian crossings and secondary station platform access would provide clearly defined crossing areas and connections along the corridor, enhancing the overall pedestrian environment and promoting community cohesion. Further details are described in Section 6.2 and 6.3 of the FEIS. Impacts to air quality is discussed in section 4.5 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngTI-020. Concerns about Washington Avenue Bridge Congestion (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0104) EngTI-38

The first comment is with regard to the Mississippi River crossing on the Washington Avenue Bridge. It is my understanding that the rail option will use a dedicated ROW on the bridge, consuming one traffic lane in each direction. I do not believe that the effects of reducing the roadway capacity of this thoroughfare have been adequately addressed.

Response EngTI-020. An analysis of reducing traffic on the Washington Avenue Bridge to one lane in each direction showed traffic would still operate at acceptable levels of service in many areas. Mitigation commitments have been made to address intersection capacity issues for the U of M area. See Chapter 2 and Section 6.2 of the FEIS for further details.

Issue Summary EngTI-021. Concerns about traffic impacts to University Avenue S.E. (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0195) EngTI-39

Running LRT or Bus Transit on University Avenue S.E. between Bedford and Washington Ave. S.E. will be disastrous for Prospect Park. University Avenue narrows from 6 lanes in St. Paul to 4 lanes between Bedford Street S.E. & Washington Ave. S.E. If you run the LRT or Bus Transit lanes in this portion of Univ. Avenue, this will remove 2 car lanes, thus reducing car lanes to one direction each way. This will be disastrous for this portion of

University Avenue S.E. Traffic on University Avenue S.E. is heavy during daily rush hour handling student and staff traffic as well as neighborhood traffic, buses, bicycles, and trucks going to the truck yards, offices, and industrial sites north of University at Malcolm. Can you imagine the traffic after University events heading east on University Avenue with one lane each way? Gopher football games, Northrup concerts, state tournaments generate huge quantities of traffic!

Response EngTI-021. The Preferred Alternative will run down the center of University Avenue, which will continue to have two lanes of through traffic in each direction. The Preferred Alternative will improve the transportation system by providing the Central Corridor with more travel choices and faster travel times between residential areas, major destinations, and employment centers. The design of the LRT is discussed in Section 2.2 of the FEIS. An analysis of future traffic on Franklin Avenue as a result of closing Washington Avenue to vehicular traffic was conducted as part of the overall analysis of traffic impacts. Traffic volumes on the Franklin Avenue Bridge were anticipated to total 13,830 with Washington Avenue closed to traffic in comparison to volumes of 12,630 under no build conditions, for a total increase of 1,200 cars per day. On the segment of Franklin Avenue near between Curfew and Eustis, it was anticipated that traffic volumes

would increase by 560 vehicles per day, or from a total of 13,180 under no build conditions to a total of 13,740 with Washington Avenue closed to vehicular traffic.

Issue Summary EngTI-022. Impact on recent progress made to enhance downtown St. Paul (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0185) EngTI-43

The interference with existing traffic has already been identified in the DEIS with an overwhelming increase of LOS D operations along the University Avenue alignment. Effectively reducing mobility along the corridor both during construction and assuredly during operations certainly does not enhance TOD as an economically-viable opportunity; this phenomenon is not exclusive to University Avenue per se but also at particular points in downtown St. Paul, which should be considered highly detrimental since this would undermine the significant progress made there to enhance the downtown area.

Response EngTI-022. A Synchro analysis performed by the Metropolitan Council's ESC in September 2008 revealed that all of the intersections studied would operate at an acceptable LOS in 2030 under the Preferred Alternative. Only three out of the 24 intersections studied would operate at LOS "D" in 2030. For urban areas, LOS "D" is considerable acceptable. The Preferred Alternative is expected to have positive effects on commercial and residential development located near transit stations. It is anticipated that the Preferred Alternative will contribute economic benefits by encouraging and supporting higher-density residential and commercial land uses around transit stations. It is expected that new development around station areas in the downtown St. Paul would also capture an increasing share of residential and employment growth as densities increase. Further details are described in Section 6.2 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTE-015. Concerns in regard to traffic impacts (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0475) PlaTE-176

p. 6-19 Claims that "traffic generated by the station sites through automobile access can be expected to be negligible" is contradicted by the experience of Hiawatha LRT.

Response PlaTE-015. Traffic impacts of the Central Corridor LRT project are discussed in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTE-026. Concerns about impact on intersections (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0425) PlaTE-7

We also spend a lot of time and money in our neighborhood businesses, so we are worried about running a train down the middle of University Ave. and disrupting the busiest intersection in Minnesota near our home.

Response PlaTE-026. Economic Impacts to businesses are discussed in Chapter 5 of the FEIS. Traffic impacts of the Central Corridor LRT project are discussed in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-022. Traffic impact at Lexington Ave and Snelling Ave intersection (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0927) PlaTP-024

My suggestion would be to instead of having stops at Lexington and Snelling, is to have a stop one block east of Lexington, so it is not causing congestion on Lexington Avenue, and one block west of Snelling Avenue. Of course, it would be nice to have the trains go over or under the traffic, so as to decrease congestion.

Response PlaTP-022. The Preferred Alternative includes LRT running at-grade along University Avenue, as it best meets the purpose and need and goals for the project, while also qualifying for federal funding. Stations located at high-volume intersections were designed as split-side platforms in order to provide for left-turn lanes and to avoid / minimize any negative traffic impacts at these locations. Keeping stations close to major intersecting bus routes will increase passenger convenience and ease of transfer.

Issue Summary PlaTP-087. Concerns about cross traffic congestion (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0472) PlaTP-078

Yes, light rail can make a great modern backbone of metro transit, bringing new vitality and benefits for businesses and residents. And the Hiawatha Avenue line is generally a big success, but we should learn from its poorly planned grade level intersections. Trains have

priority at the Hiawatha intersections, badly hanging up the crosswise auto traffic, especially during rush hours. But at least the line is rapid transit between Cedar-Riverside and points south. And auto traffic on Hiawatha runs well, with two or more lanes in each direction and speed limits of 40 and 45 mph. There's a big difference between Hiawatha Avenue and University Avenue. Hiawatha is essentially a spacious divided highway. University is a congested major street lined with retail businesses and offices. Hiawatha, between Lake Street and Highway 62: 8 stop lights in 4 miles (6 full intersections and

2 tees). University, between Huron and Rice: 25 stop lights in 6.1 miles, plus many, many additional intersections.

Response PlaTP-087. Comment noted. Signal timing along the corridor has been optimized to provide preference for LRT, extending the green cycle to allow an LRT train to pass through an intersection with preference while minimizing disruption to cross-street traffic resulting in the fastest reasonable train times. Central Corridor LRT trains, unlike Hiawatha LRT which the commenter notes, will not be given signal pre-emption at intersections along the corridor. See section 6.2 of the FEIS for further details.

Issue Summary ProALT-017. Impact of LRT-favored signal timing on traffic congestion (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0480) ProALT-038

I have grave issues with the proposed alignment of the LRT, down the center of University Ave in Saint Paul, more so with the plan calling for traffic signals to not be timed in favor of the train. I understand the challenges associated with using existing rail corridors, but remain unconvinced that enough consideration has been put toward doing so. If we can't build an LRT capable of getting from Minneapolis to Saint Paul more efficiently than would a BRT, the BRT seems the right choice ...and that would not bode well for the future of Saint Paul, to my eyes.

Response ProALT-017. Signal timing along the corridor has been optimized to provide preference for LRT, extending the green cycle to allow an LRT train to pass through an intersection with preference while minimizing disruption to cross-street traffic resulting in the fastest reasonable train times. Central Corridor LRT trains will not be given signal pre-emption at most intersections along the corridor. See section 6.2 of the FEIS for further details.

Issue Summary ProPURP-004. Concern about how Central Corridor LRT will benefit traffic congestion. (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0086) ProPURP-250

Overall, new transit is a great idea, but running lines from north and south of the metro makes more sense with the majority of cars on either 35E or 35W headed into the metro areas. I fail to understand how the Central Corridor will reduce congestion with all the cars still feeding into the downtowns.

Response ProPURP-004. The Preferred Alternative will help in addressing highway congestion and improving air quality by offering an alternative mode of transportation.

Issue Summary SocEE-004. Concerns in regard to congestion, pollution, and noise (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0166) SocEE-7

1. LRT will provide options to increased auto congestion, pollution and noise on Interstate-94 and surrounding communities.

Response SocEE-004. Development and construction of the Preferred Alternative will provide an alternative means of transportation for persons traveling in Minneapolis and St. Paul. Chapter 6 of the FEIS identifies potential impacts to the existing transportation system.

Section: 6.2 - University of Minnesota

Issue Summary EngRW-013. Should re-route through traffic around University of Minnesota Campus (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0743) EngRW-25

The Coffman Union and the medical school and the mall are separated by four lanes of high-volume traffic, a very poor design for a major campus. One lane for local traffic and one for light rail in each direction, I believe, is the appropriate solution. Let's please develop plans for rerouting that through-traffic around campus, plans that all of us can see and review.

(CCLRP0743) EngTI-10

I support light rail as the high-volume and rapid backbone of a transit system and I've had experience in other cities with these type of systems and I highly support it, but I think we should use this golden opportunity to restore pedestrian safety and air quality to the University of Minnesota Campus by diverting through-traffic around campus.

Response EngRW-013. The Preferred Alternative specifies the conversion of Washington Avenue through the University of Minnesota's East Bank Campus into a pedestrian/transit mall. Central Corridor LRT will run at-grade in the center of Washington Avenue. Washington Avenue will be closed to automobile traffic between Pleasant Street and Walnut Street. Traffic will be diverted away from the center of campus in conjunction with a package of mitigation measures for the area. Further details are described in Section 2.2 and Section 6.2 of the FEIS.

Section: 6.3 - Effects on Other Transportation Facilities and Services

Issue Summary EngTI-011. Impacts on traffic and parking (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0522) EngTI-13

Furthermore, in the "Assessment of Traffic Impacts at Station Locations" (Section 6.1.5), the conclusion that there will be "a minimal amount of new traffic" at the proposed LRT stations because of "limited opportunities for parking or drop-off facilities" (6-19) is very problematic, and as an essentially unproven claim, is not justification for failing to complete a traffic impact study at each station. The existence of "limited opportunities for parking and drop-off facilities" may not deter automobile transportation to LRT stations, and the DEIS bears the burden of proving that it will. This section of the DEIS also fails to address concerns that parking will increase in the residential areas off of University Avenue, where spaces will be available for those who wish to park and ride. Residents in these areas who own automobiles are worried that they will have difficulty parking during this time and have been shown little proof that their concerns are being adequately addressed.

Response EngTI-011. The traffic impact analysis studied intersections along the corridor as well as numerous "off-corridor" intersections. The results are reported in Section 6.2 of the FEIS. To address parking issues, the City of St. Paul is considering several strategies to manage parking for local businesses and minimize impacts to residential areas. These strategies include posting time limits or metering the remaining on-street parking on University Avenue to encourage turnover and discourage all-day parking, signing or metering the parking along the cross streets one block north and south of University Avenue, creating parking improvement districts and encouraging shared parking of vacant or underutilized existing parking lots. See Section 6.3 of the FEIS for further details.

Issue Summary PlaTE-028. Pedestrian waiting times (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0478) PlaTE-15

(a) What is the expected maximum amount of waiting time for a pedestrian waiting to cross the street at a busy intersection? (b) How does this compare with a Baseline estimate? (c) How will LRT affect the ability of the elderly and handicapped pedestrian to cross University Avenue?

Response PlaTE-028. An analysis and comparison of pedestrian waiting times for the baseline and build alternatives was not part of the study. However, given the expected improvements to the traffic signal system along the corridor with LRT, delays to pedestrians are not expected to be significantly different compared to the baseline alternative. The current configuration of University Avenue poses a barrier to pedestrians. The addition of LRT would not degrade conditions further. The development of the LRT will channel pedestrian movements to crossing locations at intersecting streets, where curb improvements and pedestrian refuge areas within the street will shield pedestrians and bicyclists from both

LRT vehicles and automobile traffic. Crossings will still be available throughout the corridor, at both signalized and non-signalized intersections, and the pedestrian channelization is intended to discourage mid-block crossings and improve pedestrian safety. Landscaping enhancements that may be included along the line such as trees or public furniture will also help to separate pedestrians from automobile traffic. As discussed in Section 6.3 of the FEIS, all pedestrian crossings will be designed in accordance with current design standards and ADA requirements to ensure access and mobility for all.

Section: 6.3 - Parking

Issue Summary EngCI-002. Impact on traffic and loss of parking space on University Avenue (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0081) EngCI-4

Maybe University Ave can keep one lane open on each side and create some parking on the parallel streets.

Response EngCI-002. University Avenue will continue to have two lanes of through traffic. The Preferred Alternative alignment is discussed in Section 2.2 of the FEIS. On street parking loss may be mitigated using several strategies, including signing the remaining on-street parking to short-term or metered parking to encourage turnover and discourage all-day parking, signing or metering the parking along the cross streets one block north and south of University Avenue, and encouraging the City to allow for off-street parking on two existing vacant parking lots near Pascal and St. Albans. A detailed discussion and parking analysis is provided in Section 6.3 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngCI-004. Impact on parking and traffic (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0271) EngCI-6

The parking and construction traffic mess on Washington Ave. will not be remedied by creating a bigger parking and construction mess.

Response EngCI-004. On street parking loss may be mitigated using several strategies, including signing the remaining on-street parking to short-term or metered parking to encourage turnover and discourage all-day parking, signing or metering the parking along the cross streets one block north and south of University Avenue, and encouraging the City to allow for off-street parking on two existing vacant parking lots near Pascal and St Albans. A detailed discussion and parking analysis is provided in Section 6.3 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngPG-001. Parking issues (82)

Comments:

(CCLRP0343) EngPG-2

Probably the biggest issue for us would be the loss of any on-street parking. If we lost ANY on-street parking for our customers, our business would suffer. In addition, on-street parking is especially convenient for customers with large trucks, semi's or trailers that frequent the restaurant. So often these people have nowhere to go because of parking constraints. With the area around the store being very industrial/commercial, this is a big issue.

(CCLRP0407) EngPG-3

In addition, Section 1.2.5 (P1-7) states that "[l]ack of parking limits growth. New housing and commercial projects continue to be built throughout the area to house all this growth. Further redevelopment in the downtown would cause additional pressure on already limited parking, reducing opportunity for additional development." ... Furthermore, lack of parking will not necessarily limit growth downtown since many new developments include accommodations for parking.

(CCLRP0905) EngPG-4

I also am concerned as a resident who lives three blocks from University Avenue and approximately six from the proposed Snelling Station that there are no park-and-ride facilities planned on this route and as we know from what happened on the Hiawatha Line, people drove to the route to get on at the local stations and then flooded the community with parking during the day and interrupting the lives of the residents and I don't want to see my street have a "You must have a permit to park here" sign up on it because then people can't come visit me easily either.

(CCLRP0038) EngPG-5

Following are a couple of specific items that will affect out business very negatively. Page 5-32 of the Environmental Impact Statement Draft states that the Snelling Ave LRT Station would "displace (all) on street parking spaces" (near the station). It also states that "the proposed station would result in a low impact". Low impact for whom?? A big chain business in the Midway marketplace that has 300 parking spaces? Our business, like so many unique locally owned small business's in the city depend on street parking for our customers, many of whom drive many miles to come to destination stores like ours. How does taking away our parking permanently, with no provision to replace it in the impact statement, result in "low impact" for us? Also, where are the supposed new riders for LRT going to park? Residential streets or private business parking lots like they do along the Hiawatha Line?

(CCLRP0655) EngPG-6

In addition, the reduction in street parking is a problem. As in many older neighborhoods, parking is limited, and as I understand, light rail services would eliminate on-street parking on one side of University Avenue. Since Raymond and University is a proposed stop, I would hope that additional parking for rail customers would be made available.

(CCLRP0470) EngPG-7

Residents of streets near University Avenue should not have to endure an increase in traffic and cars parked on their streets due to LRT/BRT, nor should they have to spend their money

on permit parking to protect themselves from this intrusion. A large number of the homeowners near University Avenue are from non-white ethnic minorities. The intrusion from the influx of LRT/BRT parking traffic would have a disproportionate negative impact on them without mitigation. Permit parking districts should be fully funded by Metro Transit as a part of the cost of running the LRT/BRT line, and dedicated parking areas must be provided at LRT/BRT stations.

(CCLRP0471) EngPG-8

The current LRT plans do not provide any parking near the stations. The assumption is that people will take a bus or walk to get to the stations. The streets near the stations along the Hiawatha line are choked with cars belonging to people who park there while using the LRT, and the same thing will happen in my neighborhood. The DEIS mentions permit parking as a method for local residents to protect their streets from this intrusion. My neighbors will end up paying twice - once in higher taxes to build the LRT, and then to pay for the permit parking district. If no parking areas are provided near the stations, then the cost to establish permit parking areas on residential streets near the stations should be borne by Metro Transit and treated as an ongoing operating cost.

(CCLRP0001) EngPG-10

I am very concerned about people living in the suburbs will come into our neighborhood and park their cars blocking our driveways and parking spaces near our homes as an inconvenience to us.

(CCLRP0475) EngPG-11

p. 1-9 Claims that rail transit can save on constructing parking are certainly not borne out by Hiawatha LRT. Parking was built for Hiawatha to increase ridership. Star Tribune has reported that people parking in neighborhoods is a problem where parking was not built. p. 6-36 On-street parking space removal. 660 out of 1,500 spaces will be removed in the Midway area or 44%. This will cause a hardship to small businesses, many of which are owned by minorities. 28 out of 50 spaces in the Capitol area will be removed or 56%. This will create a problem for citizens wanting to have their voice heard at the Legislature. A problem which was dismissed by the DEIS was that people will drive and park at stations in order to ride the train. This is already happening with Hiawatha LRT. But Hiawatha was put where houses had been torn down many years ago. Central Corridor is being shoe horned into the middle of a street. If you remove on street parking while creating a greater demand for it through LRT, this is more environmental injustice. People from the suburbs will come and park in neighborhoods, making it hard for residents to park in front of their own house. Metro Transit has a 50 cent fare zone that extends to the Rice Street station.. People are going to be parking near it to avoid paying for parking downtown, a situation exacerbated by LRT removing 121 on street parking spaces from downtown Saint Paul. With Hiawatha LRT, I hear my coworkers talking about driving south to park at LRT in order to ride it north into downtown Minneapolis to avoid downtown parking costs. They are using MORE gasoline in order to avoid parking costs. At Fort Snelling, my tax dollars are paying for "free parking" so people don't have to pay for parking in downtown Minneapolis, some of these ramps are municipal ramps. Why didn't they just make the parking cheaper there and then they wouldn't have to build the ramp at Fort Snelling or the LRT. Acquaintances outside of

work also speak of how nice it is to park at LRT and avoid parking in downtown Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0676) EngPG-12

The parking situation downtown St. Paul is tricky. The ramps are very pricey and although they offer Early Bird Specials, people who start work after 9am don't benefit by this and wind up paying a lot of money to park. - Currently, I start work at 9:30 and am parking at the Cathedral. While it's good exercise, I'm not sure about doing it in the winter. - It would be really nice to have the light rail here as another option for people like myself.

(CCLRP0084) EngPG-13

People shopping in the Midway and other areas on the route won't be slowed or frustrated in trying to reach their stores, and the parking stress will be minimized. There would still be parking available on University Street. Putting tracks on the street will likely reduce driving lanes and force city officials to ban parking on University, forcing more traffic and congestion on side streets in the neighborhoods.

(CCLRP0642) EngPG-14

Finally (for now), under objective 1B, LRT is graded higher than the Baseline with respect to parking even though page 6-37 indicates that it will result in the loss of over 800 on-street parking stalls. Since these are the stalls needed most by small establishments built prior to WWII, eliminating them will likely cause economic hardship to those businesses along the Avenue least able to withstand it.

(CCLRP0426) EngPG-15

I own Chocolat Celeste on University Avenue W and Highway 280 in St. Paul. My biggest concern will be the loss of parking. For a retailer parking is a big concern. At this point I already have customers that say the biggest problem coming to my store is the lack of parking. Light rail will take away the parking lane. No parking - no business. There needs to be some provisions for parking or alternative routing of the rail. My business will either have to move or close if the parking issue is not addressed.

(CCLRP0790) EngPG-16

So as you can see, on University parking has always been a major problem. So my question is when I was looking at the map I noticed that there is no parking site anywhere on the map so that we know where these light rail people are going to park a car when they get on the light rail because on University there's a major problem of towing cars because, again, there's not enough parking spaces; and this is -- business owners, they tow people's car if they don't park it at, you know, wherever they shop. And so basically I just know that University has always been -- parking has always been a major issue. There's a lot of towing and also I'm looking at the two lanes. Like you said, middle road. My point is right now we have parking issues. So having a light rail right in between it, I don't know where the customers are going to park their car. I mean even the light rail people getting in the light rail are going to park in the neighborhood because behind the stores these houses - they don't own a garage. They park all their cars on the side and in front of the sidewalks. So can you imagine any people getting light rail from this end going over to the other end, they have to park their car

somewhere. So I'm just telling you that parking, it's a major problem on University.

(CCLRP0104) EngPG-18

My final comment is with regard to park and ride facilities. These facilities should be given a strong emphasis, as they can provide increased ridership by encouraging multi-modal automobile and LRT/BRT transportation, as well as being beneficial to Midway-area businesses by encouraging people to patronize establishments in the area between transportation modes. One place that specifically comes to mind as beneficial would be the location of the former Snelling Ave. Garage, which would provide access to Snelling Ave, University Ave, and I-94, as well as access to numerous businesses. A park-and-ride located here would help minimize the potential conflicts due to transit riders to park in lots belonging to businesses located near the station. While parking in the corridor is currently generalized as 'underutilized', I believe the success seen with the Hiawatha Line will reverse this drastically.

(CCLRP0038) EngPG-19

No provision for parking along the proposed LRT line. In fact, many spaces will be removed near the stations. (Lack of proper parking spaces in the number one complaint about the Hiawatha LRT line.

(CCLRP0470) EngPG-20

The plan as presented in the DEIS for both LRT and BRT do nothing to address parking issues. The assumption is that people will take a bus or walk to the stations. The current situation for the Hiawatha line indicates that this is not necessarily true. Streets near the stations have become clogged with cars belonging to commuters who drive to the stations and use LRT to avoid high parking costs in downtown Minneapolis. Dedicated parking for LRT users must be provided at stations so that nearby residential streets will not become de-facto park-and-ride lots for LRT.

(CCLRP0532) EngPG-21

When new commercial property is designed or existing commercial property is remodeled, .encourage placing parking at the back of the buildings or when feasible, underground.

(CCLRP0021) EngPG-22

Businesses along University will be hurt. No street parking. No off street designated parking. Neighborhood parking will not like additional cars. How about snow emergency days with parking on one side or I-94 emergency where traffic is routed to University?

(CCLRP0047) EngPG-23

In the case of businesses, adequate parking structures should be constructed by the city and RCRRD before the disruption of construction occurs.

(CCLRP0088) EngPG-24

Adequate parking needs to exist at and around the stops, for both riders and retail customers.

(CCLRP0532) EngPG-25

Parking is a continual concern for both the district's business patrons and its residents. We need to encourage parking that enhances the business district without reducing the availability of parking for neighborhood residents.

(CCLRP0488) EngPG-26

Parking Issues: A ramp should be built on Dunlap or near the White Castle for drivers to eliminate parking on residential streets. The residents love their community and want to stay. The ramp parking would eliminate residents having to walk several blocks and parking in different locations every night, especially when you have packages you need to carry such as several bags of groceries and other heavy items---residents don't want to be walking around all hours of the night to get these chores completed --especially if you are required to work late night shifts for your employment. This parking issue could become unsafe for residents for women and men. If a resident decides to go to an evening performance--a resident will have no place to park in the evening upon return--this becomes a quality of life issue. Residents do not want to become a prisoner in their home simply because if they move their vehicle, they may not find another parking space close to their home--this issue will create hardship in the winter months for parking. Walking long distances in the cold because you can't park in front of your home will cause problems for early morning drivers. In the winter months sidewalks are not always maintained thus creating a problem for residents walking in the street trying to avoid traffic because you can't park near your home. Sometimes during the very cold months the streets are very slippery--I have fallen myself during the snow emergency parking bans moving my own vehicle and walking in the street because of snow removal issues.

(CCLRP0406) EngPG-27

However, another aspect of park & ride are those who come from longer distances to ride the LRT. ... Should there be off-street parking accommodations for such patrons along Central Corridor? ... Some of the questions raised with respect to creating such parking are: • Who pays for the parking? • Does the creation of such parking encourage even more patrons to come into the neighborhoods to park and ride? • What is the optimal size of such facilities so that there is neither under use nor spillover use into the neighborhoods? • What are the "opportunity costs" for dedicating valuable real estate for such parking?

(CCLRP0180) EngPG-28

Residents on each side of the corridor are also concerned as to how they will park if light rail is constructed.

(CCLRP0313) EngPG-29

Park & Ride can not be a significant part of Central's success. The prime land nearest the stations is too valuable to be filled with cars for hours, and the area streets should not be more burdened with peak hour traffic.

(CCLRP0086) EngPG-30

7. To relieve congestion on I-94, where will drivers park their cars to allow ridership on the LRT? 8. Where are the Park-n-Ride lots slated?

(CCLRP0232) EngPG-31

I did not see discussion of "Park and Ride" facilities with the transportation alternatives for commuters using the system. Would 280 and 94 draw park and ride commuters? This appears to be missing from any planning and is a crucial link to the highway

(CCLRP0797) EngPG-32

It needs to be better planning to where you're going to park all these people because my understanding is you're going to have over 1,050 right at University Avenue and Lexington. Now you've got to have some parking. You're going to have to park somewhere, but it shouldn't change the quality of life for the people that live in the community. That's basically what I wanted to say.

(CCLRP0797) EngPG-33

I have no issues really so much with light rail, but I think that there's some things that we should take into consideration. The parking issues. They need to have some type of ramp built. There are several businesses on University Avenue where the car companies have closed. I mean perhaps purchasing some of that space for parking because you have real issues.

(CCLRP0063) EngPG-34

The Hiawatha LRT has taught us that park and ride lots along the route are important considerations to be made before construction. There is precious little discussion about traffic impacts at stations and in nearby neighborhoods in section 6.1.5. We can do better.

(CCLRP0271) EngPG-35

If the Minneapolis/St. Paul area hopes to ever develop a relatively clean, safe, energy-efficient and economical transportation system, the University of Minnesota is going to have to take its parking business elsewhere.

(CCLRP0485) EngPG-36

J. Parking - Park and Ride lots may take up valuable land or commuters from outside the area will take up street parking on the Avenue and in the neighborhood. Businesses patrons and residents will be prevented from accessing convenient parking spaces. EJ residents will have to bear the cost associated with paying for parking permits to keep commuter parking at bay. As a mitigation alternative, be sure to develop park and rides at destination points outside of EJ communities. If any will be deemed necessary, designate existing large-scale lots like the one at the Sears building. Do not saddle EJ communities with any costs associated with securing parking permits.

(CCLRP0018) EngPG-37

I also want to make sure that parking is provided along the route so people aren't parking on side streets.

(CCLRP0263) EngPG-38

Living one block north of University I have the following concerns: Will there be 'permit parking only' on neighborhood streets? The sooner the better, as people now use our street for parking as they commute. Will there be an attractive parking alternative? Would such convenient and attractive structures for those who park & ride be welcome?

(CCLRP0406) EngPG-39

Park and ride can also be a difficult issue. The City believes that excellent north/south bus service would provide adequate access to the Central Corridor from areas outside the Corridor, and eliminate the need for park & ride accommodations for non-local originations. Historically, the City has discouraged park & ride facilities. And many national land use and transit experts recommend that park & ride lots be at least 5 miles from downtowns.

(CCLRP0532) EngPG-40

Advocate restricting parking on neighborhood streets by limiting parking time during the day for nonresidents.

(CCLRP0466) EngPG-41

She suggested that on street parking on University Avenue be limited during rush peak period and dedicate those parking areas for high occupancy travel during those times and restore parking during non-peak periods,

(CCLRP0407) EngPG-42

Section 1.2.3 (p1-5) states that according to a 1998 study, downtown Saint Paul had a 2.340 parking space shortage. Two factors should be considered here. First, shortages of parking in downtown tend to be very localized and the west end of downtown. Second, parking supply/demand is a very fluid situation, depending upon office building occupancy and transit modal split.

(CCLRP0137) EngPG-43

Placement of park-n-rides - that they will be convenient and not force parking in adjacent neighborhoods.

(CCLRP0797) EngPG-44

Some of us are also very active in the community and if you go someplace in the evening -- say you go someplace like to a theater show at 8 o'clock. You get out maybe 10, 11 o'clock at night. Again, you're going to be walking around in high heels not being able to have a parking space in front of your home. Now that becomes a safety issue.

(CCLRP0406) EngPG-45

PARKING (Section 6.5) - Issues relating to parking will continue to be near the forefront of City concerns. Specifically, there are three distinct issues that have been identified with respect to parking and the LRT system: • Loss of on-street parking; • Park & Ride accommodations, if any; and • Appropriateness of additional off-street parking to meet current and future needs.

(CCLRP0460) EngPG-46

Parking is a major concern along with the related issue of cut-through traffic. ...and want to feel assured that they will be able to park their own cars near or at their homes.

(CCLRP0190) EngPG-47

The light rail project not create a parking burden for local businesses and residents. As a resident near Bedford and University, we already have a critical parking issue as new businesses are attracted to this immediate area and housing projects continue to develop. Many older homes on our winding streets do not have alleys, garages, or even driveways. Many lot sizes do not even provide the option of providing off street parking - we have no option but to park in the street. Commuters currently fill our streets as they drive to our neighborhood, park and ride the bus to the U of M and downtown Minneapolis. New local businesses are also creating parking demands on our small congested residential streets. As we have already seen, light rail will only compound this issue. It is important for the vitality of our neighborhood businesses and residents that parking issues be pro-actively addressed.

(CCLRP0101) EngPG-49

Eliminate all street parking - use space for bus lane and or bike lanes.

(CCLRP0136) EngPG-50

I want to be sure that issues concerning parking be addressed - park and ride locations; compensation for lost on-street parking; off-street parking.

(CCLRP0531) EngPG-51

The City should partner with small businesses to construct nearby off-street parking for those businesses to replace any loss of street parking caused by the construction of light rail.

(CCLRP0313) EngPG-52

If a park & ride would make sense anywhere in the Central Corridor, it would only be at Hwy. 280. Imagine that the existing parking ramp at Westgate would be expanded by at least 300 cars and the expansion would be for park & ride. Westgate Station would be the only station with a Park & Ride symbol next to it.

(CCLRP0178) EngPG-54

The DCC recommends that, whatever is done to accommodate access to businesses and to the system, nearby neighborhoods not be turned into nascent park-and-ride opportunities for commuting drivers. Parking restrictions should be marked and enforced to minimize impacts on residential areas flanking the corridor. Businesses along the Corridor should be encouraged to share off-street parking facilities and lots. The DCC opposes the placing of park-and-ride facilities inside the city boundaries of St. Paul and Minneapolis.

(CCLRP0892) EngPG-56

Successfully address the parking impacts as was alluded earlier and develop a mitigation plan for businesses along the corridor that ensures their survival.

(CCLRP0545) EngPG-57

That parking by commuters and cut-through traffic be minimized. We do not want to see our neighborhoods become parking lots for commuters.

(CCLRP0930) EngPG-58

I am calling because my concern for where the-how you are going to place the Metro Transit rail. It is a concern because it is really going to limit parking on University Avenue.

(CCLRP0406) EngPG-60

The City of Saint Paul generally wishes to continue discouragement of park and ride activities.

(CCLRP0152) EngPG-61

Concerns are: 1. Parking 6. Homeowner parking

(CCLRP0154) EngPG-62

The MPCC strongly resists the establishment of park-n-rides along the route and favors instead North/South bus service at all station locations including Fairview and Lexington Avenues.

(CCLRP0899) EngPG-63

What kind of provisions are going to be made for lost parking through the Central Corridor?

(CCLRP0742) EngPG-65

Our neighborhood, even though we're on the west side of the University, has many problems with parking and traffic. I'm not sure that the light rail will specifically speak to that issue, but it certainly will help now with the passage of the Gopher stadium. It will be very essential to have that.

(CCLRP0522) EngPG-66

Lost parking spaces must be compensated for. We found several unresolved issues in the DEIS in regards to parking. First, as previously noted, Section 3.3.2 explicates that burden of the 660 parking spaces that will be removed due to LRT construction will be borne by the businesses along University Avenue. This impact is resolved in the DEIS with the statement that "more on-street parking spaces will remain with LRT than are projected to be demanded along University Avenue" (3-22). This statement should be qualified with information on how many parking spaces are projected to be needed in x amount of years from now at each station, given the increased traffic along University Avenue, and comparisons of those numbers to the number of spaces that will be available at each station under the current plan.

(CCLRP0458) EngPG-67

Mr. Schweigert outlined nine issues, concerns, or potential benefits raised by the district councils, in consultation with each other and their constituents, that have to be addressed or included in this project: ...5) assurance of business preservation and access including mitigation of negative impacts of construction or operation of the system and resolution of on and off street parking issues;

(CCLRP0040) EngPG-68

Parking issues on University need to be better addressed.

(CCLRP0522) EngPG-69

The primary mitigation for parking problems is offered in Section 6.5.3, suggesting that any parking deficits in specific locations may be addressed in the Preliminary Engineering phase. This mitigation should also include a deeper look into the possibilities of providing parking near stations if a community need is determined, studies on other LRT systems where no designated drop-off spots were offered and how much traffic and parking problems increased in those areas, and continual outreach to residents and businesses near stations to determine their needs and recommendations.

(CCLRP0872) EngPG-70

In addition parking is a challenge for us at all locations and we believe anything that can be done to foster alternative means of transportation to those facilities will be very much the benefit of our organization as well as the neighborhoods in which we are located.

(CCLRP0076) EngPG-71

That, of course, would beg the question of how to provide for parking for businesses with no off-street access.

(CCLRP0861) EngPG-72

The last eight years I've driven alone to work at our Midway campus located at 1700 University Avenue where there are upwards of 1,000 employees. We have a terrible parking shortage there. Not surprisingly, the neighborhood doesn't want us to build a second parking ramp. Parking ramps are not the most attractive structures nor do they help build a sense of community.

(CCLRP0076) EngPG-73

Banning parking on what is already essentially a six lane corridor would be preferred.

(CCLRP0406) EngPG-74

The City of Saint Paul will evaluate the parking requirements as part of the Development Strategy work being done by the Planning Commission.

(CCLRP0406) EngPG-75

Public actions that may eliminate on-street parking (as does LRT construction) do not require mitigation with "replacement parking," since it is a public benefit and not an entitled benefit to any particular property owner. However, during Preliminary Engineering it is appropriate to suggest potential off-street parking possibilities, either through joint-use arrangements of existing off-street parking or potential land assembly to create additional off-street parking. However, at this time, the City does not commit to "replacing" spaces lost to construction of LRT.

(CCLRP0784) EngPG-76

You put two lanes down University Avenue and the bus, where are people going to park for these businesses because these businesses do not all have parking lots and they're very busy and you can't always get into their parking lots.

(CCLRP0150) EngPG-77

Parking.

(CCLRP0271) EngPG-78

50,000 students and 10's of thousands of staff and visitors travel to the University daily. Empty and demolish the University's misplaced parking facilities and put the drive-by polluters, driving to and from school and work in single-occupant motor vehicles, on the train.

(CCLRP0532) EngPG-79

Parking ramps that are built on University Avenue should have retail at the front or first floor of the complex.

(CCLRP0941) EngPG-80

With increased cars coming to the stops to get on the light rail, parking will be worse and air quality will be worse and those of us that want to drive to University to do quick shopping in the neighborhood will not be able to find parking spaces.

(CCLRP0793) EngPG-81

I have great concerns about the impacts of light rail building on University Avenue due to three main reason. Number one, parking. We already have trouble parking. If the light rail come in we eliminate some space for parking.

(CCLRP0549) EngPG-82

We oppose the construction of park-n-ride facilities along University Avenue.

(CCLRP0786) EngPG-83

We realize that parking is going to be a complicated solution for the corridor. Some people are going to say there's a need for more parking. Some are going to say there's a need for less in order to have that balance of true transit-oriented development and reduction of car trips. We just want to make sure that we're cautious in the impacts that happen to the neighborhood. We look at the Draft EIS statement and there are a lot of parallels drawn to the Hiawatha Corridor and it's very easy to draw the parallel of the experience that neighbors there have with parking and we want to make sure that our neighbors are not going to experience that negative impact to draw away from the benefits of having light rail in the corridor.

(CCLRP0788) EngPG-84

And we must deal with parking issues.

(CCLRP0531) EngPG-85

4. A Light Rail line must include nearby, off-street parking designated for local businesses. The construction will cost the community existing street parking on University Avenue. In order for businesses to enjoy a mix of customers, we must address their parking needs independent of the needs to commuters.

(CCLRP0940) EngPG-9

I am concerned about park and ride, even if we don't have park and ride lots that people will use the LRT as a cheap way to avoid downtown parking and still park in the neighborhoods. I think that needs to be addressed and discouraged and I think having a LRT, if we go with LRT on 94 will discourage that because people will only walk so far from their parked cars.

(CCLRP0532) PlaTP-004

Encourage businesses on University Avenue to share off-street parking facilities and lots. Another option is to build park-and-ride lots near Union Depot or the Sears store.

(CCLRP0154) ProALT-389

The MPCC does not see a lack of available and affordable parking as stated, especially in the Midway area. Seldom, if ever, are any of the large-surface parking lots (which are also free) fully occupied.

(CCLRP0406) SocLU-26

A different, but related, issue deals with the provision of parking for new development along the Avenue and the administration of the City's Zoning Code. Some of the land along University Avenue has been rezoned to TN-3 (traditional neighborhood zoning), which has different (usually lower) parking requirements than other zones. More rezoning will follow. The City will consider parking maximums as well as minimums as new development comes on line. If so, how restrictive should they be? And what are the consequences of restricting parking for new development on current uses in the Corridor?

(CCLRP0797) SocSS-59

But I think you should have better lighting and I think you should have alternative parking for people in the community when they're carrying packages or working different shifts so they can come into their home, they can park in front of their homes and not -- also, for the snow emergency routes people often park on the off-street. If you have this type of parking for people that don't move their cars and don't mind getting ticketed, you're not going to have a place to park also. So just those issues are a concern.

Response EngPG-001. The Central Corridor Project Office surveyed businesses and conducted an analysis of on-street parking impacts. An inventory of University Avenue parking supply and impacts is summarized in Section 6.3 of the FEIS. The City of St. Paul is considering several strategies to manage parking for local businesses and minimize impacts to residential areas. These strategies include posting time limits or metering the remaining on-street parking on University Avenue to encourage turnover and discourage all-day parking, signing or metering the parking along the cross streets one block north and south of

University Avenue, creating parking improvement districts and encouraging shared parking of vacant or underutilized existing parking lots. Consistent with City of St. Paul plans, no park and ride facilities are planned for the Central Corridor. Additional north-south bus routes will be added along with other bus route changes to bring people to the corridor.

Issue Summary EngPG-002. Actions must be taken to prevent 'park and hide' (4)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) EngPG-48

In addition, along the Hiawatha Corridor there are a number of LRT patrons who park in the immediate neighborhoods of LRT stations and walk. Of the 346 "park & hide" patrons among 3 station areas, the vast majority come from immediate neighborhood of the station (within 1 mile), and are not willing to walk more than about 600 feet. For these local park and ride patrons, there are some mechanisms that can be used to discourage such activity including: • Better north/south bus service with "on time" transfer schedules; • Signed time limitations for parking on University Avenue; • Localized permit parking in residential neighborhoods; and • Improved pedestrian links to the stations themselves.

(CCLRP0889) EngPG-53

I'm a resident right off of University Avenue and the issues that I have are parking issues when you have a transit system and my understanding is you're going to have 1,050 people that will be using the area from the study by University and Lexington. You're going to have issues with the residents who have homes on that side. You need to have parking. The problems are caused when you have people that work in our neighborhood several different shifts. You have day-care centers. You have people going in and out because they have their own businesses. So when you have that many people parking in the area, you're going to have some overlap that's going to cause a lot of problems for quality of life issues. You're going to need -- if you work a shift and you work from 11:00 to 3:00 or whatever in the morning, you're going to need to be able to park in front of your home. It's a safety issue when you're walking for several blocks trying to find a spot to go into your home. Now your quality of life has changed. Of course, your taxes are going to go up because of the maintenance of that type of system has to be maintained and they're going to need to raise taxes on residents to maintain that type of system, but it's very important to have some type of parking plan when you have that number of people. One thousand fifty people is a large number. So you're going to need to create a ramp or build something that incorporates with the environment of the community. Now, you don't want to have residents who are running all over the place every time they want to come to their home. That's not why people purchase their homes, and people have made heavy investments in their homes because most of the people in that area tend to retire in that area because you can go right off I-94 and you can go anywhere in the city. So it's very important that you have an optional parking situation in the area and it's also a safety issue for people that work different hours so they're not running all over the neighborhood, you know, five or ten blocks away to get to their homes.

(CCLRP0531) EngPG-55

Action must be taken to prevent "park and hide" on city streets. The possibility of commuters from outside our neighborhood and city consuming the street parking surrounding the line

must be addressed without turning our neighborhood and the University Avenue Corridor into one big parking lot.

(CCLRP0531) EngPG-59

Parking enforcement to prevent "park and hide" on city streets by transit patrons must be fully funded and operated by the City of St. Paul.

Response EngPG-002. The City of St. Paul and Minneapolis are aware of neighborhood concerns about "park and hide" activities in residential areas adjacent to the Central Corridor. The City of St. Paul is looking at strategies to discourage "hide and rider" use of on-street parking in the residential areas including strategies that the City of Minneapolis has successfully implemented to minimize "hide and ride" impacts in neighborhoods adjacent to the Hiawatha LRT. Strategies Minneapolis uses include permit parking and posted parking restrictions.

Issue Summary EngPG-003. [General comment in regard to parking](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0339) EngPG-17

It would be a blessing not to have to drive to and park in either major city.

Response EngPG-003. Comment Noted

Issue Summary NR-001. [Concerns about loss of on-street parking and desire for mitigating measures](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) NR-3

The City recommends that the Preliminary Engineering process include: • Station-by-station evaluations of the potential loss of on-street parking, and suggesting potential mitigating measures so as not to unduly burden current retail establishments. • Station-by-station evaluations of likely demand for park & ride accommodations and an evaluation of techniques which are most effective in discouraging such activity in each of the circumstances. • An evaluation of a potential single, major park & ride structure in the Midway area.

Response NR-001. A discussion of current parking facilities and impacts to parking along the corridor is provided in FEIS Section 6.3 "Other Transportation Impacts." Consistent with the City of St. Paul plans, no park and ride facilities are planned for the corridor.

Issue Summary PlaTE-007. [Concerned about parking, noise and traffic problems](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0254) PlaTE-114

Having formerly lived on Marshal during the closure of I-94, the flow of traffic made life on the street difficult, loud, and parking a problem all times of the day. This traffic problem did

not abate once I-94 was fixed so that residents and businesses continue to face this problem which is being made more difficult by the addition of many condo units without sufficient parking.

Response PlaTE-007.

Comment noted.

Issue Summary PlaTE-023. Parking (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0195) PlaTE-5

This will leave University Avenue S.E. between Bedford and Washington with 4 lanes for its daily traffic load. And it will allow for cars to park on some portions of University Avenue S.E., which many of our local businesses desperately need.

Response PlaTE-023. Traffic impacts of the Central Corridor LRT project, including parking impacts, are discussed in Chapter 6 of the FEIS. Economic impacts are discussed in Chapter 5 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-005. Need to update parking capacity analysis and proposed mitigation measures (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-005

Section 6.5.1, Parking Capacity - The map should be updated with the most current parking volumes to reflect the 15,805 parking spaces on campus.

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-137

The City does call for analyses to assess the loss and potential replacement on a block by block basis. This analysis and proposed mitigation measures to parking losses must be done during Preliminary Engineering. At the conclusion of such analyses, the City will determine an appropriate course of action.

Response PlaTP-005. Parking facility impacts and committed mitigations are described in Section 6.3 of the FEIS. Specific analysis on impacts to parking was undertaken in preparation of this FEIS.

Section: 6.3 - Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Impact and Mitigation

Issue Summary EngBP-001. Concerns about routes and safety for pedestrians (especially in regard to children, seniors, and handicapped persons) (37)

Comments:

(CCLRP0436) EngBP-5

Page 6-30: The discussion of pedestrian safety should be addressed more thoroughly on a system level given that the BRT/LRT will draw more pedestrian traffic and that most will arrive at the station as pedestrians.

(CCLRP0857) EngBP-15

With regard to engineering, I would like to recommend that the sidewalk be maintained as much as possible and to try to limit the on-street parking in design and I look forward to this being done the best that it possibly can.

(CCLRP0472) EngBP-16

Think: How many pedestrians will walk across those tracks every day?

(CCLRP0914) EngBP-20

I live a block off University Avenue at Chatsworth and the inconvenience. If I had to go across the street I have to walk two blocks up, cross the street, and walk two blocks back. That's a total inconvenience to our neighborhood which is the Summit-University neighborhood. I see this no more than a glorified expressway to be honest with you.

(CCLRP0298) EngBP-23

Unable to walk to Rice Street

(CCLRP0184) EngBP-27

Pedestrian friendly environment - We were assured early on in the Hiawatha project that a good pedestrian environment was a very high priority. Yet the areas surrounding the stations show little evidence that anything except cars were taken into consideration. A pedestrian friendly environment along the Central Corridor is vital if pedestrian access to transit and to other venues is to be encouraged. This will reduce the need to drive while increasing transit ridership.

(CCLRP0232) EngBP-34

Pedestrian transportation also was mentioned but no real routes, enhancement budget (economic impact) or coordination with the BRT or LRT or anything real was discussed.

(CCLRP0478) EngBP-38

LRT will cause additional difficulties for pedestrians crossing University Avenue. This will be especially bad for the elderly and handicapped who take longer to cross the street.

(CCLRP0356) EngBP-39

The second issue is easing the traffic burden and making University Avenue more "walkable." With the sheer volume of automobile, truck, and bus traffic, crossing University Avenue on foot (even on a green light and on a crosswalk) is a high risk activity, particularly if the pedestrian has a small child or a mobility impairment. And, there is strong evidence that when urban areas are "walkable", the people living in them are healthier and more

frequently patronize local businesses. Midway neighborhoods' efforts to convince city government to adopt traffic-calming planning for University Avenue have been completely unsuccessful, and many of us do not want to make it easier for even more vehicles to race through our community.

(CCLRP0178) EngBP-46

B. Pedestrian crosswalks must be included as part of the light rail plans and each crossing -- with or without signals -- must include Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant signage, lights and sounds in order to adequately serve our large deaf and blind communities as well as children. C. Pedestrians must be allowed to cross safely at any intersection along the line without barriers isolating North communities from South, West communities from East, using signaling and warnings were necessary to ensure access to stations and crossing the corridor itself. D. Additional Pedestrian access should be considered for multiple segments along I-94 to better connect neighborhoods to the South at junctures not currently served by pedestrian-only bridges.

(CCLRP0848) EngBP-51

On Washington Avenue rush hour happens ten times a day, at the beginning of every class period. Washington Avenue is one of the densest, liveliest pedestrian environments in Minnesota.

(CCLRP0532) SocEJ-010

Pedestrian crosswalks must be included as part of the light rail plans and each crossing must include lights and sounds in order to adequately serve our large deaf and blind communities as well as children.

(CCLRP0436) SocEJ-016

Traffic signals phasing and timing needs to accommodate slower moving pedestrians, giving them adequate time to cross University Avenue and other roads used by the LRT/BRT. Providing adequate bicycle and pedestrian accommodation across and along the Central Corridor will also meet the needs of elderly, the physically disabled and other physical limitations and help to address issues raised by Environmental Justice.

(CCLRP0116) SocEJ-032

We do need shelters and benches too. We need lighting in them to make sure we have help on the bus for the handicapped people. Space for walkers, wheelchairs.

(CCLRP0298) SocEJ-033

People with lost sight and safety

(CCLRP0129) SocEJ-034

I have a concern about elderly and disabled people getting across the street in time!

(CCLRP0867) SocEJ-048

And also I would like to know, us senior citizens -- I'm one of them -- and the handicapped, are they making it so that it will be much easier for us?

(CCLRP0151) SocEJ-049
Seniors unable to travel.

(CCLRP0436) SocEJ-076
Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliance- Intersections, sidewalks, trails, paths, transit stops and transit stations, or any other transportation facility constructed must be ADA compliant. Other innovations should be pursued to provide for pedestrians with a variety of physical and cognitive limitations.

(CCLRP0068) SocSS-1
Four lanes of heavy traffic through the heart of campus at grade is dangerous to pedestrians, impacts air quality, and divides the campus. Light rail at-grade is much less dangerous and does not pollute the air.

(CCLRP0549) SocSS-2
4. The Merriam Park Community Council believes it is critical to assure pedestrian, bicyclist and car traffic safety in the planning and design of the University Avenue LRT. We consider safety to be of primary importance, especially for pedestrians crossing University Avenue in and around the Midway area and in the vicinity of senior residences such as Episcopal Homes at Fairview Avenue.

(CCLRP0406) SocSS-12
One other critical issue for the cross-section design relates to potential pedestrian barriers except at intersections. It is an issue that relates to both safety and aesthetics. Balancing pedestrian access with pedestrian safety must be considered extensively in Preliminary Engineering.

(CCLRP0150) SocSS-14
1. My sister lives at 280 Ravoux and with LRT limited stops and her abilities being limited for walking and the safety of crossing the street, I worry about LRT down University.

(CCLRP0179) SocSS-15
Building a light rail on ground is a bad idea. If it were built over University Avenue this will have no effect on traffic moving below it. There will be no confusion and no accidents do to a train hitting a vehicle or vice versa. Pedestrians will be safer, especially the illegal j-walkers University Avenue is famous for. Pedestrians will have to watch traffic as they cross, but need not worry about the light rail above them. People riding the light rail can feel safer due to no car collisions or pedestrian accidents.

(CCLRP0149) SocSS-21
But my concerns are the safety of kids and people who have been drinking and not thinking straight.

(CCLRP0007) SocSS-25
...our children have to cross University Ave or Cross over St. Anthony...

(CCLRP0004) SocSS-27

Safety is an issue. Crossing the street at University is already risky - how can this be taken care of?

(CCLRP0001) SocSS-28

Safety issues for pedestrians (seniors and handicaps) stepping out to the centerway to board the train will be risking their lives dodging impatient motorists who do not respect 'stop' signs, lights or people.

(CCLRP0145) SocSS-36

Worried about the safety of the children as they cross the street.

(CCLRP0428) SocSS-38

Safety for pedestrians at some station sites appears to become a concern for the LRT alternative due to required u-turns by diverted vehicular traffic.

(CCLRP0263) SocSS-40

How about the pedestrian traffic? Crosswalks and lights do not stop people from strolling or running across University Avenue. Perhaps this safety issue could be addressed long before tracks are placed.

(CCLRP0475) SocSS-41

p. 1-3 "Study area is one of the highest percentages of population that have zero-car households, persons living below poverty level, persons with mobility limitations." LRT will hurt these people. Every time, you take light rail, you have to cross to the middle of the street and cross travel lanes. This is bad for pedestrians and traffic. DEIS shows that LRT will increase congestion in the corridor. With the bus, you only have to cross the street half the time, when you take the bus that is traveling across the street from you. For people in wheelchairs, taking Central Corridor LRT will be a pain. Route 16 service will be cut drastically. It serves people who live between light rail stations and who work between light rail stations and shop between light rail stations. LRT alternative decreases mobility, it doesn't increase it.

(CCLRP0132) SocSS-50

I'm concerned on walking across University--already difficult, even at stop light cross streets

(CCLRP0436) SocSS-51

Pedestrian safety along the Central Corridor needs to be identified, assessed and addressed especially since they need to cross University to get to the stations. ... The safety of pedestrians needs to be more fully analyzed during the design of the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0038) SocSS-52

Pedestrian safety in crossing the tracks.

(CCLRP0180) SocSS-55

With a large number of youth and elderly, and given our number of schools, we are concerned with pedestrian safety and how it will be impacted with additional traffic. This issue is raised due to experts, stating that riders who live within a mile of a stop will derive their vehicle to the nearest stop, park, and ride. Therefore, the theory that people will bike or walk to the nearest stop appears to be without support.

(CCLRP0532) SocSS-57

Pedestrian access and safety needs to be considered and closely monitored. The district continues to have problems with cars moving too fast for drivers to be well aware of pedestrian movement. This problem is of particular importance in District 7 because of the large number of children.

Response EngBP-001. Construction of the Preferred Alternative will improve the existing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure along University Avenue, and improve the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists through implemented design guidelines. The current configuration of University Avenue poses a barrier to pedestrian travel within the corridor. The development of the LRT will channel pedestrian movements to crossing locations at intersecting streets, where curb improvements and pedestrian refuge areas within the street will shield pedestrians and bicyclists from both LRT vehicles and automobile traffic. Crossings will still be available throughout the corridor, at both signalized and non-signalized intersections, and the pedestrian channelization is intended to discourage mid-block crossings and improve pedestrian safety. Landscaping enhancements that may be included along the line such as trees or public furniture will also help to separate pedestrians from automobile traffic. As discussed in Section 6.3 of the FEIS, all pedestrian crossings will be designed in accordance with current design standards and ADA requirements to ensure access and mobility for all.

Issue Summary EngBP-002. Concerns about bicyclist routes and safety (15)

Comments:

(CCLRP0436) EngBP-3

The design of the facility should ensure that the right of way used for bus lanes, bus pullouts, LRT track, etc., does not deter the integration of bicycle travel in this corridor. University Avenue with the wide outside lane serves as bike accommodation now even though there is motor vehicle parking. Alternative bicycle routes should be identified if University Avenue will not have a separate bike lane.

(CCLRP0474) EngBP-8

What I propose is the inclusion of two bicycle lanes, one for westbound and one for eastbound. Enclosed is a drawing showing cross sections of University Avenue with this concept. The LRT transit platforms are in the center of the street with the LRT vehicles on either side. The bicycle lanes are adjacent to the LRT tracks with a fence in between. The sidewalk width is 8.0 feet at the vicinity of the LRT platform and then widens to 11.0 feet just beyond the platform.

(CCLRP0407) EngBP-9

Finally, there are many issues related to bicyclists' use of University Avenue and downtown streets. Due to the levels of transportation activities and lack of space for bicycle lanes along University Avenue, the City of Saint Paul will encourage bicycle use that does not require being within the University Avenue right-of-way.

(CCLRP0232) EngBP-11

Bicycle transportation was handled with a lame bunch of generalities, no real routes and enhancement budget percent costs for the central corridor was discussed.

(CCLRP0474) EngBP-13

A growing number of people in the Twin Cities are turning to bicycles as a means of getting around (including commuting). In light of this, it would be wise to include a significant provision for bicycles in the redesign of University Avenue.

(CCLRP0652) EngBP-24

LRT also makes it easier and faster to combine transit with a bicycle. I use a bicycle for many of my trips, and the fast loading of my bike onto the Hiawatha Line trains is much preferable to the racks in front of buses.

(CCLRP0164) EngBP-26

Second, the corridor should become more accessible to bicycles. University Avenue is presently extremely inhospitable to bicycles, which are also an essential piece of the transit picture. Any new building should provide for safe bicycling through the corridor.

(CCLRP0176) EngBP-33

Section 6.7.3 of the DEIS addresses potential bicycle/pedestrian mitigation to counter balance any negative impacts of the project. In terms of bicycle accommodation, many bicycle commuters currently use University Avenue as one of the few direct routes from the Midway area to the University of Minnesota Minneapolis campus and the two central business districts. The University Avenue right-of-way is not proposed to include bicycle lanes or even sufficient space on the shoulder for bicyclists to ride comfortable and safely. Further consideration should be given to a solution that better accommodates bicycles within the University Avenue right-of-way. In the absence of any such accommodation, alternative east-west routes that make comparable connections must be explored and provided. However, this will be difficult because so few east-west roadways in the area make the important connections made by University Avenue to the University of Minnesota, downtown Minneapolis, and points further west.

(CCLRP0666) EngBP-36

I ride my bike quite often, and I would most likely use this corridor in conjunction with my bicycle to access points east from the 29th Ave. station. Loading my bicycle onto the light rail cars is convenient and quick. I roll my bike into the car, roll it onto its back wheel, and hang it on a hook. With buses, I have to make sure the bus driver is waiting for me, pull down the rack, lift my entire bike up, pull a handlebar over the front wheel, and then board the bus. The latter process is slower and more cumbersome.

(CCLRP0470) EngBP-37

In several places throughout the DEIS, bicycle connections are mentioned. However, there is nothing of any substance concerning how existing bicycle routes would be integrated into an LRT/BRT system. Since the studies were all done five or more years ago, there have been designated bicycle routes that have been developed with bicycle amenities, such as dedicated bicycle lanes. Prior Avenue and Pascal Street in the Hamline Midway, Merriam Park, and Snelling-Hamline neighborhoods have been implemented. In particular, LRT with the barrier it creates, must not lengthen light cycles that will force bicyclists to wait much longer than at present for the signal to allow them to cross University Avenue. The Final EIS must be more specific as to how bicyclists will be accommodated.

(CCLRP0333) EngBP-40

Please advise if the light rail plan on University includes accommodations for bicyclists. Along with many, many other people, I use University Avenue from Lexington almost to the University of MN on a daily basis to commute to work. Does the construction plan include dedicated bicycle lanes? If not, why not? Will bicycles even be safe on University during and after the light rail construction? The only reason the route is acceptable at this time with the heavy vehicle traffic is because the street is quite wide. Will the parking lanes be eliminated or narrowed? If bicycles are not in the plan, then they should be. It would not make sense to eliminate an energy-free form of transportation for another energy-user form of transportation.

(CCLRP0241) EngBP-42

I want to say that the Twin Cities bike paths are far superior to what they have out in that region.

(CCLRP0176) EngBP-43

Good north-south bicycling connections to the Central Corridor and plentiful bicycle storage facilities at station areas will be needed to accommodate cyclists who wish to access destinations on University Avenue or utilize the new transit way. Current north south bicycle routes intersecting University Avenue in St. Paul include Raymond/Pelham, Prior Avenue, and Pascal Street, and the Gateway Trail/Jackson Street. Additional north south routes will be needed to connect cyclists to and across the Central Corridor, and in particular to connect cyclists to LRT stations. Potential routes include Fairview Avenue, Hamline Avenue, Lexington Parkway, Victoria Street, Dale Street, Western Avenue, and Rice Street. At Snelling Avenue, where it is likely not feasible to accommodate a north-south bicycle route, alternate connecting routes must be explored, include Aldine (which would require improved bicycle access across I-94) and Pascal/Ayd Mill Road.

(CCLRP0313) EngBP-47

Bicycles should be directed to use a quieter parallel street, such as Thomas Ave. I think it is extreme thinking to insist that bikes be given exclusive lanes everywhere.

(CCLRP0088) EngBP-49

Defined bicycle lanes along University should be included in the final plan.

Response EngBP-002. An analysis of existing and planned bicycle facilities for the entire corridor and the specific planning segments is provided in Section 6.3 of the FEIS. At present, no bicycle lanes are striped on University Avenue and the current configuration of the road, coupled with the high traffic volumes, discourage bicyclists from using University Avenue. However, some bicyclists do use the road for commuting purposes. Construction of the LRT will improve the existing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure along University Avenue, and improve the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists through implemented design guidelines. As discussed in FEIS Section 6.3, the LRT will operate on embedded tracks, which would facilitate crossings by bicyclists and pedestrians. At-grade crossings would also be paved, and there would be no adverse effects to existing bicycle lanes in the study area. The corridor would also improve linkages between destinations and other bicycle facilities outside of the study area. The cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul are both in the final stages of adopting or completing comprehensive bicycle plans, as discussed by the FEIS, which identify existing and proposed future on-street bicycle lanes and off-street bicycle trail systems.

Issue Summary EngBP-004. Should perform analysis for pedestrian and bicycle traffic (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0436) EngBP-2

Section 6.1.3: Existing and projected traffic analysis should include analysis of pedestrian and bicycle traffic as well.

(CCLRP0436) EngBP-18

Bicycles and Pedestrians (General Comments) - Specific information needs to be in the FEIS regarding bicycle and pedestrian transportation. This includes current and projected volumes, safety evaluations and needed improvements, bicycle storage, and bicycle and pedestrian access along and across University Avenue and any other roads that the BRT/LRT uses or crosses. This applies regardless of mode selected, i.e. BRT or LRT.

Response EngBP-004. Data for bicycle and pedestrian volumes specific to the corridor is currently unavailable or only available at site specific locations, as compared to traffic volume data, making a quantitative analysis of projected bicycle or pedestrian traffic within the corridor difficult. An analysis of bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the corridor is available in Section 6.3 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngBP-008. Include the most recent agency plans for bicycle and pedestrian transportation (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0436) EngBP-44

Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety - Bicycle and pedestrian transportation needs to be accommodated within the corridor. The most recent plans of the cities, counties and state should be reflected in the FEIS.

Response EngBP-008. The FEIS addresses the planning efforts for both the City of Minneapolis and the City of St. Paul's planning for future bicycle and pedestrian facilities. At present, both the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul are in the process of completing or adopting bicycle and pedestrian plans. A full discussion of the existing conditions and future plans for bicycles and pedestrians in the corridor is provided in Section 6.3 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary EngBP-009. Pedestrian and Bike Access across I-94 (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0280) EngBP-45

2 Pedestrian and Bike Access across I-94. When the Rondo neighborhood was destroyed to lay the I-94 freeway, it was an era when the car was king, and very little accommodation was made for pedestrian and bike traffic bridging the freeway. Now, as we hope to reduce car traffic, there is a tremendous reservoir of potential LRT riders south of the freeway who are within walking or biking distance of University Ave., but who will never make the trip because of how daunting it is to cross that freeway. Our district includes one of the few pedestrian bridges across I-94, on Griggs St., and it is so narrow, poorly lit, and just plain ugly, that it acts almost as a barrier across the freeway, rather than a connection. The bridges at the major car-traffic intersections are not much better, offering narrow side-paths for pedestrians and little room for bicyclists to pass safely. A significant benefit both to LRT ridership and to the life and interconnection of our communities could be gained by improving bridges across I-94 for alternative transit access. Pedestrian bridges should be widened, given better lighting, and redesigned to be safer and to attract more use. Ideally, more pedestrian/bike bridges should be added. When possible, car bridges should be rebuilt or redesigned to better accommodate pedestrian and bike traffic.

Response EngBP-009. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities located in proximity to the corridor would be enhanced with the construction of the Central Corridor, however, pedestrian or bicycle bridges across the I-94 freeway are outside the scope of this project and not addressed by the SDEIS. While the potential exists for additional corridor riders from the south side of I-94, support for facilities which cross I-94 are discussed with the City of St. Paul Planning and Economic Development Department and the Minnesota Department of Transportation.

Issue Summary EngBP-010. Economic impact in regard to ability of pedestrians to cross University Avenue (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) EngBP-10

Beginning on p5-38 is a discussion of environmental justice with respect to economic impacts. The analysis is scant with respect to issues of adding a station at Western and/or Victoria, and reduced ability for pedestrians to cross except at signalized intersections. The City of Saint Paul recommends that detailed analyses of these issues be included in the Preliminary Engineering phase.

Response EngBP-010. Economic impacts as a result of construction and operation are discussed in FEIS Chapter 5 "Economic Effects," which discuss the station-area development and infill/redevelopment potential for the six planning segments. An analysis of existing and planned pedestrian and bicycle facilities for the entire corridor and the specific planning segments is provided in Section 6.3 of the FEIS. Pedestrian and bicycle access and all crossings, signalized and un-signalized, would be improved with the construction of the Central Corridor LRT. Pedestrians will be able to cross at all signalized intersections and most unsignalized intersections. The current configuration of University Avenue poses a barrier to pedestrian travel at points along the corridor. Current design standards and ADA requirements mandate that all crossing locations be outfitted with pedestrian indicators and guidance/way finding accessible technology. This includes visual warning devices, audio warning/navigation devices (to provide safe crossings for the visually impaired), pavement treatments, and handrails, all of which is important to all pedestrians, but particularly to those with special needs. Incorporating desired system elements such as non-signalized pedestrian crossings and secondary station platform access would provide clearly defined crossing areas and connections along the corridor, along with providing added safety protections from vehicular traffic.

Issue Summary EngBP-011. [Need safe access across route to Dickerman Park and school near Wheeler and University](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0037) SocSS-13

At intersections like Wheeler and University, will there be signals to indicate when the train is approaching? My concern is that it (the intersection just mentioned) is a residential area with homes north and south of University. People, particularly families and teenagers, cross back and forth on foot to reach the school and Dickerman Park. If Dickerman Park is indeed going to be revived as a neighborhood focal point, please provide a safe means for residents on the south side of University to walk to it (please don't cut us off into an isolated pocket!)

Response EngBP-011. The intersection of Wheeler and University Avenue will include a pedestrian crossing area with devices installed to warn of oncoming trains. Curb improvements and pedestrian refuge areas within the street will shield pedestrians from both LRT vehicles and automobile traffic. Landscaping enhancements that may be included along the line such as trees or public furniture will also help to separate pedestrians from automobile traffic. As discussed in FEIS Section 6.3, all pedestrian crossings will be designed in accordance with current design standards and ADA requirements to ensure access and mobility for all. Additionally, trains will be equipped with the latest in sound warning systems to ensure pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists are aware of the trains' presence. All of these changes should improve access and safety for people wishing to access Dickerman Park and the nearby school.

Issue Summary EngBP-012. [Improved bicycle and pedestrian systems will have positive impact](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0284) EngBP-48

By having fewer stops along University Avenue than the current bus system, LRT will encourage more foot traffic due to individuals walking to and from the LRT stops. Increased foot traffic will make University Avenue a more lively and successful commercial corridor and make it safer.

Response EngBP-012. The FEIS also includes an analysis of development potential for the corridor. Impacts to pedestrian safety are discussed in Section 6.3 of the FEIS. The current configuration of University and Washington avenues pose a barrier to pedestrian travel at points along the corridor. The addition of LRT would likely improve the existing infrastructure conditions and pedestrian safety concerns throughout the alignment.

Issue Summary EngBP-013. [Safety concerns for slower pedestrian traffic](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0063) SocSS-24

My concerns are about pedestrian traffic under the BRT or LRT alternatives. I see no data in report on pedestrian traffic volumes or crashes with vehicles. Grade separation is only discussed in relation to vehicle conflicts with trains or buses, but there is no discussion or consideration for pedestrian traffic. It is summarily dismissed with no factual data to support its conclusions. My experience in riding on University Avenue is that the number of disabled or at least overburdened pedestrians is increasing. I refer to people who cannot race across the street within a few seconds when traffic waits for them to proceed. Perhaps grade separation needs to be examined in much more depth before any final decisions are made. (I for one think a light rail system that runs above grade along University Avenue would make the most sense.)

Response EngBP-013. Construction of the LRT will improve the existing pedestrian infrastructure along University Avenue, and improve the safety of pedestrians through implemented design guidelines. The current configuration of University Avenue poses a barrier to pedestrian travel within the corridor. The development of the LRT will channel pedestrian movements to crossing locations at intersecting streets, where curb improvements and pedestrian refuge areas within the street will shield pedestrians from both LRT vehicles and automobile traffic. Crossings will still be available throughout the corridor, at both signalized (approximately every 2 blocks) and non-signalized intersections (between signalized intersections), and the pedestrian channelization is intended to discourage mid-block crossings and improve pedestrian safety. Landscaping enhancements that may be included along the line such as trees or public furniture will also help to separate pedestrians from automobile traffic. As discussed in Section 6.3 of the FEIS, all pedestrian crossings will be designed in accordance with current design standards and ADA requirements to ensure access and mobility for all. Data for pedestrians volumes specific to the corridor is currently unavailable or only available at site specific locations (general estimates on the number of pedestrians are available for the University of Minnesota), as compared to traffic volume data, making a quantitative analysis of pedestrian movements in the corridor difficult.

Issue Summary EngBP-016. Pedestrians may have to walk up to half a mile to cross the street (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0895) EngBP-32

Pedestrians may have to walk up to half a mile to cross the street.

(CCLRP0775) EngBP-6

People living on either side of University Avenue will also have problems. There will be many streets where they can't make turns or where pedestrians can't walk. Going across the street to visit the cafe will make you walk three or four blocks, maybe even more out of your way.

Response EngBP-016. Concerns about pedestrian access issues have been addressed through the preliminary engineering and public involvement process to provide for non-signalized pedestrian crossings, which will essentially provide access at all current legal crossings of University Avenue. Pedestrian crossings will still be available throughout the corridor, at both signalized (approximately every 2 blocks or ¼ mile) and non-signalized intersections (approximately every block or 1/8 mile).. As discussed in Section 6.3 of the FEIS, all pedestrian crossings will be designed in accordance with current design standards and ADA requirements to ensure access and mobility for all.

Issue Summary EngBP-017. LRT should include walkway bridges (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0139) EngBP-12

8. Walkway bridges

Response EngBP-017. Pedestrian bridges are generally constructed over limited access roadways. At present, no pedestrian bridges (beyond those which already exist at the University of Minnesota) are planned for construction.

Issue Summary EngBP-018. Concerns about pedestrian and bicyclist routes and safety (16)

Comments:

(CCLRP0471) EngBP-4

LRT will reduce the places where pedestrians can cross University Avenue. The plan will remove the signal at Albert Street. According to the DEIS, pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists will only be permitted to cross University Avenue at signalized intersections. This will add four blocks to the route from my residence to Herberger's and back. While I am able-bodied and can walk the four additional blocks, many of my disabled neighbors cannot. University Avenue in its present state is difficult enough for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross. Adding LRT to the middle of University will make it exponentially more difficult for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross. It will be impossible for the handicapped.

(CCLRP0781) EngBP-7

In closing, TLC asks Ramsey and Hennepin County and the Metropolitan Council to consider the following items: make the corridor safer and more pleasant for walking and biking;

(CCLRP0381) EngBP-14

Section 6.7.1 Pedestrian & Bicycle environment - Existing Conditions, this section is very weak, and does not recognize many of the bike lanes & routes toward the eastern end of the Central Corridor. The Gateway State Trail for instance should be addressed as one of the connections that will be providing bike and pedestrian access to the Central Corridor from the northeast.

(CCLRP0443) EngBP-22

page 3-25 - University Avenue Busway/BRT Alternative: University of Minnesota Campus: The University has significant pedestrian and bicycle traffic and is concerned with any new mode of transportation that would "add an impediment to the pedestrian and bicycle environment," as stated in the DEIS. In addition, the University is concerned with the BRT alternative's potential for exacerbating congestion along Washington Avenue.

(CCLRP0436) EngBP-30

The cities of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Hennepin and Ramsey counties have added several new bicycle facilities in the past few years and also have other plans for bike and pedestrian facilities routes, such as the connection to the Gateway Trail to Summit Avenue (connecting to University Avenue), and the construction of Granery Road with bike/ped accommodation in the University of Minnesota Stadium Village area. The FEIS should not only include these bicycle and pedestrian connections, but could describe how these connections will leverage the Central Corridor investments and also emphasize the need for ample bicycle and pedestrian accommodation along the corridor and at the stations.

(CCLRP0786) EngBP-31

In addition to that, we also want to see a pedestrian and bicycle environment so that our options to get out of cars are not just limited to the light rail; that they do have an option to walk and bike and that that is fostered as much in the development process.

(CCLRP0436) EngBP-35

The FEIS needs to include an evaluation of pedestrian/bicycle crossing needs. For example, there may be some intersections where separated grade is needed to address safety and efficiency needs of bicyclists and pedestrians. While the aim is generally to provide safe at-grade crossings, there may be intersections along the corridor that are best served by offering a bike/ped separated grade crossing. The Snelling Avenue crossing, the Eustis/Cromwell intersections may be the intersections that could be evaluated in this context.

(CCLRP0467) EngEng-10

He said he does not favor physical barriers or fencing along the rail line and he would like to see pedestrian and bicycle crossings maintained at all existing intersections.

(CCLRP0829) SocSS-4

Three, make the corridor safer and more pleasant for walking and biking

(CCLRP0492) SocSS-6

Safety is of primary importance. Traffic accidents have been an issue for the Hiawatha line. It is critical in the planning and design of University Avenue LRT to assure pedestrian, bicyclist and car traffic safety. Plans for University LRT should include defined safety goals, agreed upon by the community. In areas of less traffic, simply not reducing safety might be the goal. In more dangerous areas, the goal must be that engineering of the LRT achieve improved safety and a reduced number of accidents. Over 150 traffic accidents and two pedestrian deaths have occurred near the proposed Snelling and University Avenue LRT station during the last year, a number that is unacceptable to the community. The construction of bridges or tunnels for the rail, for pedestrians/bicycles, and/or for automotive cross-traffic is needed for the University Avenue LRT to enhance safety.

(CCLRP0406) SocSS-8

Preliminary Engineering. - The City of Saint Paul recommends: An in-depth discussion of pedestrian, bicycle, and motorist safety focused on system design, public education and ongoing maintenance during and after Preliminary Engineering.

(CCLRP0549) SocSS-11

Over 150 traffic accidents and two pedestrian deaths have occurred near the proposed Snelling and University Avenue LRT station during the last year, a number that is unacceptable to the community. With light rail added to the mix, the construction of bridges or tunnels for light rail, for pedestrians/bicycles, and/or for automotive cross-traffic is badly needed for the Snelling/University Avenue intersection.

(CCLRP0482) SocSS-16

An e-mail response from Mr. Morris indicates that no gates are planned. This exposes pedestrians, bicycles, and vehicles to considerable danger.

(CCLRP0406) SocSS-19

SAFETY & SECURITY (Section 3.8) - Safety of pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists is paramount in the success of an urban transit system like LRT in the middle of University Avenue. Safety of pedestrians/bicyclists crossing University Avenue to either the station platforms or totally across the Avenue will require substantial design consideration and consistent pedestrian education. ...particular attention needs be paid to issues of visually and hearing impaired as well as mobility impaired with respect to safety.

(CCLRP0178) SocSS-26

Pedestrian/Bike/Disability Access and Safety along and crossing the Avenue. A. The DCC recommends particular attention to the safety and mobility of all pedestrians and bicyclists in the design, building, and operation of a transit system along University and other streets and avenues comprising the Central Corridor. For purposes of these recommendations, the term "pedestrian" includes wheel-chair-bound pedestrians.

(CCLRP0074) SocSS-31

I'm somewhat concerned about the safety of crossing, especially for pedestrians and bicyclists. Would it be too expensive to make the system elevate, like in Chicago? Please do not cut corners on safety in order to save money! Building it right the first time will save money in the long run.

Response EngBP-018. Construction of the LRT will improve the existing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure along University Avenue, and improve the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists through implemented design guidelines. The current configuration of University Avenue poses a barrier to pedestrian travel within the corridor. The development of the LRT will channel pedestrian movements to crossing locations at intersecting streets, where curb improvements and pedestrian refuge areas within the street will shield pedestrians and bicyclists from both LRT vehicles and automobile traffic. Crossings will still be available throughout the corridor, at both signalized and non-signalized intersections, and the pedestrian channelization is intended to discourage mid-block crossings and improve pedestrian safety. Landscaping enhancements that may be included along the line such as trees or public furniture will also help to separate pedestrians from automobile traffic. As discussed in Section 6.3 of the FEIS, all pedestrian crossings will be designed in accordance with current design standards and ADA requirements to ensure access and mobility for all.

Issue Summary PlaTP-001. Concerns in regard to pedestrian accommodations (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0407) PlaTP-001

Equally important are the pedestrian accommodations along University Avenue and the City of Saint Paul reasserts its support for maximum width sidewalks as well as pedestrian amenities along the Avenue.

Response PlaTP-001. Comment noted. The Preferred Alternative complies with all local pedestrian facility requirements. The Central Corridor LRT project is committed to maintaining sidewalks that are at least 10 feet in width whenever possible, in accordance with the City of St. Paul's Central Corridor Development Strategy.

Issue Summary PlaTP-002. Update report content to include latest bikeways and pedestrian ways (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-002

Section 6.7.2, Existing Pedestrian and Bike Facilities - Recommend figure be updated with more current bikeways and pedestrian ways.

Response PlaTP-002. Bike facilities and related graphics have been updated and are presented in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTP-042. Concerns about being disruptive to pedestrian and bicycle traffic (4)

Comments:

(CCLRP0532) PlaTP-051

If light rail is put on University Avenue, pedestrians must be allowed to safely cross University Avenue at every intersection.

(CCLRP0460) PlaTP-097

Residents want to be assured that access to local businesses is easy for them with a minimum of pedestrian crossings every two blocks along the avenue and stops at least every one-half mile.

(CCLRP0527) PlaTP-199

The Friends have concerns about the lack of bicycle facilities on University Ave. and the lack of north south routes to connect cyclists to and across the Center Corridor. In order to be successful and the least disruptive to pedestrian and bicycle traffic, adequate crossings of University Avenue must be provided.

(CCLRP0895) PlaTP-221

It says pedestrians, bicycles, and vehicles will only be able to cross University and the light rail tracks at designated signals intersections. People that have to turn right on University travel down to the next light, make a U-turn, and come back.

Response PlaTP-042. Rules for pedestrian and bicycle crossings along University Avenue have not been altered. Construction of the LRT will improve the existing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure along University Avenue where the current configuration of University Avenue poses a barrier to pedestrians. The development of the LRT will channel pedestrian movements to crossing locations at intersecting streets, where curb improvements and pedestrian islands within the street will shield pedestrians and bicyclists from both LRT vehicles and automobile traffic.. Rules for bikes on the street or within bike lanes have not changed relative to street crossings.

Issue Summary PlaTP-063. Pedestrian barriers (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) PlaTP-242

The City of Saint Paul supports the following: • Support for the typical cross-sections shown on Figure 2.3-2~ • General opposition to pedestrian barriers, however support for a detailed evaluation of such barriers in each segment along the corridor.

Response PlaTP-063. The Metropolitan Council has worked closely with St. Paul in developing the Preferred Alternative.

Issue Summary PlaTP-073. Concerns about pedestrian and bicyclist routes and safety (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0545) PlaTP-049

We also want to make sure that bike riders who currently use University Avenue as a bicycle commuter route have a safe and speedy alternative, and that adequate north-south routes are added to feed into and out of the new line. Pedestrian access to the new line should also be made safe and attractive.

Response PlaTP-073. Pedestrian access to the Central Corridor LRT and across University Avenue was refined during preliminary engineering and is discussed in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary SocEJ-018. Concerns in regard to safety of vulnerable pedestrians (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0485) SocSS-045

D. Safety/Security. With the introduction of a light rail system in a business and residential neighborhood, pedestrians many of which are the elderly, young and English as a second language speaker will have the added burden of navigating a high speed light rail train along with the cars and buses that currently traverse the avenue. Realizing this, there is a greater likelihood of pedestrian and automotive accidents with the introduction of a high-speed mode of transportation along a highly used community oriented corridor. Station shelters where stops would be located can also attract additional crime to the area. As a mitigation alternative, ensure the early creation of a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) to help design ways of overcoming these adverse affects. Recruit those from the impacted EJ community to serve on the CAC. Hire staff/consultants from the diversity within the community to design culturally appropriate informational material and conduct educational sessions on the precautions needed when crossing the tracks. Hire from the community extra security forces to patrol the area as a deterrent to crime.

Response SocEJ-018. Chapter 2 and Section 6.3 of the FEIS describe pedestrian safety elements and passenger amenities of the Central Corridor LRT stations and surroundings, and Section 3.7 discusses general safety and security. Chapter 11 of the FEIS discusses how extensive public outreach activities were conducted as a part of the EIS processes to inform residents and businesses about the project and to listen to their concerns. The public provided input on the proposed alignment and alternatives, station locations, environmental issues, future development implications, the project planning process, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative. Chapter 11 also discusses the CAC, its membership, and how it was used to guide project development. Printed materials for the public were translated into multiple languages to facilitate communication with immigrant communities. This input from public participation resulted in concurrent planning processes undertaken by the City of St. Paul in the development of the Central Corridor Development Strategy, which addresses many of the issues and concerns raised by adjacent neighborhoods (see Sections 3.1 and 3.2 and Chapter 5).

Section: 6.3 - Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Station Design

Issue Summary EngBP-003. Need secure bike storage in proximity to transit stations (4)

Comments:

(CCLRP0436) EngBP-1

Secure bike storage in close proximity to transit stations is critical. The FEIS should describe the provision of short and long-term secure bicycle storage and parking to link bicycling and public transportation for commuting and other trip purposes. ... The FEIS should provide an estimation of the number of bike parking spaces needed and the space needed to accommodate bike storage at the stations and bus stops.

(CCLRP0176) EngBP-17

(CCLRP0178) EngBP-29

Secure, covered, accessible bicycle storage facilities will be needed at Central Corridor stations along University Avenue to accommodate bicyclists who will utilize the new line.

(CCLRP0436) EngBP-28

By statute definition, bicycles are vehicles. The terminology used throughout the DEIS often refers to bicycles as separate from other vehicles. Also, when vehicles are discussed, it is unclear if bicycles are considered within that discussion (e.g. page S-12). The traffic analysis in the DEIS concentrates on transit and motorized vehicle traffic without accounting for or evaluating or estimating future pedestrian and bicycle traffic.

Response EngBP-003. Construction of the Preferred Alternative is expected to significantly improve the existing bicycle facilities within the corridor, enhancing safety, security, and connectivity for bicyclists. The opportunity to locate bicycle storage lockers in proximity to transit stations will be investigated by Metro Transit, based on availability of space and demand. Light rail vehicles will be outfitted with bicycle hooks for passengers who travel with their bikes. The specific number of bicycle lockers or storage racks is a function of demand volume. Data for bicycle volumes specific to the corridor is currently unavailable or only available at site specific locations, as compared to traffic volume data, making a quantitative analysis of projected bicycle ridership and facility usage difficult. Any specific analysis to determine the number of bicycle storage lockers or racks at station locations or bus stops would likely have to occur after the project is operational. Analysis of existing and planned bicycle facilities for the entire corridor and the specific planning segments is provided in FEIS Section 6.3.

Issue Summary EngBP-005. Need good pedestrian access to light rail stops (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0140) EngBP-19

I am concerned that the light rail stops along the central corridor are pedestrian friendly, including access for walking and bicycling, and with open space and public art.

(CCLRP0407) PlaTP-106

...the analysis focuses on bicycle and pedestrian accommodations along the Avenue. No discussion is included on needed accommodations for accessing the corridor. One of the most important accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists is getting access to the stations. Work done on other corridors in North America strongly suggests that the effectiveness of TOD and station use is highly dependent on paths through the neighborhoods to the stations themselves.

Response EngBP-005. A discussion of pedestrian and bicycle issues is provided in Section 6.3 of the FEIS. The safety and security of pedestrians and bicyclists is a priority, and construction of the Central Corridor LRT would significantly improve upon the existing infrastructure conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians. Chapter 5 of the FEIS contains a discussion of station area location and development.

Issue Summary PlaTE-001. Improve from experience of the Hiawatha LRT (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0063) EngEng-3

Hiawatha LRT is a huge success albeit with some relatively minor problems. We should learn from these mistakes, improve upon them and realize that the Central Corridor is not the Hiawatha Corridor. A precise and careful analysis of the make-up of the Central Corridor is required to accomplish this feat. The current DEIS is not complete with regard to pedestrian traffic, safety and need.

Response PlaTE-001. Comment noted. Transportation effects including transit, traffic, pedestrian and bike systems are assessed and reported in chapter 6 of the FEIS. The purpose and need for the project was established during project initiation.

Issue Summary PlaTP-088. Need to accommodate bike transport (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0040) PlaTP-080

Discussion of and accommodation of bike transport on LRT and BRT.

Response PlaTP-088. The accommodation of bikes on light rail trains will comply with existing policy employed on Hiawatha. Section 6.3 of the FEIS provides an analysis of bicycle and pedestrian issues.

Issue Summary PlaTP-125. Concerned about access into LRT (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0121) PlaTP-175

Will it be scooter accessible? I have a hard time climbing steps in the buses also.

Response PlaTP-125. All elements and components of the Central Corridor LRT will be in compliance with ADA requirements and will be fully accessible.

Section: 6.3 - Pedestrians & Bicyclists - Distance/Paths to Stations

Issue Summary EngBP-006. Concerns about distance to walk to light rail stops (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0152) EngBP-25

Concerns are: 5. Too far to walk

Response EngBP-006. The defined study area as outlined in the FEIS considered a "walkshed" between one quarter mile and one half mile from the identified station locations, which equates to approximately a 5 or 10 minute walk. Improvements to pedestrian facilities are discussed in FEIS Section 6.3.

Issue Summary PlaTF-006. Concern of potential walking distances and station locations. (3)

Comments:

(CCLRP0271) PlaTE-63

According to Russ Stark from the University UNITED Midway Transportation Organization, in 1983, when traffic conditions were much less troublesome than they are today, the University Ave. alignment was recommended because it would replace the existing bus service with a more efficient rail service. LRT will not replace the 16A. LRT on University and Washington Avenues would replace one limited-stop bus line. No regular transit rider is going to welcome an additional 2-6-block walk on University Avenue. University Avenue is not now, and will not be, during or after the construction of LRT, a pedestrian-friendly street.

(CCLRP0937) PlaTP-065

I am very concerned that I would have to walk further to my stop if it is light rail and not a #16 bus.

(CCLRP0933) ProHLP-094

The reason I am against the light rail is because I am a senior citizen and they don't make enough stops and I am not able to walk a long way.

Response PlaTF-006. Station locations along the LRT line were chosen strategically in order to minimize walking times. Route 16 service will continue to operate in the Central Corridor providing local bus service as well as connections to Central Corridor LRT stations. Additional bus routes and changed to existing bus routes will be implemented to improve connectivity as part of the project. See Section 6.1 of the FEIS for further details.

Issue Summary ProHLP-029. Walking distance (to stations) for elderly and people without cars (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0524) ProHLP-038

1. The DEIS (3.9.3) states "In general, the University Ave LRT would provide enhanced

access to transit and increased mobility and would not have a major impact on the cohesiveness of the neighborhoods, including minority or low income neighborhoods or transit dependant populations..." The concept of "neighborhood cohesiveness" is not operationally defined, and no data appears to support this conclusion. Nor is there any reference to this concept in the "glossary." In fact, where the majority of low-income residents live along University Avenue is a "pass through zone" where stations are the furthest apart. The first 11 proposed stops in the west are all within the first five miles. After the Raymond Station, distances between stations increases to one mile apart until after the Rice Street station. In effect, about one half of the corridor exceeds the walk-to-station distance recognized as acceptable by transit experts. (.25 miles...the document even states in the new Hiawatha corridor, some street park and ride actual pedestrian walking distance seems to be no more than 600 feet!) So where the greatest numbers of elderly and people without cars live, the stations are furthest apart. (Demographics covered 3.1)

Response ProHLP-029. Comment noted. Section 3.2 of the FEIS discusses community cohesion issues and impacts from construction and operation of the Central Corridor LRT project. The corridor is not intended, nor would it act as a physical barrier between neighborhoods. With regard to station locations, station spacing, and transit dependency, the Metropolitan Council is continuing to evaluate the three infill stations and factors affecting transit dependency in the corridor, discussions of which are provided in the section 3.8 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProPURP-003. Comment on general LRT ridership and bicycle, pedestrian and bus integration (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0890) ProPURP-236

I did want to talk today about a very micro issue and that is the actual people that ride that 16-A bus that goes down University Avenue. For some time, because I was quite sick, I had to ride that bus with great frequency and I wasn't able to drive and I got to know a number of people there and I think when people ask about who this benefits and does it just benefit the businesses and the corporations, I think they need to think about the fact that 90 percent of public-assisted recipients don't own a car, 40 percent of the daily public transport people are low income and there are people like the guy who I met when he was released from Regions Hospital and had no one to greet him and had to travel down University Avenue in order to get to his uncle's house. There was a senior woman who lived, again, in the Frogtown area and was traveling quite a long distance every day to take care of her children's kids and that was her job and she really loved her job and she loved her kids, but it was an hour and a half on the road. It was a really hard time. And then there was the blind person who I just admire greatly and I saw many times. He lived in the Midway area, worked in Minneapolis, and how could you imagine that this could be any more difficult for a blind person to get around, but they prevail.

Response ProPURP-003. Comment noted. A discussion of factors contributing to transit dependency is provided in FEIS Section 3.8.

Section: 6.3 - Miscellaneous

Issue Summary EngCI-009. **Impact on airports** (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0379) EngCI-52

It appears the proposed project will not have a direct impact to airports. If construction impacts require disruption to navigational aids or would create obstructions that would affect navigable airspace, construction notification may be required under Part 77 of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Response EngCI-009. The Central Corridor LRT project will have no direct impacts to airports.

Section: 6.0 - Report Corrections Needed

Issue Summary ProPM-021. **Report corrections needed** (6)

Comments:

(CCLRP0436) PlaTP-096

Page 2-5, Planned Improvements in the Central Corridor, Letter D, 2nd bullet; Figure 2.3-1; Pg 6-3; 6.2.2: The document states, "Intensify regional coverage of bus-only shoulder use on I-94 and expand number of ramp meter bypass lanes." Lengthen this sentence to include at the end, "where right-of-way is available." Expanding the number of ramp meter bypasses is no longer a goal (since the ramp-metering policy changed), but ramp meters may be provided where work is being done and where right-of-way is available.

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-136

Section 6.5.1, page 6-36, University of Minnesota Campus - The University currently has 13,410 parking spaces on the East Bank and 2,395 spaces on the West Bank for a total of 15,805 off-street spaces. Figure 6.5-1 should be updated in the Final EIS.

(CCLRP0443) PlaTP-138

27th Ave SE Station should read "University" Ave and 27th Ave SE rather than "Washington" Ave.

(CCLRP0443) ProPM-121

Section 6.1.1, page 6-3, METHODOLOGY AN ASSUMPTIONS Programmed and Planned Roadway System. - The DEIS should reflect current Transportation Improvements (TIP) for the study area not 2001-2004 as noted.

(CCLRP0271) ProPM-125

Where is the study of the north of University Ave. LRT alignment utilizing the existing section of Central Corridor transitway connecting the Minneapolis and St. Paul U of M campuses?

(CCLRP0443) ProPM-205

Section 6.1-2b - Recommend figure be updated with more current volumes.

Response ProPM-021. All chapters and sections of the AA/DEIS have been updated since publication of the AA/DEIS and selection of the AA/DEIS LPA. The Metropolitan Council has conducted and published an SDEIS to assess the impacts of necessary changes to key elements of the AA/DEIS LPA before selecting the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is fully described in Chapter 2 of the FEIS, and all chapters and sections assess the potential beneficial and adverse impacts of the Preferred Alternative and present mitigation strategies. The FEIS utilizes the latest information and analysis methods available for each section. It uses the most current data, studies, community plans, model outputs, and assumptions, and is based on the current design and engineering studies for the Central Corridor LRT.

Section: 8.1 - Capital Funding Strategy

Issue Summary NR-026. What will be the cost of the project? (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0151) NR-1
What will be the cost?

Response NR-026. The cost of the Central Corridor LRT Project is \$914.9 million in year of expenditure (YOE) dollars. Detailed cost information is included in Chapter 8 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PlaTE-009. Concerns about LRT O&M costs. (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0475) PlaTE-132

p. S-20 Baseline adds 34 additional bus vehicles with added operating cost of \$43 million in 2002 dollars. p. S-21 LRT adds 31 new LRT vehicles (a higher figure than the 26 mentioned later on in the DEIS and removes 47 bus vehicles, cutting bus service by \$.10 million in year 2002 dollars. The 31 vehicles with 66 seats each would add seating capacity of 2,046. Removing 47 buses with 45 seats each would remove 2,115 seats. LRT alternative decreases transit seating capacity in the corridor. LRT +bus is \$48,000,000 annual O&M. Add back the \$10 million bus service cut, that would be \$58,000,000. Subtract existing \$40,500,000 and that gives LRT annual O&M of \$17,500,000.

Response PlaTE-009. In the FEIS, operation and maintenance costs were updated to account for proposed changes in the Preferred Alternative, Baseline and No-Build Alternative. Operations of the Preferred Alternative and various alternatives are described in Chapter 2 of the FEIS. Costs associated with operations are described in Chapter 8.

Issue Summary ProALT-011. Continued project funding (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0207) ProALT-049

I know we will be users of an LRT system in the Central Corridor. It is important to finish our planning and secure the currently available federal funding help for construction.

Response ProALT-011. It is anticipated that funding from Section 5309 New Starts grants would comprise approximately 50 percent of the project cost. The federal grant will be formalized in a full funding grant agreement (FFGA) at the end of final design. Once budgeted by Congress, the FTA will authorize the Metropolitan Council to draw against those funds provided that it matches the FTA funds with state and/or local commitments for the project.

Issue Summary ProFSt-001. Concerned that cost of project will hurt local economy (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0800) ProFSt-001

I'm a little concerned about these fantasies that Met Council and other people in this community have about light rail or any other nickel and dime con games they have to satisfy their needs. It says here that even after the fares are collected the state's still going to have to pay 50 percent of the operating cost. I mean these are just dark holes that we keep on throwing money down. They kill the economy in the local area.

Response ProFSt-001. Comment noted.

Issue Summary ProFSt-003. General Comment on Operating Costs Comparison (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0436) ProFSt-003

General Comment on Operating Costs Comparison: We suggest that the funds that the Met Council would receive from the Federal Transit Association (FTA) for having a fixed guideway segment in both the BRT Alternative and the LRT Alternative (verses the Baseline Alternative) should be added to at least one of the cost tables. While this does not really affect the total operating costs, it does affect the income the state receives to pay for those costs.

Response ProFSt-003. Central Corridor LRT project costs have been refined during preliminary engineering to reflect the Preferred Alternative, as documented and reported in the FEIS. A detailed description of the operating costs is included in Chapter 8 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProFSt-004. Do not want St. Paul and east metro to lose out on available federal funds. (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0859) ProFSt-004

And, finally, we just simply do not want St. Paul and the east metro left behind. Competition over federal funds is extremely intense. We understand that this project is not yet funded. We do not want that \$840 million to be invested elsewhere.

Response ProFSt-004. Comment noted. It is anticipated that funding from Section 5309 New Starts grants would comprise approximately 50 percent of the project cost. The federal grant will be formalized in a full funding grant agreement (FFGA) at the end of final design. Once budgeted by Congress, the FTA will authorize the Metropolitan Council to draw against those funds provided that it matches the FTA funds with state and/or local commitments for the project.

Issue Summary ProFSt-006. Fund this project privately, not publicly (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0328) ProFSt-008

As a supporter of mass transit systems I do not necessarily support full public funding of these systems. Please consider a private business to run transit systems without governmental intrusion. Bus lines in the Twin Cities have increased their ridership tremendously recently and perhaps there are private businesses that could manage a transit system base solely on consumer self-interest and fees. This would be especially true if our state and local governments would resist the temptation to subsidize every vehicle on the road by paying for the damage those vehicles create. I propose a shift from public infrastructure to private investment. Then we would really know which projects have a reason to be paid for.

Response ProFSt-006. Comment noted. No private funding sources have been identified for the Central Corridor LRT Project.

Issue Summary ProFSt-007. We cannot afford this project (4)

Comments:

(CCLRP0864) PlaTE-159

It is equally important during this planning and approval and construction period of time for the City of St. Paul not to spend so much time and emotion and money on the Central Corridor that we forget about or lose track of the continuing needs for the health, economic viability, and the building facade improvement needs of our feeder corridors

(CCLRP0092) ProFSt-007

We can't (taxpayers) afford any more taxes.

(CCLRP0747) ProFSt-009

We are crowded on 16, but when I try 50 it's an underutilized system. How are we going to pay for this? How if it's underutilized? Please think about it. Thank you

(CCLRP0806) ProFSt-010

Where will the funds come from?

Response ProFSt-007. The Metropolitan Council is requesting FTA Section 5309 Discretionary New Starts funding for the project in the amount of \$453 million in the Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) as total New Starts together with \$4.5 million in prior CMAQ funding for the Central Corridor LRT. Other project funding will come from the State of Minnesota, the Counties Transit Improvement Board, RCRRRA, and HCRRRA. State bond funds in the amount of \$83 million have been secured to date. In addition, RCRRRA and HCRRRA have adequate cash and bond capacity to provide the remaining local share of preliminary engineering costs in 2008 and 2009. The CTIB has begun to receive a reliable stream from its sales tax revenue. The Central Corridor LRT is a priority project for the CTIB, and all of its leveraged funding capacity is potentially available to the project. The CTIB has committed to provide 30 percent of the capital funding.

Issue Summary ProFSt-008. Should account for losses and the gains in the private sector as a result of this project (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0836) ProFSt-011

So I hope that when we develop this we can develop a financing mechanism that takes into account both the losses and the gains in the private sector from the public investment.

Response ProFSt-008. Comment noted. Economic effects of the Central Corridor LRT are discussed in Chapter 5 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProFSt-009. The project will have a positive impact (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0083) ProFSt-012

Now is the time to support the development of a light rail system. The competition from other cities for federal funding increases every year. Light rail is an investment in our future. Now is the time to make transportation advances in the Twin Cities. We have a very viable, sound project that will further the attractiveness of our cities and state.

Response ProFSt-009. Comment noted. It is anticipated that funding from Section 5309 New Starts grants would compromise approximately 50 percent of the project cost. The federal grant will be formalized in a full funding grant agreement (FFGA) at the end of final design. Once budgeted by Congress, the FTA will authorize the Metropolitan Council to draw against those funds provided that it matches the FTA funds with state and/or local commitments for the project.

Issue Summary ProFSt-010. Concerned that operating costs will be too high (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0184) ProFSt-005

Operating costs - I find it puzzling that the DEIS projects that light rail operating cost will exceed BRT operating costs. This comparison does not appear to be true for other well run transit agencies. Last summer, the Hiawatha Corridor light rail line was providing over 12% of Metro Transit's trips for less than 8% of its operating expense. In 2004, St. Louis' light rail system provided 51% of the transit agency's passenger miles for just 25% of its operating expense.

Response ProFSt-010. Comment noted. A detailed description of the operating costs is included in Chapter 8 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProPM-015. Project funding (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) ProPM-004

There is also need for adequate funding for maintenance. Excellence in maintenance is crucial for the long-term success of the LRT line. The discussion here does not deal with all the issues related to funding for maintenance. However, some of the critical issues include the need for funding to ensure:

- Excellent upkeep such as replacing broken/damaged materials, sidewalk repairs, timely clearing and snow removal;
- Ongoing updating of security equipment; and
- Adequate security personnel to ensure personal safety at the stops and on the trains.

Response ProPM-015. Project financial information, including infrastructure and operating costs are presented in Chapter 8 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProProjBdj-005. We should not borrow money for this project (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0761) ProProjBdj-008

When you get Leslie Davis you'll stop this borrowing, borrowing, borrowing increasing the debt, debt, debt. There's no money for this. When I look through your literature it talks about there are no funding sources. So what are you going to do? Borrow more money and pay more interest? I have a chart that I'm going to make available to you in the days ahead that show by the year 2016, ten short years from today, all the income of all the wage earners will not be sufficient to service the debt; city, county, state, federal, and consumer debt. It will not be able to be serviced by 2016.

(CCLRP0761) ProProjBdj-011

So I'm pretty annoyed about the way you folks are going ahead and spending money that we don't have and borrowing money that future generations are going to pay and pay in interest, interest, interest on the debt, debt, debt. Davis for Governor will put an end to this kind of activity and thank you very much.

Response ProProjBdj-005. Comment noted. It is anticipated that funding from Section 5309 New Starts grants would comprise approximately 50 percent of the project cost. The federal grant will be formalized in a full funding grant agreement (FFGA) at the end of final design. Once budgeted by Congress, the FTA will authorize the Metropolitan Council to draw against those funds provided that it matches the FTA funds with state and/or local commitments for the project. Other project funding will come from the State of Minnesota, the Counties Transit Improvement Board, RCRRA, and HCRRA.

Section: 9.0 - Secondary and Cumulative Impacts

Issue Summary SocSC-001. Hire more sanitation crews to clean up stations (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0473) SocSC-3

People also already don't seem to care about the trash they leave behind at stops, including shopping carts. The city should hire more sanitation crews to pick up the mess.

Response SocSC-001. Sanitation and Maintenance of Central Corridor LRT stations will be in accordance with Metro Transit, City of St. Paul and City of Minneapolis policies and practices, similar to what is done for Hiawatha LRT.

Issue Summary SocSC-002. Define parameters for dealing with induced secondary impacts (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0428) SocSC-5

Since one of the stated project goals is to induce secondary transit oriented developments (TOD) for economic enhancement along this corridor, FTA and local sponsors should define parameters for dealing with such induced secondary impacts in the final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). For example, will this project provide incentives for assessment, cleanup, and redevelopment of these TOD induced hazardous waste sites?

Response SocSC-002. Since the publication of the AA/DEIS, St. Paul has begun to establish Transit Opportunity Zone overlay districts (TOZ), which, generally, promote and facilitate desired change or improvement through redevelopment and rehabilitation activities. Two policy layers are used: The first establishes a priority approach for a range of incentives, planning, infrastructure, economic development, and capital improvements. In general, hazardous materials clean up would come under this layer. The second consists of a set of development directions.

Section: 10.1 - Evaluation Relative to Project Goals and Objectives

Issue Summary ProProjBdj-006. **The project will not be cost effective** (8)

Comments:

(CCLRP0800) ProProjBdj-006

We got the Hiawatha Corridor that was over budget by half as much what they originally projected and it didn't do one bit of economic good, that whole Hiawatha Corridor. If anything it condemned it because if you're driving a car you can't get down the road anymore. I don't know where you people come up and do this B.S. and, unfortunately, the business owners here sound to me like, "Well, if we got to have it then I need parking. got to have it."

(CCLRP0746) ProProjBdj-009

I support mass transit in the corridor, I support mass transit in both of our cities, and I believe that \$800 million for 11 miles of light rail is not economically sound.

(CCLRP0800) ProProjBdj-015

I never heard one person here in favor of anything, but they are saying, "If we got to have it, this is what we have to have." I don't think these people are in favor. I don't know why the state should put a billion dollars -- a billion three is what it's going to end up costing because your estimates are always so much under and waste this money and then have to supplement by hundreds of millions of dollars a year afterwards. The State of Minnesota cannot keep on paying out for all this B.S.

(CCLRP0906) ProProjBdj-022

my second point is not really meaningful as I state it I recognize, but economically there's something analogous to what I'm about to say that is meaningful and that is the interest on \$800 million, \$30 or \$40 million a year, can do a great deal for the existing system for increasing its frequency particularly.

(CCLRP0075) ProProjBdj-023

Please do not make a very expensive mistake by putting light rail in along University Avenue.

(CCLRP0225) ProProjBdj-025

1. It is too expensive for what you get.

(CCLRP0482) ProProjBdj-027

1) Costs too much, does too little - The Met council estimated a few years ago that it could double the number of buses it runs for \$440 million, which might increase the number of daily trips by 40% (90,000 to 100,000 boardings per day) across the metro area. If this LRT is built, ridership will only increase by about 11,000 one-way trips a day while spending almost twice as much money (\$840 million.) They are spending \$100 million on a posh renovation of the Union Depot, so that train riders can have a far more pleasant wait than 90% of all bus riders. They expect to move the Amtrak depot, which will prove wasteful

when Amtrak cross-country lines are discontinued, especially when you consider that there are only two Amtrak trains per day through the Twin Cities. There will be no "high-speed" regional rail system. It's unlikely that there will be even one commuter rail line into downtown Saint Paul, since the federal funding is decreasing each year.

(CCLRP0075) ProProjBdj-029
Light rail is incredibly expensive.

Response ProProjBdj-006. Comment noted. Meeting the federal cost effectiveness criteria was an essential part of entering into preliminary engineering and will be an essential criterion for entering into final design.

Issue Summary ProProjBdj-008. Project will cost much more than cost estimate (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0741) ProProjBdj-013

How much would this cost? Well, a lot more money, much more than the 800 million that you have proposed. We don't know how much and that's what we need is the facts. It should be laid out so we can decide whether we want to wait until we can round up that kind of money to build a first-class line or if we don't, we ought to know how much it's going to cost to tear up what we have now if 20 years from now we decide that we need an above- and belowground light rail line.

Response ProProjBdj-008. The cost of the Central Corridor LRT Project is \$914.9 million in year of expenditure (YOE) dollars. Detailed cost information is included in Chapter 8 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary ProProjBdj-010. The LRT should be safe but also should be built on time and under budget (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0183) ProProjBdj-017

?? Every effort should be made to get the LRT built on time and within (or under) budget - unless, of course, extra time is needed to build the system so it's safe and functioning as smoothly as possible from day one of operation.

Response ProProjBdj-010. Comment noted. The Metropolitan Council along with the project partners have and will continue to maintain the project schedule. The estimated project costs have been refined during preliminary engineering to reflect updated project elements as well as to account for updated construction costs. Every effort will be made to maintain both the project cost and schedule.

Issue Summary ProProjBdj-012. EIS consultants should not be granted design contracts (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0085) ProProjBdj-026

Page 7-29 of the DEIS indicates that the engineering and administration costs associated with the LRT alternative will be 30% of projected construction costs. I have spoken to the Director of Public Works for Hennepin County about the typical rate for such costs for project of this magnitude. He has told me that a rate of 12% to 18% would be logical for this category. His guess was that costs were set at a high level because of the cost overruns that occurred with the Hiawatha line. However, the text of the DEIS states that 30% is a rate to be applied regardless of project cost. And there is a separate category for contingencies of \$118 million, less than the \$137 million for engineering and administration. I believe the estimate for engineering and administration is about twice as high as it should be given the size of this project. Keeping this much money in this category could be a cover for extra money to be returned to advocates and decision makers voting for this project. Half of \$137 million is \$68.5 million. That is great deal of the public's money without justifiable purpose in this project. I believe the figure of 30% for engineering and administration should not be accepted, but should be reduced to no more than 15%, with the possibility of contingency fees associated with extra work, should it arise and only if it is clearly documented. I also would strongly urge that no firm that obtained contracts for the EIS, or alternatives analysis phases should be granted a contract for design of construction of any of the alternatives. To do so, gives an incentive, as I suspect may be the case, for a planning firm to steer the analysis toward the alternative with the highest cost and thus the highest eventual consulting contract. This is a conflict of interest which the public should not countenance on any project, but especially one of this magnitude.

Response ProProjBdj-012. Capital cost estimates in YOE dollars were documented in the FTA's Standard Cost Category (SCC) worksheets and submitted to FTA as part of the update to the annual New Starts Report. The cost estimates were reviewed by the FTA as well as local project stakeholders. Detailed information about the project costs is included in Chapter 8 of the FEIS. The Environmental Consultants that completed the AA/DEIS, SDEIS and this FEIS are not involved in the preliminary engineering, final design or construction of the Central Corridor LRT project.

Issue Summary ProProjBdj-014. Keep the project on time. Keep the project on budget
(1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0892) ProProjBdj-030

As the project moves forward the chamber will continue to stress the importance of additional principles. One, keep the project on time. Keep the project on budget.

Response ProProjBdj-014. These principles have also been adopted by the Metropolitan Council to guide the Central Corridor LRT project, as embodied in the resolution adopting the Preferred Alternative in 2006 (Resolution #2006-15) and reaffirmed in the resolution adopting the Preferred Alternative (Resolution #2008-245).

Section: 11.0 - Public Comment Process

Issue Summary PlaTP-131. **Comments & coordination** (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0271) PlaTP-059

At the last meeting of the Central Corridor Coordinating Committee (CCCC), it was announced that Bob Baker, University of Minnesota Parking Executive has replaced Jan Morlock, Community Relations Director, as the University's seat on the CCCC. Is the University's vote on the CCCC representing the many 1000s of daily riders of the 16A, many of whom travel to and from the University, or do the votes of the Community Relations Director and the Parking Executive reflect the greed, stupidity, and not very enlightened self-interest of the 10s of thousands of drive-by polluters pouring in and out of the University's misplaced parking facilities?

(CCLRP0436) ProPOL-24

Any use of or work within or affecting Mn/DOT right of way requires a permit. This includes any additional drainage (i.e. pipe or overland).

(CCLRP0271) ProPOL-34

At what is supposedly the State's premier research institution, which houses departments of engineering, urban planning, public health, economics, history, geography and other disciplines directly related to the issue of public transit, why would the Board of Regents, or whomever is responsible for placing a representative on the CCCC, select first a Public Relations Director, and then a Parking Executive, to represent the interests of U of M transit riders?

(CCLRP0406) ProPOL-35

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Council requests that PED continue to participate as appropriate on behalf of the City in the study of light rail on University Avenue

(CCLRP0764) ProPOL-37

So I'll just make a record on that question and wanted the committee and the members of the public to know the intended process that the City will follow to establish the formal City comments as part of this process.

Response PlaTP-131. Comment Noted

Issue Summary PubPI-003. **Concern over the length of the public comment period.** (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0457) ProPOL-40

On May 5, 2006 the Draft EIS was released for public comments, with comments due to the Ramsey County Regional Rail Authority (RCRRA) by June 5, 2006. This short time frame did not allow City personnel sufficient time to present them through the normal City Council meeting cycle prior to the June 5 deadline. As a result Public Works developed and

submitted draft comments to the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority (RCRRA) by the June 5, 2006 deadlines. The Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority (RCRRA) agreed to receive the draft comments by the deadline with the understanding that the City of Minneapolis would prepare final comments and obtain City Council approvals.

(CCLRP0453) PubPI-003

The people who will be most seriously impacted by the Central Corridor project are those in low income communities where a large percentage of the population is not of the white majority. Those communities of color deserve the opportunity to have the most input into this process, because they have the most to lose. The RCRRA has had many years to develop this project, yet some of you would choose to limit the public comment period to a mere 45 days. This is a slap in the faces of all those people who live and own businesses near this project. It is a matter of justice. When I-94 was built, why was the chosen location right down the middle of the black community's main business area rather than along some railroad right-of-way? It was because those were the people who lacked money and power. Many of those citizens and business owners participated in task forces in the late 1980s/early 1990s to recommend the preferred alignment for LRT. They chose I-94, not once, but twice! Yet you would overrule the citizens. They spoke loud and clear, but it wasn't the answer the RCRRA wanted to hear. The RCRRA made an arbitrary choice to put LRT on University Avenue. I believe that the reason really is about developers who covet the land where the successful ethnic business community is located. Those folks built their businesses on the east end of University Avenue when no one else was willing to invest. Now greedy developers are just waiting for the opportunity to squeeze these folks out, just like in the days of Rondo. The least the RCRRA can do is give these folks a comment period of sufficient length to fully articulate their feelings and bring forth their ideas. Anything less is tyranny, and, since most of the commissioners don't even live near the LRT line, they shouldn't be imposing their will on the poor. **EXTEND THE COMMENT PERIOD IN THE NAME OF JUSTICE.**

Response PubPI-003. The public comment period following publication of the AA/DEIS was consistent with the requirements set forth by the federal government, lasting 45 days, and was not extended. However, any comments received after the closing of the comment period were included in the public record. In the next phase of the project, Preliminary Engineering, the Metropolitan Council held a variety of public meetings, forums, and listening sessions prior to making further scoping decisions. Public comments and outreach are discussed in Chapter 11 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PubPI-008. Concerns in regard to public comment process (18)

Comments:

(CCLRP0055) ProPM-195

It's best to see if the people really want the railroad to be built on University Ave. Many would be furious if they didn't know about this situation. Let the people voice their mind and listen!

(CCLRP0910) PubPI-010

I think it's a travesty that we were not included in these discussions and we were not considered.

(CCLRP0148) PubPI-013

Since it's already been planned by City planners and engineers, I feel my comments or voice does not matter.

(CCLRP0760) PubPI-016

I also want to thank you for holding the first hearing here in Minneapolis because it's important that people recognize this is not just about St. Paul. This is about the entire region, and Minneapolis is very pleased to support that. We are founding members of the Central Corridor Partnership and are working closely with St. Paul on this regional effort for LRT in that district.

(CCLRP0271) PubPI-018

According to a conversation I had this morning with Barbara Lawrence, Ramsey County Human Resources staffer, the County has been in the process of hiring a Public Information Associate for the past 6 months or longer. According to Ms. Lawrence, the primary function of the Public Information Associate will be to facilitate a series of citizen participation meetings concerning the Central Corridor project. How can Mayor Coleman, or anyone else, claim that studies determining the preferred route for the Central Corridor LRT have been completed prior to the beginning of the lengthy and expensive process of engaging and educating the public about the Central Corridor project? <http://www.co.ramsey.mn.us/hr/jobs/publicinfoassocposting.pdf>

(CCLRP0183) PubPI-024

You have done a outstanding job of soliciting input from the public and giving us many opportunities and methods for expressing our concerns.

(CCLRP0938) PubPI-026

First of all, we have no say. We didn't have say the first time when you put in I-94.

(CCLRP0090) PubPI-028

Frustrated that we didn't get this mailing until June! All public dialogues were in May?!!!!

(CCLRP0782) PubPI-029

I support also and appreciate the engagement of the community in this process, especially given the history of the Rondo community and, therefore, I appreciate any sensitivity to ensuring that the African-American community in particular continues to be engaged in how Light Rail Transit is carried out between Minneapolis and St. Paul.

(CCLRP0471) PubPI-034

Fifteen years ago, real people who live near University Avenue served on a task force that chose I-94 as the preferred LRT location. In 2002, the Ramsey County Regional Rail Authority, who are a bunch of elected officials who don't live anywhere near University

Avenue, decided that LRT should be placed on University Avenue. These people won't have to live with the problems that LRT will create on University Avenue, we will. Why should their will be imposed on us?

(CCLRP0031) PubPI-036

LRT is already a 'done-deal' and having these meetings makes us feel like we actually have some say in the matter. Not!

(CCLRP0273) PubPI-055

Well, after five simple phone calls to major transit manufacturers and a little inventive solutions pondering (coming from 25 years of transit research), my confidence in this public process feels like it has been run over by a train. I imagine I feel just like most of the small businesses and citizens that don't have lobbyists and haven't been at one time members of the Regional Rail Authority.

(CCLRP0058) PubPI-061

Why not ask us FIRST? Why not make this available and KNOWN to the public, especially the ones most affected by it?

(CCLRP0934) PubPI-065

I know that there was a meeting--I read about a meeting that was held. I have not received any invitation for this meeting. Was there some public announcement about it? I did not learn about it until this community meeting that took place on the 24th of May.

(CCLRP0470) PubPI-077

In Section 7 of the DEIS, several planning documents are referenced as well as public comments received about each of them. For each of these documents, the number of comments that support LRT was listed, but the rest of the information is missing. To provide a fair and objective analysis, the public must be told how many total comments were received, and the number of comments that were favorable, neutral, or unfavorable. For example, in the last paragraph on page 7-11, it says, "As indicated in the Central Corridor Scoping Summary Report, there were 29 total comments supportive of LRT and the need for LRT in the Central corridor." How many total comments were received? The document doesn't say. How many negative comments were received? The information is not provided here. This is an obvious attempt to bias the reader toward LRT, and is not appropriate. When examining the list of public meetings held concerning the scoping found in Section 8.6.2 of the DEIS, I noticed that meetings were held in all of the neighborhoods except one, and that is Hamline Midway. Meetings were held for Community Councils not adjacent to University Avenue (Como Community Council, District 2 Community Council) and some districts had more than one meeting, but Hamline Midway was not included. This is a major oversight, and all Hamline Midway residents should be given additional time to comment as remediation. Finally, in Section 8.8 of the DEIS, the last sentence of the second paragraph states, "The Final EIS will identify how comments received influenced the project outcome." I fully expect to see an outcome that is more closely aligned with the goals and objectives of those of us who live near University Avenue rather than the goals of elected officials who won't suffer any loss if LRT is built.

(CCLRP0463) PubPI-083

She asked that the City continue to include the opinions and viewpoints of the young people as they want to be involved. Ms. Lee noted that a position statement was previously sent to the City Council.

(CCLRP0298) PubPI-084

I need more information

(CCLRP0407) PubPI-087

PUBLIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM - (Section 8) This Section recounts the public participation process that the region followed in the creation and completion of the Draft EIS. The information is consistent with City records of meetings and other outreach.

Response PubPI-008. A comprehensive plan for public involvement was developed as part of preliminary engineering and was summarized in Chapter 11 of the FEIS. This plan included outreach to all communities along the corridor and also included hiring Community Outreach Coordinators whose sole responsibility is to interface with residents, business owners and other stakeholders in the process. The Community Outreach Coordinator team is multilingual, including Spanish, Thai, Vietnamese, Hmong, French, and American Sign Language. The plan included a component to reach out to limited English proficiency and other sectors of the community who may be typically underrepresented in the planning and public involvement process. During preliminary engineering, a full-time Manager of Communications was hired to ensure that information about the Central Corridor LRT was available and published in local media and to develop informational materials published by the project office informing the public about the project. There has been and will continue to be a Central Corridor project Web site containing a comprehensive record of engineering and environmental studies completed for the project. This site also contains a record of all public meetings, including minutes, handouts, presentations, etc. It can be found at www.centralcorridor.org.

Issue Summary PubPI-015. Availability of AA/DEIS online and length of the comment period concerns (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0939) PubPI-027

The draft EIS was not released for many months, or a couple of years I believe. And I believe the timing of the release of this was kind of difficult, because it was a time when people starting getting very busy. The meetings were good to have, but they all happened in the same week and that week I could not attend, so I think 45 days for something that took so long to release that will have an impact on our community was way too short of a comment period and I cannot access the 600 page draft EIS on my computer. I cannot download that, so I was not able to read the actual document.

(CCLRP0075) PubPI-041

I am also very troubled by the fact that the mailed notice from Peter McLaughlin of the public hearings did not get mailed until May 30 (received by my household June 1) AFTER

all of the public hearings had taken place!! This is a ridiculous way to inform the public of a major issue that should have public comment. It seems to me that the comment period should be extended since notification was given so late.

(CCLRP0452) PubPI-058

A plea was made at the Central Corridor Coordinating Committee meeting to extend the Environmentally Impact Statement comment time frame by fifteen (15) days or more. This would allow a small portion of time (360 hours) to permit the needs of the resident ethnic community to be addressed in comment. I recognize the tremendous power and impact the LRT Project will have on the community, and ask you affirm a decision to grant the requested extension. The bitterness of poor treatment remains long after the victory of a quick vote. A small over-reach or extension to ensure an inclusive process can make an enormous community difference in the long-term.

(CCLRP0105) PubPI-071

I am appalled at the lack of professionalism surrounding the request for public feedback on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Light Rail Transit along the Central Corridor. On May 31st, last Wednesday, I received your request for feedback. While your request is dated May 18th, it is marked May 30th. The statement itself (dated April 3rd on the cover) states in the abstract that a "45-day period has been established for comments on this document." Five calendar days is not enough time to obtain a copy of the DEIS and provide meaningful feedback. Furthermore, the letter was postmarked AFTER three of the four public hearings it was announcing. The letter contains no information on the fourth public hearing beyond the fact that there is a fourth. It is obvious that the letter was not proofread or this would have been noticed and fixed. The deadline for public comment should be extended until July 14th (45 days from May 30th) and new public hearings should be scheduled. At a minimum, the deadline should be extended three more weeks (June 26th) and one more public hearing should be scheduled with sufficient notification to at least those of us who live within one block on the Central Corridor. I realize that Mr. McLaughlin and his team are working very hard on this matter. However, matters so important to the long-term development of the Twin Cities must not be rushed. The time must be spent to ensure quality work is done. If I've learned anything from your letter, it is that I am not comfortable with the quality of work being done by the author. I hope the quality of this project will be higher.

(CCLRP0453) PubPI-072

I wish to go on record in support of the Central Corridor Equity Commission's letter of April 20 to Commissioner Ortega requesting that the RCRRRA grant an extension to the LRT public comment period. I recommend that this period be lengthened to a minimum of 60 days for one simple reason. The decision we make will have a lasting impact of 50 years or more. Something of this magnitude must be given a serious amount of consideration by the members of the public who will live with these decisions long after you are no longer in office or even working.

Response PubPI-015. The public comment period during the AA/DEIS phase was not extended to 60 days as requested in these comments. However, any comments received after the closing of the comment period were included in the public record. Timing for public

hearings in Minnesota is regulated by state environmental statutes and typically must take place within the span of one week. In addition to being posted online, the AA/DEIS was available at local area libraries and many hundreds of hard copies of the document were made and distributed to the public.

Issue Summary PubPI-022. Concern about the length of the AA/DEIS public comment period (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0177) PubPI-044

I suggest that deeper consideration affords the opportunity to develop a plan for development that is more inclusive of affected constituencies than the 45 day comment period in effect through today. Further, I suggest that the laudable efforts of the Central Corridor Partnership be connected to the equally laudable objectives of the Central Corridor Equity Coalition - which proposes that "there should be no revitalization that causes gentrification and displacement" - and further that we must "reserve and enhance, restore and heal our community."

Response PubPI-022. The public comment period during the AA/DEIS phase was not extended; however, any comments received after the closing of the comment period were included in the public record. Members of the Central Corridor Equity Coalition were invited and accepted membership to serve on the Community Advisory Committee formed in the early stages of preliminary engineering.

Issue Summary PubPI-043. Concern about the opportunity to speak at public hearings (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0133) PubPI-079

I attended the "public hearing" at Central High School on May 23, 2006. I was VERY frustrated to sit and listen to HOURS of testimony from Stakeholders and supporters of light rail (from business and non-profits) with only minor connection with the midway neighborhood, while residents waited for their turn to be heard. Most residents, like myself, who were NOT there as part of their professional duties but were taking time away from home and family, were forced to leave in disgust, without being heard. I am for LRT. But you MUST have a TRUE community forum in which the concerns of residents of the old Rondo neighborhood will be heard and recorded.

Response PubPI-043. Public hearings are open to all who choose to attend and ground rules, including time limits, were established to provide everyone an opportunity to share their comments. The public was also provided the opportunity to leave comments via written letter, email, and telephone.

Issue Summary PubPI-044. Availability of the AA/DEIS in alternative languages and comment period (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0524) PubPI-082

Chapter 8 documents all efforts to solicit public opinion prior to the OBIS. While these efforts are commendable, they do not mention the DEIS was presented to the community with a very short response period. Despite repeated appeals to add more time for the community to respond, the 45-day response time to the DEIS was not altered. While Executive summaries in some languages were made available in Libraries (sometimes not in the effected neighborhoods), an in-depth understanding of this massive document by immigrant and other groups in the Corridor is an issue.

Response PubPI-044. The public comment period during the AA/DEIS phase was not extended to 60 days as requested in this comment. However, any comments received after the closing of the comment period were included in the public record. A comprehensive plan for public involvement was developed as part of preliminary engineering and was summarized in Chapter 11 of the FEIS. This plan did include outreach to all communities along the corridor and also included hiring Community Outreach Coordinators whose sole responsibility is to interface with residents, business owners and other stakeholders in the process. The Community Outreach Coordinator team is multilingual, including Spanish, Thai, Vietnamese, Hmong, French, and American Sign Language. The plan included a component to reach out to limited English proficiency and other sectors of the community who may be typically underrepresented in the planning and public involvement process.

Section: 11.0 - Public Involvement

Issue Summary NR-009. The project should handle specific and broad construction issues thoughtfully and quickly (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0406) NR-14

Finally, a public relations firm should be hired as part of the construction team to develop a plan for outreach which would deal with specific and broad issues related to construction. There should be special construction accommodations during construction including a 24-hour contractor hotline with 30 minute response time to contact the complainant.

(CCLRP0139) NR-41

Construction mitigation

Response NR-009. In February 2007, the Metropolitan Council prepared the Central Corridor LRT Communication and Public Involvement Strategic Plan. Information on the formation and activities associated with this plan and the Central Corridor Project Office (CCPO) is provided in FEIS Chapter 11. In order to mitigate against negative impacts associated with the LRT's construction, best management practices and guidelines will be followed in order to avoid impacts to the greatest extent practicable to adjacent neighbors and neighborhoods.

Issue Summary PubPI-004. Concerns about public involvement and input. (5)

Comments:

(CCLRP0874) PubPI-004

Now, a third time has presented itself for interruptions in the community. If University Avenue becomes a Central Corridor it will be an interruption and it has been a disrespect for people of color. We have not been asked to be a part of the corridor partnership to help plan this. You only came to us after you had made up your mind where you wanted to go and where (Applause) We're all willing to work to make this a better community because we're included with it all, but imagine my surprise when tax time came to find my taxes had already gone up \$1500. There has to be some kind of stop and you guys need to stop completely disrespecting us and let us know when the next meeting is so we can have something to say that you will listen to.

(CCLRP0447) PubPI-007

Through whose, mind's eye does the vision of the Light Rail Transit Project "exist"? Clearly not from the constituent's of Summit University, Lexington - Hamline or Frog Town Communities. With the "Not in our back Yard" mentality of suburbanites we need to understand how and why their input is regarded into the support this project. They are not a part of the communities just mentioned. We are beginning to hear more of their input than those who are going to be severely impacted by this proposed mode of transportation. The people surrounding this issue need a strong voice that considers and respects their thoughts and their vision, not from those who don't live and work in the area.

(CCLRP0180) PubPI-008

We are trying to be visionary as we look forward in the 21st Century. We want to ensure that we are included and an integral part of the process.

(CCLRP0019) PubPI-022

Continue to keep citizens informed of process and progress of the Central Corridor.

(CCLRP0877) PubPI-040

And as a side note I would just support the light rail alternative more so long as the powers that be continue to and perhaps do a better job of listening to some legitimate issues that members of the community have.

Response PubPI-004. Comment noted. A comprehensive plan for public involvement was developed as part of preliminary engineering and is summarized in Chapter 11 of the FEIS. This plan did include outreach to all communities along the corridor and also included hiring Community Outreach Coordinators whose sole responsibility is to interface with residents, business owners and other stakeholders in the process.

Issue Summary PubPI-010. Comment on the role and budget of the Community Advisory Committee. (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0171) PubPI-012

The committee should be accorded a powerful role in decision-making throughout the planning and building process, with a budget to provide for technical and outreach staff, and expenses for research, publicity, public relations, community organizing, and financial incentives for successful mitigation of construction impacts.

Response PubPI-010. The Community Advisory Committee was not given a budget to disburse of its own accord. Members of the CAC did have and will continue to have direct access to CCPO staff through the Community Outreach Coordinators that have been assigned to liaise with them. Requests to receive technical data, to have technical data explained to them, and other requests have been and will continue to be fulfilled by Central Corridor project staff.

Issue Summary PubPI-017. Concerns in regard to CCCC decision making (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0470) PubPI-032

On page S-4 of the document, the Central Corridor Coordinating Committee (CCCC) has stated some goals for whatever action they decide upon. The members of the CCCC are primarily elected officials and others who are far removed from the needs and concerns of ordinary people. They also don't live anywhere close to University Avenue and won't have to live with any negative impacts caused by their decision. Thus the goals that they have for the overall project are not necessarily in the best interest of the people who live adjacent to University Avenue and will be impacted most by this decision.

Response PubPI-017. Comment noted. The CCCC and the CCMC which began meeting during preliminary engineering is made up of local elected officials whose charge is to make decisions in the public interest for the people they represent. The CCMC also includes a representative of the business community and the corridor residents.

Issue Summary PubPI-027. Concerns about public input in the project and issue-based task forces (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0894) PubPI-050

I have also listened intently to the people who have expressed valid concerns and questions concerning the project. I think it's important that these concerns and questions be addressed fully during the preliminary engineering phase of this project.

(CCLRP0406) PubPI-053

Finally, the City of Saint Paul recommends community-based work groups/task forces be established for each of the issues listed above, and staffed by multi-disciplinary staff teams (including engineers, public artists, planners, and developers). Results of these analyses should be viewed as input to the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Central Corridor

Management Team and foundational for making decisions on the design and construction of LRT.

Response PubPI-027. The proposed strategy to form issues-based task forces and report on their progress to a CAC and to the CCMC was instituted during preliminary engineering and this strategy and its outcomes are reported in the FEIS in Chapter 11.

Issue Summary PubPI-039. Concern about neighborhood input in the planning of the project (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0043) PubPI-073

By actively recruiting people from impacted neighborhoods along University Ave to participate in the planning and decision making at every step along the way.

Response PubPI-039. A Community Advisory Committee was formed in early preliminary engineering as a means of engaging community representatives and leaders in the process. The CAC includes representatives from District 6, District 7, Capitol River Council, District 13, the District Councils Collaborative Summit University Avenue Planning Council, and many other community councils. The CAC will continue to meet throughout advanced preliminary engineering, final design, and construction of the Central Corridor LRT. Details on public outreach activities are available in Chapter 11 of the FEIS.

Section: 11.0 - Information Availability

Issue Summary PubPI-012. Concern about the online availability of the AA/DEIS (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0086) PubPI-019

Why isn't the draft EIS available in sections or summary form on-line so all residents of the region have access?

Response PubPI-012. The AA/DEIS is available online by chapter, including an Executive Summary of the document. It can be found at www.centralcorridor.org.

Issue Summary PubPI-023. Concern about the availability of project data. (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0801) PubPI-045

So I'm requesting that some kind of data information system that provides the population with -- regardless of what kind of project is developed, that there be a data process set up to monitor and evaluate and, therefore, use that information to further improve the project.

Response PubPI-023. There has been and will continue to be a Central Corridor project Web site containing a comprehensive record of engineering and environmental studies

completed for the project. This site also contains a record of all public meetings, including minutes, handouts, presentations, etc. It can be found at www.centralcorridor.org. Details on public outreach activities are available in Chapter 11 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PubPI-031. Utilizing newspapers for project information (2)

Comments:

(CCLRP0774) PubPI-057

My understanding talking to an engineer here is that on the cross streets, instead of having access at every cross street it will be every other one. Well, I didn't know that before I came here. I understand that there will still be two lanes of traffic each way. I didn't know that before I came here. And I think that you people ought to utilize the newspapers more fully to explain just how light rail is going to impact all the people that already use University.

(CCLRP0774) PubPI-074

during the discussion on light rail I've heard very little about the impact it will have on the people that already use University; and I don't think you people have done a very good job of that in either of the newspapers. I think you really ought to utilize the newspapers to show just what kind of access everyone's going to have to University after light rail, you know.

Response PubPI-031. A Central Corridor Communications Manager was hired by the Council during preliminary engineering to work closely with the media and disseminate information about the project to the public. Details on public outreach activities are available in Chapter 11 of the FEIS. The FEIS documents all signalized intersections and non-signalized pedestrian crossings along the Central Corridor. See Chapter 2 and Chapter 6 of the FEIS for further details.

Issue Summary PubPI-037. Concern about availability of construction updates (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0532) PubPI-069

There should be a 24-hour construction hotline in multiple languages for residents and businesses.

Response PubPI-037. Information on construction plans, impacts, and schedule will be available for the public, local area residents and businesses during final design and during construction. The multilingual outreach staff will be responsible for informing the community. Details on public outreach activities are available in Chapter 11 of the FEIS.

Issue Summary PubPI-041. Communication of information from government to public (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0801) PubPI-075

We know what happened with Rondo. We know what happened when the community developed some block plans and displacement of these curbs and that kind of developmental

strategy. What I'm saying, in essence, and requesting is that some kind of informational system, data collection and reporting process be developed from the Day One to monitor and determine what impact this program is having on the communities that it's going to be built through or built within; and so what I'm saying, in essence, is that we need a process that is open. We have sunshine coming through. We need a process that is responsible to the constituencies that this development project is going to be dealing with.

Response PubPI-041. A Community Advisory Committee was formed in early preliminary engineering as a means of engaging community representatives and leaders in the process. The CAC will continue to meet throughout advanced preliminary engineering, final design, and construction of the Central Corridor LRT. The Community Advisory Committee was constituted to intentionally represent all geographic, neighborhood, ethnic, and cultural interests along the corridor. Each member of the CAC is charged with interfacing with the community he or she represents and bringing forward those voices to the CAC. At each monthly CCMC meeting (made up of locally elected officials and agency representatives) there is a CAC report to update that group on the CAC's business. Issues raised by the community through public meetings, public input and comments on the AA/DEIS were addressed during early stages of preliminary engineering through the development of Issues Teams charged with resolving major outstanding issues. This process is discussed in Chapter 11 of the FEIS. Additional information regarding public involvement is available at www.centralcorridor.org.

Section: 11.0 - Report Corrections

Issue Summary NR-011. Clarify and quantify outreach techniques (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0457) NR-57

Page 1-16 (Section 1.5): Outreach Techniques State the website address, the newsletter name and number of publication, etc. Clarify and quantify the methods used.

Response NR-011. Public involvement and outreach activities of the Metropolitan Council and the Central Corridor Project Office with respect to the FEIS are provided in Chapter 11.

Section: 11.0 - Agency Coordination

Issue Summary EngRW-007. Coordinate with other agencies in regard to other construction projects and existing systems (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0436) EngRW-8

Page 2-4: Programmed Improvements in the Central Corridor and Page 6-3: There is a mill and overlay project programmed for FY 2009 that includes (through complete

reconstruction) filling in one of the major exception areas in the bus-only shoulder network. It is on westbound I-94, just before the entrance ramp of TH 280. The entire segment is already signed as a bus shoulder, but this specific area is signed as an exception area (because it's too narrow).

Response EngRW-007. Comment noted..

Section: 11.0 - Project Contracting

Issue Summary NR-002. Concerned that the project includes inappropriate contractual services (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0802) NR-26

Commissioner Rettman -- I guess she still is back here -- informed me last night that over the past five years Ramsey County has contracted with Dick Wells - Wells Mosville (phonetic), a young University certified highway engineer, for consulting services I guess is the term and I have a document that I'd like to present as my testimony saying I no more welfare for Dick Mosville.

Response NR-002. Concerns regarding contractual services should be brought before the appropriate county authorities.

Issue Summary NR-003. The project should include apprenticeship programs (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0139) NR-63

4. Apprenticeship programs

Response NR-003. Both the Metropolitan Council and Metro Transit offer internship opportunities for college and graduate students, and interns have worked in the Central Corridor Project Office. Questions regarding internship opportunities are best answered by the agencies involved with the project, and are not part of either the SDEIS or FEIS.

Issue Summary ProPOL-007. Construction labor issues (8)

Comments:

(CCLRP0832) ProPOL-2

We also encourage individuals that will be developing this to consider minimum wage structures that exist within the construction industry, that the project have a site stabilization agreement on it, and also that the work force that the LRT will travel to will be reflected in the way that it should be.

(CCLRP0535) ProPOL-3

...I encourage you to consider the following as this project moves forward: • A site base labor agreement for the duration of the project.

(CCLRP0535) ProPOL-6

...I encourage you to consider the following as this project moves forward: • Contracting provisions that will provide employment opportunities for this project and beyond with the initiative to not only provide jobs, but careers.

(CCLRP0534) ProPOL-8

Listed below are components that need to be placed in the design and bid specifications of this exciting project. • A site-based labor agreement that will provide stabilization for the duration of this project.

(CCLRP0535) ProPOL-9

...I encourage you to consider the following as this project moves forward: • The payment of prevailing wages to maintain area standards and ensure a quality product.

(CCLRP0534) ProPOL-10

Listed below are components that need to be placed in the design and bid specifications of this exciting project. The payment of prevailing wages and a mechanism to ensure compliance.

(CCLRP0534) ProPOL-26

Listed below are components that need to be placed in the design and bid specifications of this exciting project. Inclusiveness in contracting provision which will provide employment development opportunities for emerging contractors.

(CCLRP0534) ProPOL-41

Listed below are components that need to be placed in the design and bid specifications of this exciting project. • A pre-employment training initiative providing technical training for communities wanting to connect with this industry.

Response ProPOL-007. Comment noted.

Section: 11.0 - Miscellaneous

Issue Summary NR-005. [Reference to website with comments about station locations and land use issues](#) (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0869) NR-51

We will submit 30 pages of comments which will also be on the City's website that touches on issues in regards to the station locations and also a number of land use issues.

Response NR-005. Comment noted. A discussion of land use is provided in FEIS Chapter 3, Section 3.1. Additionally, a discussion of station area development opportunity is provided in FEIS Chapter 5, Section 5.2.

Issue Summary NR-010. Contact information for person who has suggestions (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0675) NR-13

I am a 21 year old student of the University of Minnesota and have some suggestions for the proposed light rail connecting the two downtowns. If there is someone who would like some input from a student very interested in mass transit, please have them get in touch with me. I would just like to make a few suggestions.

Response NR-010. Public involvement activities associated with the Central Corridor LRT project are described in FEIS Chapter 11. As part of the public outreach strategy, the Metropolitan Council Central Corridor Project Office hired six Community Outreach Coordinators, each assigned to a specific planning segment (including the University of Minnesota) to directly address questions, concerns, and comments about the project from

persons living, working or traveling through each segment. In addition, a comment phone line and e-mail address have been established.

Issue Summary PlaTP-138. Miscellaneous comment (15)

Comments:

(CCLRP0485) NR-7

1. Agency means the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority. 2. EJ Communities "Environmental Justice Communities" means the minority and/or low-income population and the area in which that population resides that is impacted by the LRT University Avenue alternative. Minority and low-income have the same meaning as intended by Executive Order Number 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations and Department of Transportation Final Order on Environmental Justice Order 5610.2, Environmental Justice. 3. Gentrification means that process whereby economic development and the attendant increase in property values, taxes and related economic factors, has the effect of displacing the existing residents of a neighborhood. As sociologist Ruth Glass, the originator of the term described "once this process of gentrification starts in a district it goes on rapidly until all or most of the original working-class occupiers are displaced and the whole social character of the district is changed." 4. Impacts mean both direct and indirect effects of the preferred alternative. Indirect effects may include growth inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate. Impacts include aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic, social, or health, whether direct, indirect, or cumulative. Effects may also include those resulting from actions which may have both beneficial and detrimental effects, even if on balance the effect will be beneficial. See CEQ Reg. 1508.8.

5. Adverse effects means the totality of significant individual or cumulative human health or environmental effects, including interrelated social and economic effects, which may include, but are not limited to: bodily impairment, infirmity, illness or death; air, noise, and water pollution and soil contamination; destruction or disruption of man-made or natural resources; destruction or diminution of aesthetic values; destruction or disruption of community cohesion or a community's economic vitality; destruction or disruption of the availability of public and private facilities and services; vibration; adverse employment effects; displacement of persons, businesses, farms, or nonprofit organizations; increased traffic congestion, isolation, exclusion or separation of minority or low-income individuals within a given community or from the broader community; and the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of, benefits of DOT programs, policies, or activities. See

<http://www.dot.state.mn.us/tecsup/xyzplu/hdpd/book2sg/envjusticel>.

6. Disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority and low-income populations means an adverse effect that: 1) is predominately borne by a minority population and/or a low-income population, or 2) will be suffered by the minority population and/or low-income population and is appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than the adverse effect that will be suffered by the non-minority population and/or non-low-income population. See

<http://www.dot.state.mn.us/tecsup/xyzplu/hdpd/book2sg/envjusticel>

7. Mitigation means either: (a) Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action. (b) Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation. (c) Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment. (d) Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action. (e) Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments. See CEQ Regulations 1508.20. Project or LRT means the locally preferred alternative and refers to the construction of a light rail transit line down the center of University Avenue.

(CCLRP0124) NR-19

Working for the Common Good

(CCLRP0125) NR-59

Jim White "Working for the Common Good" Vote for Jim White for House Seat 64A. Jim is seeking your endorsement at the upcoming DFL Caucus and District Convention. - DATES TO REMEMBER - Precinct Caucus: March 7, 2006 at 7 p.m. - Ramsey Junior High School, District Convention: April 8, 2006 at 9 a.m. - Central High School. Active in DFL Party since 2002. Worked with ACT (America Coming Together) 2004. Worked with Minnesota Watch 2005. Delegate to District DFL Convention 2004. Personal Biography. Mortgage Banker for 27 years. Member of St. Luke's Catholic Church. Graduate of the University of St. Thomas and the University of Minnesota. Veteran of the US Air Force and a retiree of the Minnesota Air National Guard. Active in Amicus Program for five years. Photo above is of Jim's family. Jim, his wife and children live at 1071 Fairmount Ave. Bottom row left to right: Charlie, Elizabeth, Andy, Michael. Top row left to right: Sarah, Jim and Peter.

(CCLRP0141) ProALT-074

I believe the light rail project has been designed strictly as a people mover for people who work in Minneapolis or St. Paul and need or want transportation from one city to the other.

(CCLRP0524) ProALT-106

MICAH is a religious (faith) based organization of over 150 congregations representing Christian, Islamic, and Jewish perspectives. Our purpose is to take our common religious injunction for social justice for the poor seriously. (MICAH 8. 6.) Specifically, the stated goal of this chapter is to: Maintain and increase access to transportation, affordable housing and jobs for low-income citizens through proper location of stations and integration of the bus and light rail systems.

(CCLRP0120) ProALT-132

Haven't decided about light rail.

(CCLRP0406) ProALT-206

The following review is divided into three parts. PART 1 outlines the rationale for the City's position on the preferred transit mode, since this is the only 'decision' that will come out of the Draft EIS public hearing process. PART 2 outlines those issues that are most relevant to this notion of city-building, and contains the most significant issues for the City of Saint Paul. And, PART 3 is a review of the Draft: EIS on a chapter-by-chapter basis. These comments will also be used as a template for City involvement as the region proceeds through the Preliminary Engineering process. Note that the City of Saint Paul may supplement and/or amend responses in Parts 2 and 3 to reflect additional written comments received between May 24 and July 19, 2006.

(CCLRP0786) ProALT-267

We have been supportive of light rail as a transit option along University Avenue and I just quickly wanted to express some of the concerns that we found with the Draft EIS.

(CCLRP0406) ProALT-290

WHEREAS it is important to continue to review alternative alignments carefully and continue to clarify our intentions concerning potential light rail development in order to participate appropriately in regional decisions.

(CCLRP0002) ProALT-409

I currently live in Northern Minnesota, but will return to the Twin Cities soon. I lived in Portland, Oregon, for a time and appreciated their transit system. I need quality transit in the city in which I live. Mass transit is and will remain an important issue for me.

(CCLRP0778) ProPOL-30

It might be notable that University Avenue wouldn't be here except for the 1891 opening of the electrification of streetcars which drew a hundred thousand people in its opening in 1891 and most of that right-of-way was only streetcar back then, cars, but my main point today is, with all the stadium hullabaloo, to give a long-term perspective of this.

(CCLRP0092) ProPOL-32

We have to pay for another stadium for the Twins. The dome downtown is good enough for the Twins. They can't play ball anyway.

(CCLRP0123) ProPOL-42

Vote for Jim White for 64A My platform: Designated funding for Metro Transit. I believe that we should allocate 1/2 of 1 percent of the sales tax collected in the Metro Area to the operating expenses of Metro Transit. Governmental affairs. The Metropolitan Council, the Airports Commission, the Stadium Commission, and the Metropolitan Sports Commission should all consist of board members who are elected by the public at large, not appointed by the Governor. Restorative justice.

We need to reinstate education and rehabilitation programs within our prison walls and we need to provide reconnect services for newly released ex-offenders. Bringing the Catholic vote back to the Democratic Party. We are the "pro-life" party. Pro-life is not just abortion, but rather all those things that bring us life: good education, good healthcare, environmental stewardship, parks, libraries, and transit, just to name a few. We can't forget that we are the party that championed voting rights, civil rights, Social Security, and Medicare - all of which have positively affected the lives of millions of people. I will work to get this message out to my fellow Catholics every chance I get.

(CCLRP0848) ProPURP-226

The Central Corridor will pass through the campus that attracts approximately 80,000 people on a typical day. Washington Avenue is the hub for the University Residence Halls, Coffman Memorial Union, the graduate and professional schools, Institute of Technology, University libraries, and scores of heavily used classrooms. It is a 24/7 environment.

(CCLRP0882) SocNC-084

I'm concerned about our youth as far as the problems on University. We don't have enough places for our youth as it is.

Response PlaTP-138. Comment noted.

Issue Summary ProPOL-002. **Concerns in regard to public policy** (1)

Comments:

(CCLRP0180) ProPOL-23

In closing, I feel it is imperative that the Minnesota Vehicle Excise Tax Amendment pass, to support the funding of public transportation.

Response ProPOL-002. Comment noted.