



Appendix G

Response to Draft EIS Comments

Guide to the Draft EIS Response to Comments

1. Response to Comments – Agencies
2. Response to Comments – Businesses
3. Response to Comments – Civic and Community Organizations
4. Index of Comments and Response to Comments – General Public Written Comments
5. Index of Comments and Response to Comments – General Public Verbal Testimony
6. Comments Received on Draft EIS – Agencies
7. Comments Received on Draft EIS – Businesses
8. Comments Received on Draft EIS – Civic and Community Organizations
9. Comments Received on Draft EIS – General Public
10. Transcript – Brooklyn Park Hearing
11. Transcript – Crystal Hearing
12. Transcript – Golden Valley Hearing
13. Transcript – Minneapolis Hearing



This page intentionally left blank



G Guide to the Draft EIS Response to Comments

Appendix G contains the comments received on the proposed METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit (BLRT) Extension project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS). A total of 191 communications were received during this time. Many of the communications contained multiple comments. For example, a resident in Golden Valley may have written a letter expressing concern about noise from LRT operations, impacts to parks and wildlife, and the need for a park-and-ride serving the proposed BLRT Extension project to be built in the city.

G.1 Draft EIS Comment Period

The Draft EIS comment period began on April 11, 2014, when notice of the availability of the document was published and ended on May 29, 2014. Comments were transmitted in several ways including written communications (letters, e-mail communications, comment cards filled out at public hearings) and by people testifying at public hearings.

All communications received or postmarked by the end of the comment period are included in this appendix. The communication was assigned a unique identifying number (generally corresponding to when it was received) – the communication number is printed in the upper left-hand corner of each communication. Since many of the communications received included multiple comments, the first task was to identify comments within the communication and, after this was done for all communications, to group comments into categories by topic (e.g., purpose and need, alternatives, noise and vibration).

G.2 Comments by Topic

Examples of comments and associated topics include “why is the project needed?” (purpose and need topic); “do the transportation benefits match the cost of the project?” (fiscal effects topic); or “how loud is LRT?” (noise and vibration topic). Using this approach, all similar comments could be grouped together for a response. The topics identified were:

- 1 – Purpose and Need
- 2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule
- 3 – National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Process and Public Involvement
- 4 – Social and Economic Effects
- 5 – Environmental Effects
- 6 – Noise & Vibration Effects
- 7 – Alternatives, Engineering & Design
- 8 – Transportation System Effects



G.3 How to Find a Response to a Comment

A particular comment and the corresponding response can be found in the tables following this introduction to **Appendix G**. The tables of comments and corresponding responses are organized as follows:

- Comment ID Number: A unique comment identification number assigned to each comment
- Commenter's Last Name
- Commenter's First Name
- Organization
- Communication Number: A unique number for each comment in chronological order in which it was received
- Comment Type: e-mail, letter by e-mail, mail, verbal testimony, etc.
- Topic: as described above
- Comment
- Response

All comments received on the Draft EIS have been documented and responded to in the Final EIS.

Comments from agencies and municipalities and their corresponding responses are grouped alphabetically by organization, as follows:

- Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission
- City of Crystal
- City of Golden Valley
- City of Maple Grove
- City of Minneapolis
- Federal Aviation Administration
- Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe
- Minnesota Department of Transportation
- Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB)
- Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
- Three Rivers Park District
- US Department of the Interior
- US Environmental Protection Agency



Comments from businesses and their corresponding responses are grouped alphabetically by organization, as follows:

- Allina Health
- Crystal Wine and Spirits
- Marr-Don Apartments
- Sawhorse, Inc.
- Target Corporation

Comments from civic and community organizations and their corresponding responses are grouped alphabetically by organization, as follows:

- Alliance for Metropolitan Stability
- Asian Media Access
- CAPI
- City of Lakes Community Land Trust
- Downtown Minneapolis Transportation Management Organization
- Harrison Neighborhood Association
- Heritage Park Neighborhood Association
- Loppet Foundation
- Masjid An-Nur
- North Hennepin Community College
- Saint Margaret Mary Church
- Summit Academy OIC
- Transit for Livable Communities

Comments from the general public and their corresponding responses are listed numerically by the Comment ID. These comments are presented in two summary tables; one table for comments received in writing, and one table for comments received as verbal testimony during public hearings. An index is provided with each of the tables of responses to comments from the general public (see the following sections of this appendix). Each index is grouped alphabetically by the last name of the commenter and their corresponding Comment IDs to make finding a specific individual's comment(s) easier. Locate the name of the individual in each index then look for the Comment ID in the general public comments and responses tables.

G.4 Master Responses to Similar Comments

The Council received a total of 1,252 comments were submitted in the form of letters, emails, public testimony at the public hearings, and comment cards received at the public open houses and public hearings. Comments were received from individuals, businesses, public interest groups, and public agencies, including local communities and regulatory agencies. Many comments were very similar



in nature and the Council has prepared master responses to these comments. Where comments included more specific and detailed questions, detailed responses may be found in Attachments 1 through 3.

G.4.1 General Opposition to or Support for the Proposed BLRT Extension Project

General Comment 1: Opposed to the locally preferred alternative (LPA) identified in the Draft EIS, opposed to the proposed BLRT Extension project, or in favor of another alignment.

Master Response 1: The Metropolitan Council (Council) acknowledges opposition to the LPA identified in the Draft EIS or opposition to the proposed BLRT Extension project. The Council also acknowledges support for another alignment other than the LPA or the proposed BLRT Extension project.

The proposed BLRT Extension project was developed to meet specific transportation needs in the City of Minneapolis and several northern and western suburbs. As outlined in the purpose and need, the proposed BLRT Extension project is needed to effectively address long-term regional transit mobility and local accessibility needs while providing efficient, travel-time competitive transit service that supports economic development goals and objectives of local, regional, and statewide plans. Five factors contribute to the need for the proposed BLRT Extension project:

- Growing travel demand resulting from continuing growth in population and employment
- Increasing traffic congestion and limited federal, state, and local fiscal resources for transportation improvements
- An increase in the number of people who depend on transit to meet their transportation needs
- Limited transit service to suburban destinations (reverse commute opportunities) and time-efficient transit options
- Regional objectives for growth stated in the *Thrive MSP 2040*

The development of the proposed BLRT Extension project started with an Alternatives Analysis that culminated in the selection of the LPA. The following summarizes the selection process for the LPA identified in the Draft EIS.

The LPA is the alternative that the cities in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor (Minneapolis, Golden Valley, Robbinsdale, Crystal, and Brooklyn Park), Hennepin County, and the Council recommended for detailed study through engineering and environmental review. The LPA specifies both the type of transit that would be used (mode – light rail transit) and the location (alignment – B-C-D1).

The Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) recommended Alignment D1 over Alignment D2 because Alignment D1 would result in significantly less property and neighborhood impacts, improved travel time, greater cost-effectiveness, and less disruption of roadway traffic operations. Discussion focused on the adverse impacts of Alignment D2 and that Alignment D1 better meets the proposed



BLRT Extension project goals. The costs (impacts) of Alignment D2 for the people on Penn Avenue would outweigh the potential benefits.

The PAC recommended Alignment B over Alignment A because Alignment B would provide better service to people who depend on transit and to key civic and educational destinations, and access to greater numbers of new jobs and development.

The LPA meets the purpose of and need for the proposed BLRT Extension project and is the environmentally preferable alternative because it would best protect, preserve, and enhance social, historic, and cultural resources. However, because of the effects of Alternative B-C-D1 (the LPA) would have on biological and natural resources; the LPA would not cause the least damage to the physical environment.

Since the selection of the LPA, the Council has worked closely with regulatory agencies and project stakeholders to refine the LPA in a manner that avoids or minimizes social, economic, and environmental impacts. Where impacts cannot be avoided, mitigation measures have been identified. These avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures are documented in the Final EIS for the proposed BLRT Extension project.

General Comment 2: Support for the LPA identified in the Draft EIS or the proposed BLRT Extension project.

Master Response 2: The Council acknowledges support for LPA identified in the Draft EIS or the proposed BLRT Extension project. FTA and the Council have determined that the proposed BLRT Extension project best meets the need for transit improvements in the area. Careful analysis and stakeholder coordination resulted in the selection of the LPA; the following summarizes the LPA selection process as identified in the Draft EIS.

The LPA is the alternative that the cities in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor (Minneapolis, Golden Valley, Robbinsdale, Crystal, and Brooklyn Park), Hennepin County, and the Council recommended for detailed study through engineering and environmental review. The LPA specifies both the type of transit that would be used (mode – light rail transit) and the location (alignment – B-C-D1).

The Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) recommended Alignment D1 over Alignment D2 because Alignment D1 would result in significantly less property and neighborhood impacts, improved travel time, greater cost-effectiveness, and less disruption of roadway traffic operations. Discussion focused on the adverse impacts of Alignment D2 and that Alignment D1 better meets the proposed BLRT Extension project goals. The costs (impacts) of Alignment D2 for the people on Penn Avenue would outweigh the potential benefits.

The PAC recommended Alignment B over Alignment A because Alignment B would provide better service to people who depend on transit and to key civic and educational destinations, and access to greater numbers of new jobs and development.

The LPA meets the purpose of and need for the proposed BLRT Extension project and is the environmentally preferable alternative because it would best protect, preserve, and enhance social,



historic, and cultural resources. However, because of the effects of Alternative B-C-D1 (the LPA) would have on biological and natural resources; the LPA would not cause the least damage to the physical environment.

G.4.2 Purpose and Need

General Comment 3: Why is the proposed BLRT Extension project needed?

Master Response 3: The purpose and need for the proposed BLRT Extension project has been the subject of many studies. The proposed BLRT Extension project includes an alignment that meets the purpose and need most efficiently while minimizing project impacts. The purpose of the proposed BLRT Extension project is to provide transit service that would satisfy the long-term regional mobility and accessibility needs for businesses and the traveling public. The proposed BLRT Extension project is needed to effectively address long-term regional transit mobility and local accessibility needs while providing efficient, travel-time competitive transit service that supports economic development goals and objectives of local, regional, and statewide plans.

G.4.3 Fiscal Effects and Schedule

General Comment 4: Do the transportation benefits match the cost of the proposed BLRT Extension project?

Master Response 4: NEPA does not require monetizing costs and benefits (40 CFR 1502.23). Furthermore, the weighing of the pros and cons of the various alternatives should not be displayed using a monetary cost-benefit analysis when there are important qualitative considerations. A cost-benefit analysis should not be included when costs or benefits can only be qualitatively assessed, without an adequate measure for monetizing the environmental benefits of a project. The proposed BLRT Extension project meets the intended purpose and need for the proposed BLRT Extension project, that is to effectively address long-term regional transit mobility and local accessibility needs while providing efficient, travel-time competitive transit service that supports economic development goals and objectives of local, regional, and statewide plans. Meeting federal cost-effectiveness criteria, which is separate from a cost and benefit analysis, would be an essential part of entering into the Engineering phase for this project. Cost is one of a number of factors in the proposed BLRT Extension project. Purpose and Need is discussed in **Chapter 1** of the Final EIS and a financial analysis of the proposed BLRT Extension project is discussed in **Chapter 10** of the Final EIS. **Table 10.1-1** in **Chapter 10 – Financial Analysis** of the Final EIS outlines a breakdown of cost for the different elements of the proposed BLRT Extension project totaling \$1.496 billion.

G.4.4 NEPA Process and Public Involvement

General Comment 5: Several commenters stated that there was not enough time to review the Draft EIS.

Master Response 5: The notification and comment period followed the legal requirements (minimum requirement is 45 days per 40 CFR Part 1506.10 (c)). The Draft EIS comment period was from April 11 to May 29, 2014 (48 days).



General Comment 6: Several commenters stated that they felt public opinion was being ignored by the Council.

Master Response 6: The Council acknowledges concern about public input into the planning process for the proposed BLRT Extension project. **Chapter 9** of the Final EIS describes the public outreach process used for public and stakeholder outreach. For the proposed BLRT Extension project, the Council has implemented a comprehensive public outreach program that has engaged nearby communities and underrepresented groups in the proposed BLRT Extension project design and engineering process. This includes appointing two voting members to the proposed BLRT Extension project Corridor Management Committee (CMC) that represent the Blue Line Coalition (a community-based group working to advance local and regional equity and community health along the Blue Line Corridor). The proposed BLRT Extension project has also established a Business Advisory Committee and Community Advisory Committee to seek public input and advise the CMC and the Council. The Council will continue to engage community groups directly and via local/neighborhood-based media to inform on project progress.

G.4.5 Social and Economic Effects

General Comment 7: Concerned about the effect of the proposed BLRT Extension project on property values.

Master Response 7: Research has shown that major transit investments such as light rail generally yield positive effects on property values. There is the potential for an increase in property values in the areas surrounding proposed light rail stations, as light rail access can increase the convenience and desirability of nearby residential, commercial, and office properties. Light rail transit can also contribute to existing market forces that can increase the potential for transit-oriented development or redevelopment. Development and redevelopment is regulated by the cities and is predominantly driven by regional and local economic conditions and allowable land uses as defined in locally adopted comprehensive plans. However, light rail lines can advance the timing and increase the intensity of development, especially in areas near proposed stations, within the limits allowed by local comprehensive plans.

As an example, in 1996, New Jersey Transit introduced “Midtown Direct” service, a one-seat ride to New York Penn Station on the Morris & Essex Lines. The expanded service led directly to an increase in property values of homes within walking distance of stations on the Morris & Essex line by \$90,000 more than homes farther away, after direct service to Midtown Manhattan was inaugurated in 1996 (Michaelson, 2004). Houses immediately adjacent to San Francisco’s BART (south and northeast of San Francisco) sold for nearly 38 percent more than identical houses in areas not served by BART (Landis and Cervero, 1995). Residential rents decreased by 2.4 percent for every one-tenth mile further from Washington, D.C., Metro stations (Benjamin and Sirmans, 1996). Single-family homes in communities served by Boston’s commuter rail were worth 6.7 percent more than similar homes in other communities (Armstrong, 1994). In Chicago, the prices of single-family houses located within 1,000 feet of stations were 20 percent higher than comparable houses located a mile away (Gruen, 1997). Median home prices in the Philadelphia region were 10



percent higher in census tracts served by a PATCO rail line and 4 percent higher in tracts served by a SEPTA rail line (Voith, 1991).

Light rail can have a positive impact on nearby business communities as transitways can provide a new connection for riders to access these businesses, and because pedestrian and vehicular traffic around stations and park-and-ride lots can increase. As an example, since 2009, the year before the Council's Green Line LRT (Central Corridor) construction started, the neighborhoods between the Downtown East Station in Minneapolis and the Union Depot Station in St. Paul have experienced more than \$3 billion in commercial and residential development—including new construction, redevelopment, and expansion. In addition, businesses on the corridor prior to the Green Line opening reinvested in their businesses and related community efforts to create distinctive districts around the stations (www.metrocouncil.org/News-Events/Transportation/Newsletters/Connections-ground-businesses,-arts-on-METRO-Green.aspx).

General Comment 8: Concerned about how the proposed BLRT Extension project would affect safety and security.

Master Response 8: Chapter 4 (Section 4.7) of the Final EIS addresses safety and security. Adherence to transitway design guidelines and the oversight of security personnel would result in no adverse impacts related to safety and security. Safety for rail users, area residents, local pedestrians and bicyclists, project construction workers, operators and vehicle occupants is an important consideration for the proposed BLRT Extension project. The framework for ensuring the highest level of safety to these groups would be established through conformance with the proposed BLRT Extension project site safety and health plan, construction contingency plan, the Council's Safety and Security Management Plan and the Metro Transit Security and Emergency Preparedness plan. Project operations in conformance with these plans would necessarily be closely and continuously coordinated with local area law enforcement, medical, fire, transportation and other organizations with related emergency responsibilities within the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor.

General Comment 9: Concerned about the effect of the proposed BLRT Extension project on community character and cohesion.

Master Response 9: Chapter 4 (Section 4.2) of the Final EIS discusses community facilities/ community character and cohesion. Impacts associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project were not severe enough to affect overall community character and cohesion, or the accessibility to and use of community facilities. Hennepin County published the Bottineau Transitway Health Impact Assessment (HIA) in December 2013, and its findings and recommendations for equitable and optimal community health benefits resulting from the proposed BLRT Extension project, which were based on several factors including location affordability, are driving components of the station area plans.



General Comment 10: Concerned in general about the effect of the proposed BLRT Extension project on the loss of homes.

Master Response 10: Chapter 4 (Section 4.3) of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. Impacts to residential property are anticipated, but these impacts would be partial takings and not result in displacement of residents. The acquisition of portions of residential property for the proposed BLRT Extension project will be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minnesota Statute 117.

G.4.6 Environmental Effects

General Comment 11: Concerned about how the proposed BLRT Extension project would affect air quality and pollution.

Master Response 11: Chapter 5 (Section 5.10) of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) contains a full evaluation of air quality issues as they pertain to the existing conditions of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor and the projected future conditions with construction and operation of the proposed BLRT Extension project. The analysis presented in this Final EIS demonstrates that air pollutant concentrations during the operating phase of the proposed BLRT Extension project would not exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards; therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary. The State of Minnesota does not require permits related to air quality for projects of this type.

General Comment 12: Concerned about air quality, dust and dirt during construction of the proposed BLRT Extension project

Master Response 12: During construction a series of best management practices (BMPs) would be implemented including the following preventive and mitigation measures:

- Minimize land disturbance during site preparation
- Use watering trucks to minimize dust
- Cover trucks while hauling soil or debris off site or transferring materials
- Stabilize dirt piles if they are not removed immediately
- Use dust suppressants on unpaved areas
- Minimize unnecessary vehicle and machinery idling
- Revegetate any disturbed land post-construction

General Comment 13: Concerned about how the proposed BLRT Extension project would affect wildlife.

Master Response 13: Concerning wildlife: The proposed BLRT Extension project would involve constructing physical barriers that could restrict the crossing of portions of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor by wildlife. The Council has analyzed design and construction methods that would minimize potential impacts to wildlife. Some culverts that cross the proposed trackage



can be designed to accommodate safe passage of some wildlife. Where effective and feasible, suitable wildlife crossings would be accommodated within proposed culverts to allow some wildlife species to cross from one side of the proposed BLRT Extension project/freight rail tracks to the other. Fencing in key areas can be used to minimize potential wildlife collisions with the LRT.

General Comment 14: Concerned about general impacts to Theodore Wirth Regional Park (TWRP) associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project.

Master Response 14: Chapter 8 of the Final EIS describes the impacts to Theodore Wirth Regional Park under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966. The proposed BLRT Extension project would result in the permanent incorporation of approximately 2.1 acres of property from TWRP. In particular, an approximate 1.9 acre portion of designated parkland, located in the southwest corner of the Golden Valley Road and Theodore Wirth Parkway intersection, would be affected with the construction of a transit station and park-and-ride lot. This triangle-shaped portion of TWRP is unimproved with no existing or planned recreational amenities. During construction, approximately 9.2 acres of temporary construction easements would be required within TWRP to grade land around the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor, to provide access during construction, and to provide floodplain and wetland mitigation. The land encompassed by temporary construction easements includes existing open space (e.g., wooded and grassland areas adjacent to the rail corridor and Bassett Creek). In consideration of the permanent and temporary uses of TWRP property, the proposed BLRT Extension project has evaluated park-related enhancements as measures to minimize harm to the park resource. These enhancements include trail improvements near the Plymouth Avenue Station, a new trail connection from Theodore Wirth Regional Park to Sochacki Park, a trailhead at the Golden Valley Road Station park-and-ride, reconstruction of the Theodore Wirth Parkway bridge and the Theodore Wirth Parkway/Golden Valley Road intersection, and minimization of visual effects.

General Comment 15: Concerned about general impacts to Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit and Sochacki Park: Sochacki Management Unit associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project.

Master Response 15: The proposed BLRT Extension project would require a temporary occupancy of approximately 0.57 acre along the eastern border of Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit to facilitate construction activities and stormwater conveyance improvements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would require a temporary occupancy of approximately 5.6 acres of Sochacki Park: Sochacki Management Unit in Robbinsdale in order to provide access and construction staging for the construction of a new LRT bridge structure across Grimes Pond. All non-park construction staging options have been considered and proven to not be feasible.

The proposed temporary occupancy of Sochacki Park involves multiple areas of the park and includes the following components:

- Approximately 5.6 acres of park property would be subject to a temporary easement for staging/laydown areas on both the north and south sides of North Rice Pond, and for a temporary construction access road from the northern border of the park to the northern and



southern staging areas. This road would generally follow the current road/path alignment to minimize additional impacts to park trees and other vegetation. These temporary construction facilities would be used for the construction of the new LRT bridge across Grimes Pond.

- A temporary fence would be erected along both sides of the existing access road and a new pedestrian path would be added to just west of the access road provide a safe north-south connection through the park while construction vehicles utilize the access road during construction of the new LRT bridge.
- Minor improvements to the existing narrow access road would be made in order to accommodate the structural capacity needs of construction vehicles/equipment and to provide several bypass areas to allow two-way traffic an opportunity to safely pass when entering/exiting the park property.

Based on the criteria that are used to determine a temporary occupancy, FTA has determined that there would be no permanent Section 4(f) use of Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit or Sochacki Park: Sochacki Park Management Unit and that proposed construction activities within the parks would meet the criteria for a Temporary Occupancy Exception described in 23 CFR Part 774.13(d). The portion of the park to be temporarily occupied during construction would be restored to existing conditions or better.

General Comment 16: Concerned about general impacts to wetlands associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project.

Master Response 16: Concerning wetlands: The Final EIS describes in detail several types of impacts to wetlands including direct impacts, indirect impacts, and potential cumulative effects and secondary impacts to wetlands. **Section 5.3** of the Final EIS discusses the wetland impacts for both short and long-term impacts as well as the avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures. Wetland impacts from the proposed BLRT Extension project would be as presented in **Table G.4-1**.



Table G.4-1. Impacts to Delineated Basins from the Proposed BLRT Extension Project by Wetland Type

Wetland Type		Impacts (acres)				
Circular 39 ¹	Eggers and Reed ²	Permanent Impacts	Temporary Impacts	Total Impacts	USACE Jurisdictional Impacts	WCA Jurisdictional Impacts
Type 1	Seasonally flooded basin	5.33	1.26	6.59	2.52	4.28
Type 3	Shallow marsh	—	—	—	—	—
Type 4	Deep marsh	2.44	0.05	2.49	1.01	0.10
Type 5	Open water	1.69	1.92	3.61	0.42	1.69
Type 6	Shrub carr	0.50	—	0.50	0.21	0.21
Total		9.96	3.23	13.19	4.16	6.28

¹ Plant communities classified based on US Fish and Wildlife Circular 39.

² Plant communities classified based on *Wetland Plants and Plant Communities of Minnesota and Wisconsin* by Eggers and Reed (1997) (USACE St. Paul District).

The proposed BLRT Extension project would require coordination and permitting from local, state, and federal water resource agencies. The Council coordinated with the Wetlands Technical Evaluation Panel regarding mitigation strategies prior to submitting the WCA and CWA Section 404 permit applications. The Council’s analysis of preliminary mitigation strategies included establishing project-specific permittee-responsible mitigation sites and purchasing wetland mitigation bank credits. Based on this analysis, the Council determined that wetland impacts from the proposed BLRT Extension project will be mitigated through a combination of on-site wetland mitigation and purchases of private wetland credits from existing mitigation banks in suitable major watersheds and Bank Service Areas.

G.4.7 Noise and Vibration Effects

General Comment 17: Concerned about general noise impacts associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project.

Master Response 17: Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit’s noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Noise is discussed in **Chapter 5 (Section 5.6)** of the Final EIS. Without minimization and mitigation, the proposed BLRT Extension project would result in 366 moderate noise impacts to residential land uses and 618 severe noise impacts. As a part of the proposed BLRT Extension project, Quiet Zones will be implemented at all Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and light rail transit (LRT) shared at-grade crossings. A Quiet Zone is an FRA-approved section of a freight rail line where freight trains do not sound horns. Public roadway crossings of a Quiet Zone must have certain safety measures in place, which include gates, warning devices, and in some cases other supplemental safety measures, such as concrete medians. The



implementation of Quiet Zones reduces residential land use impacts to 176 moderate noise impacts and 120 severe noise impacts. Additional mitigation measures in the form of noise barriers and wayside devices are proposed for certain locations; interior testing will be performed at various locations to determine the need for additional mitigation. With the incorporation of noise barriers, wayside devices and additional mitigation (if required through interior testing), the proposed BLRT Extension project would result in five residual moderate and two residual severe residential land use noise impacts. See **Table 5.6-7** in the Final EIS for a summary of proposed mitigation measures by location.

General Comment 18: Concerned about general vibration impacts associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project.

Master Response 18: Vibration impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures have been recommended. Vibration is discussed in **Chapter 5 (Section 5.7)** of the Final EIS.

G.4.8 Alternatives, Engineering, and Design

General Comment 19: Several comments were received regarding the need for stations at Plymouth Avenue and/or Golden Valley Road.

Master Response 19: Both the Plymouth Avenue and Golden Valley Road stations are included in the proposed BLRT Extension project scope and budget. The proposed BLRT Extension project would improve the transportation system by providing more travel choices and faster travel times between residential areas, major destinations, and employment centers. **Chapter 2** of the Final EIS presents a summary of the alternatives analysis conducted for the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. This chapter also details the proposed BLRT Extension project including the location of all stations.

General Comment 20: Request for a tunnel option to be evaluated for the proposed BLRT Extension project.

Master Response 20: Capital costs are a consideration when defining reasonable alternatives for evaluation, and there are increased costs associated with a tunnel alignment. Generally speaking, accommodating a travel way (rail or car/truck) in a subsurface tunnel is many times (400 percent and up) more expensive than the same facility at grade because of the extensive structural work required to support the tunnel as well as the perpetual operating costs associated with tunnels (lighting/communication, drainage, ventilation, fire protection, general maintenance, etc.). Additional infrastructure, such as a tunnel, is considered when there is a driving factor or benefit that would outweigh the additional costs. For this project there was not sufficient reason to evaluate a tunnel alignment; therefore, it was not included in the universe of alternatives studied. However, as part of the Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 evaluation, tunnel options were developed as avoidance alternatives (see **Chapter 8** of the Final EIS). These avoidance alternatives were not deemed prudent for many of the reasons stated above.



General Comment 21: Opposed to the widening of West Broadway Avenue (County State-Aid Highway 103) and concerned about residential property displacements and noise.

Master Response 21: Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued in December 2015. The Final EIS discloses this information in **Chapter 2 – Alternatives. Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects** discloses cumulative effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project which considers the construction of the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction Project.

Property acquisition and displacement related to the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction Project is outside of the scope of the proposed BLRT Extension project. The West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction Project EAW would contain the relevant information related to project's impact on acquisition and displacement. Each project has been analyzed for noise in accordance with the appropriate methods and noise mitigation has been evaluated in accordance with the applicable requirements. Since neither the proposed BLRT Extension project nor the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project result in noise impacts that require mitigation, there is a low probability of cumulative noise effects from the combination of the two projects.



Appendix G

Response to Draft EIS Comments

1 Response to Comments – Agencies



This page intentionally left blank

City of Maple Grove

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
1A	Opatz	Mike	City of Maple Grove	1	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	The City of Maple Grove would not alter any of its Maple Grove Transit express routes [reference page 3-7 of the Draft EIS] given the approved Bottineau line alignment/LPA, which does not serve the City of Maple Grove. Furthermore, the Route 787 would not be eliminated. Maple Grove would likely add local feeder service to the Bottineau line as demand and funding allows.	The proposed METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit (BLRT) Extension project does not include the A alignment; therefore, no modifications to transit routes serving the City of Maple Grove are anticipated or required. Changes to City of Maple Grove transit express routes are at the discretion of the city of Maple Grove.
1B	Opatz	Mike	City of Maple Grove	1	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	The City of Maple Grove reserves the right to conduct further research on feasibility of Route 732 and be the operator of that route if funded.	The Enhanced Bus/Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative has been eliminated from further consideration; therefore, Route 732 is not required as a new service to the area as part of the proposed BLRT Extension project. This does not preclude the city of Maple Grove from researching the feasibility of that route and implementing that route if it is determined to be a viable transit option.
1C	Opatz	Mike	City of Maple Grove	1	Email	2 - Fiscal Effects and Schedule	The City of Maple Grove would like to better understand project costs for the different scenarios, especially the LPA.	A financial analysis of the proposed BLRT Extension project is discussed in Chapter 10 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The proposed BLRT Extension project was analyzed further for the Final EIS; however, the other alternatives were not. Costs for the proposed BLRT Extension project were refined based on the Preliminary Engineering Plans and unit costs from local and national sources. Section 10.1.1 discusses the capital cost estimate basis for the proposed BLRT Extension project. Table 10.1-1 of the Final EIS shows a breakdown of the costs. For additional information regarding all alternatives, please review Chapters 2 and 10 of the Draft EIS.
1D	Opatz	Mike	City of Maple Grove	1	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	The City of Maple Grove notes that the Maple Grove express bus riders would even less likely to give up their bus option for a rail option that is in Brooklyn Park (the LPA option).	The Council understands and appreciates the effectiveness of the City of Maple Grove's express bus service. The effectiveness of this service was part of the reasoning for the selection of the proposed BLRT Extension project on a corridor that does not have an effective express bus service option.

City of Crystal

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
104A	Norris	Anne	City of Crystal	104	Letter via e-mail	6 - Noise & Vibration Effects	Concerned about projected noise impacts along the C Alignment in Crystal, the report indicates that there are a significant number of adjacent noise sensitive land uses that are predicted to experience noise impacts from LRT construction and operation, if unmitigated. A total of approximately 246 dwelling units (single-family, 2-family and apartment units) are assumed to have "severe" impacts from noise. While there are some anticipated impacts associated with construction noise, the DEIS does acknowledge the city's noise ordinance restrictions in that regard, and the construction activity is temporary. City is concerned with noise impact directly associated with the sounding of a train horn in advance of at-grade crossings at Corvallis and West Broadway, because it poses an increase to the baseline noise within what are predominantly residential neighborhoods. Impacts associated with the horn are intensified by the number of train trips. The City contends the establishment of quiet zones will be the most effective method of noise mitigation within Crystal.	Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) methodology and impact criteria. In the City of Crystal, 95 moderate and 204 severe impacts were reported, without mitigation, using FTA's methodology. (See Table 5.6-5 in Section 5.6 of the Final EIS.) With the implementation of Quiet Zones, there would be 10 moderate and 31 severe noise impacts. (See Table 5.6-5 in Section 5.6 of the Final EIS.) Mitigation for residual noise impact will be the use of a wayside device; a 10-foot-high, 1,300-foot-long noise barrier; a 10-foot-high, 1,100-foot-long noise barrier; and interior testing to determine appropriate mitigation (if applicable and feasible) at the remaining residences near grade crossings where noise barriers cannot be constructed.
104B	Norris	Anne	City of Crystal	104	Letter via e-mail	2 - Fiscal Effects and Schedule	All costs associated with quiet zone improvements must be borne by the project and not the City.	The proposed BLRT Extension project assumes all infrastructure costs associated with the implementation of Quiet Zones in the City of Crystal. These costs are included in the proposed BLRT Extension project's budget.
104C	Norris	Anne	City of Crystal	104	Letter via e-mail	8 - Transportation System Effects	The Bottineau project should incorporate this roadway evaluation (whether the West Broadway s-curve crossing of the BNSF tracks at 48th Avenue North either ought to be reconstructed as is, reconfigured, replaced by a crossing in a different location or eliminated) into the FEIS and Project Development phase to determine the feasibility of eliminating the rail crossing at West Broadway, need for roadway evaluation to determine the feasibility of eliminating the rail crossing at West Broadway.	Several design options were considered in coordination with the city of Crystal, Hennepin County, and other stakeholders at the West Broadway Avenue (County State-Aid Highway 103) rail crossing, including the potential of closing the crossing. Ultimately a revised crossing that maintained and improved access to the adjacent neighborhoods while enhancing the safety of the crossing was selected.
104D	Norris	Anne	City of Crystal	104	Letter via e-mail	3 - NEPA Process & Public Involvement	Figure 22: Alignment C Noise Impact Locations, there are two commercial/industrial properties misidentified as residential (the vacant industrial property at 5216 Hanson Ct and the vacant commercial property at 4940 West Broadway), and one commercial property (4947 West Broadway) that as of May 8, 2014, is no longer a church and will be developed for the City's a new Public Works facility. These three properties should no longer be included in the list of properties with potential for severe impacts from noise.	This was verified and corrected in the Final EIS.
104E	Norris	Anne	City of Crystal	104	Letter via e-mail	6 - Noise & Vibration Effects	Four residential properties (classified as "Category 2" uses) in Crystal have been identified as having potential for impacts from vibration (Figure 39 in the Technical Report) in the range of 72-90 VdB, depending on proximity to the track centerline. The Bottineau project should incorporate successful vibration mitigation measures for evaluation in the FEIS and during Project Development.	Vibration impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures have been recommended. Vibration is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS. In the Draft EIS, four residences were identified as vibration impacts, all in the area near Fairview Avenue. However, with greater engineering detail available during the Final EIS and changes in the proposed BLRT Extension project, only one residence with vibration impact remains at this location. A 300-foot-long ballast mat will eliminate the impact.
104F	Norris	Anne	City of Crystal	104	Letter via e-mail	8 - Transportation System Effects	The FEIS and Project Development all need to include a detailed analysis that satisfactorily addresses the potential adverse impacts associated with the lack of an off-street drop off or	The Bass Lake Road Station incorporates 170 space park-and-ride and a passenger drop-off area. The Bass Lake Road intersection with Bottineau Boulevard (County Road 81) was studied in the Traffic Operations Technical Memorandum, which is

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
							parking area that can support the Bass Lake Road station without compromising traffic operations.	available in Appendix F of the Final EIS. The intersection at Bass Lake Road and Bottineau Boulevard would operate at level of service (LOS) C with a freight event in the 2040 AM peak, and LOS D in the 2040 PM peak for the proposed BLRT Extension project. This level of service performance does not require mitigation.
104G	Norris	Anne	City of Crystal	104	Letter via e-mail	8 - Transportation System Effects	The City looks forward to participating in the process to ensure that Crystal residents will have safe pedestrian facilities on Bass Lake Road, Corvallis Avenue and West Broadway Avenue to access the station and that connect neighborhoods across the rail corridor.	Section 3.4 of the Final EIS summarizes pedestrian and bicycle improvements as part of the proposed BLRT Extension project. The proposed Bass Lake Road Station area provides improved connections from trails and sidewalks along the south side of Bass Lake Road to reach the station. A grade separated pedestrian crossing of Bottineau Boulevard would be constructed on the south side of Bass Lake Road. In addition, sidewalk connections would be provided or improved in the area of the proposed park-and-ride lot, including improved connections to Lakeland Avenue. The Crystal Lake Regional Trail runs along the east side of Bottineau Boulevard; bicyclists and pedestrians would be able to use the existing crossing facilities or the grade separated pedestrian crossing at the Bass Lake Road intersection to connect to the Bass Lake Road Station. South of Bass Lake Road, the proposed BLRT Extension project also includes improved pedestrian crossings of the light rail transit (LRT) tracks at West Broadway Avenue (about 1 mile south of the Bass Lake Road Station) and Corvallis Avenue (about ¾ mile south of the Bass Lake Road Station).
104H	Norris	Anne	City of Crystal	104	Letter via e-mail	4 - Social and Economic Effects	The City is concerned that, with the frequency of trains and the regular closing of major crossings such as at Bass Lake Road, there is the potential for adverse impacts to public safety services, such as increased response time, reduced access and increased costs. The pending traffic analysis must address and mitigate these possible impacts.	Section 4.7 of the Final EIS addresses safety and security. The Issue Resolution Team (coordinated between the Council and the city of Crystal) found that traffic operations of the Bass Lake Road and Bottineau Boulevard intersection would function at acceptable levels and does not warrant grade separation. Proposed BLRT Extension project tracks would cross Bass Lake Road at grade. In locations where there would be at-grade light rail crossings of roadways, the potential exists for increases in emergency response time as a result of delay to emergency vehicles while LRVs are in the crossing. During the peak weekday hour, up to 12 light rail trains (six in each direction) would pass through these at-grade crossings, causing approximately 50 seconds of delay per light rail train crossing. These delays could increase fire, emergency medical services, and police response times on routes using the crossings. To help avoid or minimize delays, the Council would coordinate with emergency services providers by providing them with the light rail operating schedule and identification of alternative crossing routes. Additional coordination will occur through the Fire Life Safety and Security Committee, as described in the proposed BLRT Extension project's Safety and Security Management Plan (SSMP) (Council, 2014).
104I	Norris	Anne	City of Crystal	104	Letter via e-mail	8 - Transportation System Effects	The City also is concerned that access to Bottineau Boulevard for residents north of the Canadian Pacific (CP) Rail will be compromised by the gated crossing at Bass Lake Road. Frequently the east-west CP Rail traffic blocks Douglas Drive and West Broadway. This forces residents north of the CP Rail to use Bass Lake Road to access Bottineau Boulevard and points south; and with the gates activated for LRT at the Bass Lake Road crossing, it may impose considerable traffic delays and queuing on Bass Lake Road that may take an inordinate amount of time to clear. The pending traffic analysis must also address and mitigate these possible impacts.	The Bass Lake Road intersection with Bottineau Boulevard was studied in the Traffic Operations Technical Memorandum, which is available as an appendix to the Final EIS (Appendix F). The intersection at Bass Lake Road and Bottineau Boulevard would operate at LOS C with a freight event in the 2040 AM peak, and LOS D in the 2040 PM peak for the proposed BLRT Extension project. This level of service performance does not require mitigation.
104J	Norris	Anne	City of Crystal	104	Letter via e-mail	4 - Social and Economic Effects	The City expects that the FEIS and Project Development phases will be sensitive to any adverse impacts on the Crystal business community that may be caused by construction of the Transitway and that there will be plans and programs in place to mitigate any anticipated adverse impacts.	Impacts related to temporary changes to parking and access will be mitigated by the development of a Construction Mitigation Plan, which will include a Construction Communications Plan, during final design. The plan will detail planned activities during construction, partnerships, and specific programs to assist local businesses and residents affected by construction and methods to minimize adverse impacts during construction of the proposed BLRT Extension project.

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB)

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
119A	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	6 - Noise & Vibration Effects	The eastern portion of Theodore Wirth Regional Park, which abuts the proposed D1 alignment, is known for its especially quiet and natural character and is enjoyed by thousands seeking a more passive recreational experience in the middle of a bustling urban community. Theodore Wirth Regional Park and the Grand Rounds must be separated from visual, noise, functional and other impacts which would significantly change or detract from the natural, quiet and scenic character of the park.	<p>FTA has separately addressed the Grand Rounds Historic District (GRHD) and Theodore Wirth Regional Park (TWRP) in the Final EIS. These resources, although overlapping to some degree, are distinct in terms of their cultural and environmental significance and separating these resources was an important distinction to make for readers of the Final EIS. The GRHD is significant as a historic and cultural resource and information can be found on the GRHD in Section 4.4 of the Final EIS with more detailed technical information made available in Appendix H – Cultural Resources Supporting Information of the Final EIS. TWRP is significant as the largest park in the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB) system, totaling a little over 759 acres in area. As a large park in an urban area, it contains a wealth of active and passive features, including the Eloise Butler Wildflower Garden, a golf course, archery range, sledding hill and many miles of trails for bicyclists and pedestrians. Information on TWRP can be found in Section 4.2 of the Final EIS. Both the GRHD and TWRP are separately addressed, as distinct resources, in Chapter 8 – Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation of the Final EIS. Separating these resources in terms of the land area they include, the features and facilities they contain and convey, and the separate owners with jurisdiction—Minnesota Historic Preservation Office (MnHPO) for the GRHD and MPRB for TWRP—was necessary in order to complete the Section 4(f) Evaluation for the proposed BLRT Extension project.</p> <p>Chapter 8 – Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation of the Final EIS presents the preliminary determination of FTA that the proposed BLRT Extension project would have a <i>de minimis</i> use of TWRP; FTA will make a final determination after receiving written concurrence from MPRB regarding this finding.</p> <p>The GRHD, as noted above, is a separate resource that is still subject to protection under Section 4(f), but as a historic resource, and not a park resource. Chapter 8 of the Final EIS also presents FTA’s preliminary determination that the proposed BLRT Extension project would have a direct use of the GRHD. This use determination was based on the assessment of adverse effects to the historic district through the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Section 106) process. MnHPO has concurred with the proposed mitigation measures for the adverse effects to the GRHD, which are also presented in Chapter 8 (see Section 8.7.2.11). A least overall harm analysis was conducted for the proposed BLRT Extension project (see Section 8.7.3) which found that the proposed alignment would have the least overall harm in relation to the magnitude of harm, after reasonable mitigation, to the other resources considered—both Section 4(f) and non–Section 4(f).</p>
119B	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The MPRB has adopted the outcome that Theodore Wirth Regional Park and adjoining park land remains a quiet, tranquil, serene and natural park destination.	<p>The Final EIS includes an analysis of noise impacts to passive use areas of TWRP at two locations within the park (the Chalet and a location east of Theodore Wirth Parkway between the Plymouth Avenue and Golden Valley Road stations); areas where park visitors may seek a place to linger and be separated from the urban character of the metropolitan area that surrounds the park. No noise impacts to the park were identified, even using the most stringent type of FTA sensitive receptor designation (Category 1 sensitive use) for the park at the locations (see Chapter 5 of the Final EIS for a discussion of potential proposed BLRT Extension project noise).</p> <p>The proposed BLRT Extension project would introduce transportation infrastructure features and remove vegetation from areas adjacent to the park, resulting in a change to the visual setting. However, these changes would not alter the features or attributes that make TWRP a significant and important community and regional park resource. (See Chapter 8 – Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation of the Final EIS for more information on the ability of TWRP to remain a functional park resource with construction of the proposed BLRT Extension project.)The Council will continue to work with MPRB staff to develop aesthetic design concepts (such as selection of landscape treatments) that would reduce the visual impact of the proposed BLRT</p>

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								Extension project.
119C	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The MPRB has adopted the outcome that permeable paving materials are incorporated to reduce stormwater impacts to park land when hard surfaces are added by the project.	A stormwater management plan will be developed for the proposed BLRT Extension project to meet the stormwater ordinances, rules, and requirements of the various regulatory entities in the appropriate portions of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Where feasible, low impact development best management practices (BMPs) will be incorporated into facilities associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project. Low-impact development practices can substantially reduce stormwater runoff and may include the use of permeable pavers, pervious concrete, bio-infiltration, tree trenches. Such low impact design allows surface water to slowly infiltrate into the soil and helps to counteract the bounce of receiving waterbodies including Bassett Creek. Low impact design also helps to trap oils and hydrocarbons that may be present in areas with high vehicle use. Feasibility of various low-impact development practices will be determined based on depth to the seasonal high groundwater elevation, soil types, any evidence of contaminated soils, and elevation constraints.
119D	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The MPRB has adopted the outcome that the portion of Theodore Wirth Regional Park lying adjacent to Segment D1, continues to be used by those who desire a park experience in this natural, quiet setting.	The ability to maintain the attributes of the TWRP, including its setting, features, and facilities, with construction of the proposed BLRT Extension project is an important assessment for FTA in completing a Section 4(f) Evaluation (see Chapter 8 of the Final EIS for a copy of the Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation). As noted in Chapter 8, the Section 4(f) analysis discusses the preliminary determination of the <i>de minimis</i> use of TWRP in the vicinity of the Plymouth Avenue and Golden Valley Road stations. In summary, the incorporation of 2.1 acres of TWRP property were found to not alter the features or attributes that make TWRP a significant and important community and regional park resource. Specific to noise, two locations (the Chalet and a location east of Theodore Wirth Parkway between the Plymouth Avenue and Golden Valley Road stations) were analyzed under FTA's Category 1 land use designation and found to have no noise impacts; therefore, the park property adjacent to Alignment D1 can continue to serve the park users who desire a park experience in the natural, quiet setting.
119E	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The MPRB does not agree with a <i>de minimis</i> section 4(f) finding for Theodore Wirth Regional Park due to lack of information in several areas including, location of proposed wetland and floodplain mitigation, lack of category 1 noise analysis, and lack of analysis of constructive uses for Theodore Wirth Regional Park.	FTA and the Council acknowledge MPRB's concern with a <i>de minimis</i> Section 4(f) finding for TWRP. The Final EIS clarifies that two Section 4(f) properties were evaluated within the TWRP area—TWRP and the GRHD. Under Section 4(f) regulations, MPRB is the Official with Jurisdiction over the park resource (TWRP) and MnHPO is the Official with Jurisdiction over the GRHD. In the March 2014 Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation (Chapter 8 of the Draft EIS), the GRHD was identified as a direct use in Table 8.3-2 on page 8-13, but was described as a <i>de minimis</i> use in the text on page 8-35. The correct preliminary determination in the March 2014 Draft Section 4(f) analysis was a <i>de minimis</i> use for the GRHD. The TWRP resource was preliminarily determined to have a direct use, under the March 2014 Draft EIS Section 4(f) evaluation. Since the publication of the Draft EIS, additional information was developed during preliminary design efforts on the proposed BLRT Extension project which has resulted in an updated preliminary Section 4(f) findings. Chapter 8 of the Final EIS (the Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation) presents FTA's preliminary <i>de minimis</i> finding for the park resource (TWRP). This preliminary finding has been based on updated information regarding the level of impact to park property, and whether the impact is one that, after taking into account avoidance, minimization, mitigation and enhancement measures, results in no adverse effect to the activities, features, or attributes qualifying the park for protection under Section 4(f). This preliminary finding has also been developed with extensive coordination with MPRB staff. Wetland impacts on TWRP property would be less than one acre; mitigation for the impact is proposed at a site north of Olson Memorial Highway (Trunk Highway 55) and west of the BNSF Railway (BNSF) right-of-way, largely on MPRB property. An

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								<p>estimated 1.5 acres of wetland credit can be gained from this wetland mitigation site. The proposed BLRT Extension project would have about 16,800 cubic yards (CY) of floodplain impact on or adjacent to MPRB property. Floodplain mitigation is discussed in Section 5.2.5 of the Final EIS. The floodplain mitigation site for this 16,800 cubic yard impact is located west of the BNSF rail corridor and north of Olson Memorial Highway, largely on MPRB property (the same site as the wetland mitigation site discussed above). The site is being designed in coordination with Bassett Creek Water Management Commission (BCWMC) and MPRB staff to ensure that the site fits into the landscape.</p> <p>The Final EIS evaluated the potential for noise impacts to areas within TWRP using a Category 1 classification. The areas evaluated included the Theodore Wirth Chalet and a location between the Plymouth Avenue and Golden Valley Road stations on the east side of Theodore Wirth Parkway. No noise impacts to the park were identified based on this evaluation (see Section 5.6 of the Final EIS for more details on this evaluation).</p> <p>The information presented above was used to help determine that the proposed BLRT Extension project would not alter or impair the overall use or function of TWRP. This informed FTA's preliminary determination of a <i>de minimis</i> use, and also informed that there would not be a constructive use.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Final EIS also makes a determination of direct use on the GRHD based on an adverse effect finding under Section 106. Through an extensive coordination and consultation process, FTA has identified mitigation measures for the GRHD (as noted in the Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement [MOA]).</p> <p>Final Section 4(f) determinations will be made after consideration the comments received from the Officials with Jurisdictions and the public on Chapter 8 of the Final EIS. As noted above, MPRB is the Official with Jurisdiction for TWRP, and MPRB concurrence will be required prior to finalization of the <i>de minimis</i> finding for the park.</p>
Wirth 119F	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	As the design progresses, park lands must be evaluated under Section 4(f) to identify all <u>permanent and temporary</u> uses.	The Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation presents both temporary and permanent impacts to park properties, including impacts to parks purchased by Land and Water Conservation Funds [Section 6(f)]. A total of 9.45 acres of MPRB property would be temporarily occupied for proposed BLRT Extension project construction purposes, and 2.11 acres of MPRB property would be permanently acquired for the proposed BLRT Extension project.
119G	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	As the design progresses, park lands must be re-evaluated under Section 4(f) to determine whether there are <u>constructive</u> uses of park land due to long-term noise, vibration and visual impacts, potential impacts to wetland and floodplains within the park, and potential stormwater impacts.	Constructive use of a property is set forth in 23 CFR Part 774.15(a). It is defined as occurring when the transportation project does not incorporate land from a Section 4(f) property, but the proposed BLRT Extension project's proximity impacts are so severe that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify the property for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired. Substantial impairment occurs only when the protected activities, features, or attributes of the property are substantially diminished and rendered unusable to the park users. Chapter 8 – Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation of the Final EIS indicates that there would be no constructive use of MPRB park resources (see Section 8.7.1). Based on the finding of no constructive use, a re-evaluation will not be conducted.
119H	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	As the design progresses, park lands must be re-evaluated under Section 4(f) to determine whether there are <u>constructive</u> uses of park land due to long-term impacts on the cultural characteristics of the parks, with attention focused on those that are considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.	Please see response to Comment 119G.
119I	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Park land along the corridor is preserved in the same or better condition.	Park land temporarily impacted by construction activities would be restored to as good or better conditions [23 CFR Part 774.13(d)]. In addition, the proposed BLRT

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
			Board					Extension project includes new trail connections and enhancements of existing trails that would provide greater access to and utility of park property.
119J	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Park property is not used permanently as part of LRT development.	The Amended Section 4(f) Evaluation indicates that 2.1 acres of TWRP property would be permanently acquired for the construction of LRT facilities, including the Golden Valley Road Station park-and-ride and the Plymouth Avenue Station. Mitigation for this permanent property impact would be in the form of replacement property of equal or greater value that could be readily incorporated into the park system, or through a negotiated financial settlement.
119K	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	A number of archaeological features within Theodore Wirth Regional Park and adjoining areas were not discussed in the DEIS. Further research is needed to properly document all appropriate structures.	A study to document cultural landscape elements in TWRP (including Theodore Wirth Parkway) has been completed. Archaeological resources within TWRP, including Germania Brewery, were reviewed as part of the study to document the cultural landscape in the park. It is important to note that, in the Draft EIS and in the Final EIS, the Germania Brewery site was identified as an archaeological site that was outside the archaeological area of potential effect (APE) and therefore did not require detailed analysis. The fact that an archaeological site may lie within an architectural APE (which is generally more extensive than an archaeological APE) does not indicate that it must be analyzed for adverse effects. By definition, the APE is the area for potential effect, and a site outside the area for potential effect would therefore not be subject to potential effects. See Appendix H of the Final EIS for additional information.
119L	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The Section 4(f) and Section 106 review need to evaluate the impacts to the cultural landscape of Theodore Wirth Regional Park and Bassett's Creek.	The proposed BLRT Extension project's potential impacts to the Theodore Wirth Segment of the GRHD was evaluated by FTA and the results of this evaluation are summarized in Section 4.4 of the Final EIS with technical and supporting information included in Appendix H of the Final EIS. The GRHD is significant as a historic resource as it represents a conscious effort to link area of the city into a comprehensive and unified system (the "Grand Rounds"). It is one of the most unique and iconic features of Minneapolis, and continues to draw national attention for its role as a recreational resource that enhances the vitality of a major American city. A study to document cultural landscape elements in TWRP (including Theodore Wirth Parkway) has been completed and includes examining view sheds to and from the proposed BLRT Extension project. Effects to historic property views within the APE were analyzed. All attempts were made to avoid or minimize adverse effects to historical or cultural resources as a part of the Section 106 process. Effects from all project elements, including wetland, floodplain, or stormwater mitigation, on historic properties were analyzed. (See Appendix H of the Final EIS for more detail on the process of assessing the proposed BLRT Extension project's effects on cultural and historic resources.) Boundaries for the GRHD were confirmed. The study to document cultural landscape elements in TWRP includes the area around Bassett Creek. According to information from the MnHPO inventory files, Bassett Creek Park is not identified as individually eligible or contributing to the GRHD; however, the nomination form for the District is currently being reevaluated. FTA published a Section 106 Determination of Effects report for the proposed BLRT Extension project in December 2015, a copy of which is included in Appendix H of the Final EIS. This report did find that the proposed BLRT Extension project would have an adverse effect on the GRHD, including the direct physical effects resulting from construction of the Plymouth Avenue Station, the Golden Valley Road Station, and the park-and-ride facility at Golden Valley Road. Based on this information, FTA has made a preliminary Section 4(f) direct use determination for the GRHD (see Chapter 8 – Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation of the Final EIS).
119M	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The impacts to the cultural resources within Theodore Wirth Regional Park are underrepresented in the DEIS from a construction and operation perspective. Further research is needed to properly document impacts, especially in terms of noise, impacts on users, and cultural landscapes.	Effects on historic properties within the APE, including potential effects from the design of the proposed BLRT Extension project, noise, vibration, or visual impacts, were analyzed for the Final EIS. To inform the analysis of effects, a study to document cultural landscape elements in TWRP was completed and includes examining any view sheds to and from the proposed BLRT Extension project.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								A Section 106 MOA has been developed by FTA and MnHPO including the participation of the Council and other parties. The Section 106 MOA sets forth commitments to avoid, minimize, and mitigate the potential adverse effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on cultural and historic resources (see Section 4.4 of the Final EIS). A copy of the draft Section 106 MOA is included in Appendix H of the Final EIS. An executed copy of this document will be included in the proposed BLRT Extension project's Record of Decision.
119N	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Architecture areas of potential effect include entire park parcels where the intent of the parkland was preservation of a view shed such as in Valley View/Glenview Terrace Park.	The architecture/history APE includes a portion of the Valley View/Glenview Terrace Park parcels. Areas included in the architectural/historical APE are defined in Section 4.4.1.1 of the Final EIS. Areas outside the architectural APE were not evaluated, pursuant to the requirements of 36 CFR Part 800.4(a)(2); therefore, only the portion of Valley View/Glenview Terrace Park which falls within the APE were evaluated for impacts associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project. Effects on historic properties within the APE, including potential effects from visual impacts were analyzed for the Final EIS. To inform the analysis of effects, a study to document cultural landscape elements in TWRP was completed and includes examining any view sheds to and from the proposed BLRT Extension project both within and outside the APE, including from Valley View/Glenview Terrace Park. A copy of this report can be found in Appendix H of the Final EIS. Visibility of the proposed BLRT Extension project may change with the season due to the vegetative cover of deciduous plants and trees. Therefore, field survey was conducted when no snow was present and prior to full leaf-out of deciduous species, in an effort to observe potential viewsheds when the lowest level of natural obstructions would exist. The analysis of viewshed impacts of the proposed BLRT Extension project from Valley View/Glenview Terrace Park resulted in a "No Visibility" finding. While this park (Valley View/Glenview Terrace) is located adjacent to the proposed BLRT Extension project, it has no direct view of the proposed BLRT Extension project and only limited views of TWRP due to dense vegetation and topography.
119O	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The protection of the entire parkland view shed shall be considered, from sunset hill (at 26th Av. N.) on Theodore Wirth Parkway through Valley View/Glenview Terrace Park.	Effects on historic properties within the APE, including potential effects from visual impacts were analyzed for the Final EIS. To inform the analysis of effects, a study to document cultural landscape elements in TWRP was completed and includes examining any viewsheds to and from the proposed BLRT Extension project both within and outside the APE, including from Sunset Hill through Valley View/Glenview Terrace Park. A copy of this report can be found in Appendix H of the Final EIS. Visibility of the proposed BLRT Extension project may change with the season due to the vegetative cover of deciduous plants and trees. Therefore, field survey was conducted when no snow was present and prior to full leaf-out of deciduous species, in an effort to observe potential viewsheds when the lowest level of natural obstructions would exist. The analysis of viewshed impacts of the proposed BLRT Extension project from Sunset Hill resulted in a "No Visibility" finding. The current extent of parkland and its orientation, as well as adjacent development and dense vegetation in the southwestern corner of Glenview Park, do not afford any views of TWRP or the proposed BLRT Extension project area from Sunset Hill.
119P	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Assessment and prevention of impacts to cultural landscape features of the Grand Rounds Historic District will be done holistically, considering the overlapping of assets to avoid or mitigate impacts.	A study to document cultural landscape elements in TWRP (including Theodore Wirth Parkway) has been completed and included examining any view sheds to and from the proposed BLRT Extension project. Avoidance, minimization, and mitigation strategies have been and will continue to be developed in consideration of the entire resource that is the Theodore Wirth Segment, a contributing element, of the GRHD. This includes developing mitigation strategies in coordination with Section 106 consulting parties, including MPRB. A Section 106 MOA has been developed by FTA and MnHPO including the participation of Council and other parties. The MOA sets forth commitments to avoid, minimize, and mitigate the potential adverse effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on cultural and historic resources (see Section 4.4 of the Final EIS for a full

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								discussion of the mitigation measures). The mitigation measures include design elements around cultural landscapes, construction protection plan, vegetation and landscaping to screen and minimize views of the proposed BLRT Extension project. A copy of the draft Section 106 MOA is included in Appendix H of the Final EIS. An executed copy of this document will be included in the proposed BLRT Extension project's Record of Decision.
119Q	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Support and safety structures, as well as final transitway station designs, are harmonious, beautiful, and both historically and context sensitive.	The proposed mitigation for adverse effects to the Theodore Wirth Segment of the GRHD includes designs in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's (SOI) standards, as identified in the proposed BLRT Extension project's Section 106 MOA. These standards are intended to result in project design elements that are in harmony with the historic setting in which they are built.
119R	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Wetland, floodplain or stormwater mitigation practices applied to the corridor protects the historic cultural landscape of Theodore Wirth Regional Park and Bassett Creek.	There are wetland, floodplain and stormwater mitigation measures planned in TWRP and Bassett Creek. A floodplain mitigation area has been identified in TWRP between the Bassett Creek main stem and the BNSF rail corridor. Mitigation would include excavating adjacent ground below the elevation of the Bassett Creek 100-year floodplain to provide compensatory floodplain storage for the fill placed in the floodplain. A portion of Bassett Creek would be relocated to accommodate the proposed BLRT Extension project. Mitigation will be accomplished through a combination of on-site wetland mitigation and purchases of wetland credits. For water quality and stormwater, long-term mitigation measures will include designing and constructing permanent BMPs, such as detention and infiltration facilities, which would control and treat stormwater runoff caused by an increase in impervious surfaces as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project.
119S	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The visual impact of the LRT and related infrastructure is minimized for trail and park users and honors the historic character of the Grand Rounds where it crosses or abuts the Grand Rounds.	The proposed BLRT Extension project's visual impacts on TWRP and the GRHD include views being opened up by grading and vegetation thinning for the transitway. The Final EIS addressed, evaluated, and resolved the potential visual impacts of the proposed BLRT Extension project on all land uses in the study area. Appropriate mitigation measures for visual impacts were discussed in the Final EIS; these include incorporating design elements that allow design features to blend in with their surroundings, or landscape elements that soften the effect of the proposed BLRT Extension project on the surrounding landscape.
119T	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The train and station area lights have minimal visual impacts on trail and park users.	The Final EIS evaluated the impacts from the addition of lights from the train and the stations. To minimize effects from the lights, appropriate mitigation measures for visual impacts were discussed in the Final EIS. These measures include minimizing operational night lighting where practicable, including shielding of lights and directional lighting to minimize the impact of "spillover" light into visually sensitive areas adjacent to the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor.
119U	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	The MPRB concludes that sufficient design and research has not been conducted for it to articulate whether it concurs with the finding that the LPA is also the Environmentally Preferred Alternative.	Since the publication of the Draft EIS, the Council has advanced design of the proposed BLRT Extension project and has reviewed the environmental resources which are affected by the proposed BLRT Extension project. The results of such analysis are reported in the body of the Final EIS. In summary, the proposed BLRT Extension project would have a positive effect on transit services while impacting parking, historic properties, visual resources, floodplains and wetlands, noise and vibration, and biological resources. However, with the mitigation noted for these resources, there will be overall improved transit service, the addition of over 1,600 parking spaces associated with new park-and-rides, new interpretive features for historic properties as well as preservation plans for historic properties, aesthetic treatments incorporated in transit features, noise walls or other mitigation measures, new wetland and floodplain areas, and vegetation restoration. Furthermore, the proposed BLRT Extension project would result in improved connections to park resources and a better pedestrian environment. See the Executive Summary of the Final EIS for a more detailed review of impacts and

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								mitigation.
119V	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Wetland and floodplain mitigation locations and design options within Theodore Wirth Regional Park need to be identified and evaluated under Section 4(f) and Section 106.	One floodplain mitigation site has been identified as depicted in Figure 5.2-5 of the Final EIS; this site would also be used for wetland mitigation. This site lies partially within MPRB property and partially within Canadian Pacific Railway property. On November 4, 2015, MPRB passed a resolution addressing the proposed BLRT Extension project resolving, amongst other items, to support the floodplain mitigation site identified partially within TWRP (as depicted in Figure 5.2-5). Section 4(f) and Section 106 analysis has considered the temporary impact of constructing floodplain/wetland mitigation in this area. Mitigation designs will be developed to blend in with the surroundings, and no permanent use or adverse effects are anticipated at this site. A copy of the draft US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Section 404 permit, which includes wetlands mitigation commitments, including required compensatory mitigation, is included as Appendix I of the Final EIS.
119W	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The project's stormwater design does not increase the volume of runoff or pollutant loads in water bodies owned and/or managed by the MPRB.	A stormwater management plan will be developed for the proposed BLRT Extension project to meet the stormwater ordinances, rules, and requirements of the various regulatory entities in the appropriate portions of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Where feasible, low impact development BMPs would be incorporated into facilities associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project. Low impact development practices can substantially reduce stormwater runoff and may include the use of permeable pavers, pervious concrete, bio-infiltration, tree trenches. Such low impact design allows surface water to slowly infiltrate into the soil and helps to counteract the bounce of receiving waterbodies including Bassett Creek. Low impact design also helps to trap oils and hydrocarbons such as what may be present in areas with high vehicle use. Feasibility of various low impact development practices would be determined based on depth to the seasonal high groundwater elevation, soil types, any evidence of contaminated soils, and elevation constraints.
119X	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Wetland, floodplain or stormwater mitigation practices applied to the corridor protect water table levels and habitat within the park land that are dependent on those water levels.	Appropriate measures, such as construction of detention and infiltration facilities, to avoid and minimize impacts to surface and groundwater will be implemented during construction and operation/maintenance phases of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Low impact stormwater designs allow surface water to slowly infiltrate into the soil and help to counteract the bounce of receiving waters including Bassett Creek.
119Y	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Wet meadow areas within Theodore Wirth Regional Park are high quality wildlife habitat and provide high quality water filtration benefits.	The Final EIS discusses notable aquatic habitats within and adjacent to the proposed BLRT Extension project limits. Table 6 in the Biological Environment Technical Report specifically identifies Bassett Creek and the surrounding wetlands as an area of notable aquatic habitat. The area adjacent to the proposed BLRT Extension project is estimated at just under 12 acres. The area that would be impacted is estimated at approximately 1.8 acres. Much of this area will be temporarily impacted and restored; some of the impact would be on BNSF right-of-way, and some of the impact is proposed to be mitigated on MPRB property within the same stretch of Bassett Creek. The joint Section 404/Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) permit application (see Appendix I of the Final EIS) provides additional information about proposed mitigation.
119Z	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Any mitigation of wetland on MPRB land shall be type-for-type.	The Section 404/WCA permit application (see Appendix I of the Final EIS) indicates that less than 1 acre of permanent wetland impact would occur on MPRB property. A wetland mitigation site has been identified at the same location as the proposed floodplain mitigation site on MPRB property north of Olson Memorial Highway and west of the BNSF right-of-way. It is anticipated that this mitigation site would yield 1.5 acres of wetland mitigation credit, so there will be no net loss of wetlands on MPRB property, and there will likely be an increase in wetland area and functionality.
119AA	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Any mitigation of floodplain on MPRB land shall use BMPs and will not impair existing recreation activities.	Floodplain mitigation will occur on MPRB land (see Figure 5.2-5 of the Final EIS) and will be designed to maintain or enhance the experience of recreationists through the use of attractive native plantings and, where appropriate, interpretive signage.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								Appropriate BMPs will be incorporated into the design. Floodplain mitigation strategies have been discussed with the BCWMC, MPRB, and the cities of Minneapolis and Golden Valley, and staffs from those governmental units have approved the final mitigation sites. The Council will continue to coordinate approvals for floodplain impacts and mitigation strategies with the BCWMC, the cities of Minneapolis and Golden Valley, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).
119AB	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	6 - Noise & Vibration Effects	Category 1 is most consistent with the type of park land the MPRB owns or maintains adjacent to or within Segment D1. Noise impacts for these park lands and its users must be re-evaluated under the standards set for Category 1.	Passive use parks are classified as Category 3 land uses in the FTA noise guidance. Category 1 is reserved for the most sensitive locations, such as recording studios, concert halls, memorials and outdoor amphitheatres. It is not intended for park settings with passive uses in some locations, such as TWRP. Active use parks, and locations within parks with active uses are not considered noise sensitive. The Chalet is over 900 feet from the nearest point of the proposed BLRT Extension project right-of-way, and the JD Rivers Garden is over 1,000 feet from the nearest point of the right-of-way. Neither resource would have any impacts associated with LRT operations, evaluated under a Category 3 assessment. Recognizing the concerns expressed by MPRB, FTA conducted an evaluation to identify whether any potential additional noise impacts would result if the evaluation used a Category 1 classification. The Final EIS evaluated the potential for noise impacts at two locations within TWRP using a Category 1 classification. The areas evaluated included the Theodore Wirth Chalet and a location between the Plymouth Avenue and Golden Valley Road stations on the east side of Theodore Wirth Parkway. No noise impacts to the park were identified based on this evaluation (see Section 5.6 of the Final EIS for more details on this evaluation).
119AC	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	6 - Noise & Vibration Effects	Theodore Wirth Regional Park has limited areas of active recreation. Section 5.6.4.1 indicates that the MPRB views the entire park as being meant for active-use and that it is not sensitive to noise impacts. The MPRB disagrees with this statement. Theodore Wirth Regional Park should be considered for sensitive noise impacts.	Please see response to Comment 119AB.
119AD	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	6 - Noise & Vibration Effects	The JD Rivers Garden feature in Theodore Wirth Regional Park is an educational as well as recreational amenity visited regularly by school children and especially at risk for detrimental effects from noise and vibration associated with BLRT.	Vibration associated with LRT operations decreases dramatically based on distance from the source (i.e., the LRT train and tracks). As noted in FTA's Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual, train vibration is most sensitive and detectable by humans at a distance of approximately 350-feet from a light rail guideway. The JD Rivers Garden feature is located over 1,000 feet from the nearest point of the proposed BLRT Extension project right-of-way and the associated vibration levels would be several orders of magnitude below the threshold for human perception. Therefore, there is no ground-borne vibration impacts at the JD Rivers Garden given the distance between the proposed BLRT Extension project and this park feature.
119AE	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	6 - Noise & Vibration Effects	The vibration impacts are minimized for park users.	The 2006 Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual establishes the methodology used by FTA in assessing potential vibration impacts for transit projects. In predicting impacts from train operations, the methodology focuses on the generation of vibration at the source (the train for light rail projects), its path through the ground, and its effect on a receiver (a structure). Vibration is not assessed for outdoor land uses such as parks. Although the motion of the ground may be perceived by a park user, without the effects associated with the shaking of a building, the motion does not provoke the same adverse human reaction.
119AF	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	6 - Noise & Vibration Effects	The noise impacts are minimized for park users and do not exceed the noise standards set for Category 1.	Please see response to Comment 119AB.
119AG	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	6 - Noise & Vibration Effects	Technology that reduces track noise and vibration are incorporated into transitway design and construction.	The LRT and reconstructed freight rail track would be continuously welded rail and would reduce noise and vibration impacts by eliminating the impact of the vehicle wheels hitting joints in the rail.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
119AH	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	8 - Transportation System Effects	Communities on the east side of the LRT safely and easily access the Luce Line Regional Trail at Highway 55.	The proposed BLRT Extension project scope approved by the Corridor Management Committee (CMC) includes the reconstruction of Olson Memorial Highway, including the westbound bridge over the freight rail corridor. This reconstruction includes provisions for pedestrian and bicycle trails that allow for connectivity to TWRP trail systems, and access to the Luce Line Regional Trail.
119AI	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	8 - Transportation System Effects	Communities on the east side of the LRT can access Theodore Wirth Regional Park and the trail that follows the east side of the park along the corridor.	The proposed BLRT Extension project scope approved by the CMC includes the reconstruction of the Plymouth Avenue Bridge, the Theodore Wirth Parkway Bridge, and the Golden Valley Road Bridge. All of these bridges will be improved to include pedestrian/bicycle facilities meeting current design standards. This reconstruction will allow for connectivity to TWRP trail systems. The proposed BLRT Extension project also includes construction of a staircase leading from the Theodore Wirth Trail on the east side of the BNSF rail corridor connecting to Plymouth Avenue, facilitating connections to the Plymouth Avenue Station and to the other trails and park facilities located nearby.
119AJ	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	8 - Transportation System Effects	There is adequate access to the Theodore Wirth Regional Park from the east side of the LRT tracks, and access points are a reasonable walking distance apart.	As part of proposed BLRT Extension project improvements, the trail that runs along the east side of TWRP would be relocated out of BNSF right-of-way and onto MPRB property. In the design plans (located in Appendix E of the Final EIS), a 10-foot trail is shown with reaction space to nearby structures, such as the Plymouth Avenue Bridge. Additional trail accommodations including a connection from the Theodore Wirth Trail to Plymouth Avenue, and a connection between Theodore Wirth Parkway Trail and Sochacki Park, are also being developed for inclusion in the proposed BLRT Extension project. Trails implemented as a part of the proposed BLRT Extension project are being planned in cooperation with local jurisdictions including Hennepin County and the local municipality and designed to applicable local standards including the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) Bikeways Facility Design Manual. The design of trail facilities will also be coordinated with MPRB, the Three Rivers Park District, and other park entities to develop a trail design that meets the needs of the intended users.
119AK	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	8 - Transportation System Effects	The trail design meets the needs of current and projected users.	Please see response to Comment 119AJ.
119AL	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	8 - Transportation System Effects	Bicycle and walking trail users have a positive, linear park-like experience, including being free of obstructions, having a 2-foot or greater buffer on each side of all trails, and retaining a sense of connection to open space.	Please see response to Comment 119AJ.
119AM	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	8 - Transportation System Effects	All trail connections are maintained or improved.	Please see response to Comment 119AJ.
119AN	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	8 - Transportation System Effects	At all points along the corridor, and especially at the narrowest locations, sufficient space remains for the Luce Line Regional Trail and the trail that runs along the east side of Theodore Wirth Regional Park, trail users, and year-round maintenance vehicles and crews.	Please see response to Comment 119AJ.
119AO	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Surface and groundwater quality is protected during construction.	Appropriate measures to avoid and minimize impacts to surface and groundwater will be implemented during construction and maintenance phases of the proposed BLRT Extension project. These include construction stormwater BMPs such as silt fences, ditch checks, erosion control mats, temporary mulching and/or seeding, and other appropriate practices to control runoff and sedimentation. Spill control plans will be required of construction contractors to address accidental releases of petroleum products or other controlled substances. As part of proposed BLRT Extension project construction, a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit will be prepared. This permit will establish the measures which the Council and its contractors will implement during construction to protect surface and groundwater

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								quality and the monitoring activities used to report on implementation of such measures.
119AP	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	8 - Transportation System Effects	Reasonable and safe alternative routes are provided for trail users when sections are closed during construction.	Reasonable and safe routes for trail users will be provided during construction. The Council will develop a Construction Communications Plan which will be used to coordinate trail and roadway closures and detours with the public and with local jurisdictions, including MPRB.
119AQ	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Any flora that is lost to construction of LRT use is replaced with flora that is in accordance with MPRB plans, with monitoring through a plant survey and replacement for five (5) years after construction is complete.	The Council has coordinated with MPRB to plan appropriate vegetation replacement. The Council obtained maps of outstanding stands of trees and coordinated with MPRB to determine an appropriate strategy for preservation or mitigation. The Council will coordinate with MPRB staff on a final revegetation plan for implementation during proposed BLRT Extension project construction.
119AR	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Soils and slopes are stabilized during construction.	As part of mitigation commitments, an NPDES permit will outline the appropriate measures to minimize the potential for slope erosion. These measures will be implemented during construction and maintenance phases of the proposed BLRT Extension project.
119AS	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Construction dewatering protects water table levels and habitat within park lands that is dependent on those water levels.	Construction dewatering would be conducted in accordance with DNR requirements. Dewatering discharge will be redirected to upgradient recharge areas so as to maintain existing water table elevations outside of the area requiring groundwater removal.
119AT	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Construction practices prevent introduction of new invasive species to park lands and waters.	The construction contractor will be required to develop a vegetation management plan that includes provisions for avoiding introduction of invasive species within the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Methods may include steam cleaning construction equipment prior to entry to the proposed BLRT Extension project site; quarantining of equipment used in an area of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor known to contain invasive species, and other appropriate methods. The Council will complete a Construction Mitigation Plan as part of commitments to minimize impacts during the construction phase. This plan will focus on methods of communicating requirements mitigation commitments to contractors and requirements to work with communities and stakeholders.
119AU	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	8 - Transportation System Effects	Users have access to Theodore Wirth Regional Park, Bassett's Creek Park, Luce Line Regional Trail, and other connection recreational opportunities.	Please see responses to Comments 119AH, 119AI, and 119AJ.
119AV	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The current wildlife habitat character of Theodore Wirth Regional Park, Bassett Creek Park, and Valley View Park is sustained.	The proposed BLRT Extension project includes mitigation commitments to address impacts to terrestrial and aquatic habitat. Terrestrial habitat mitigation will be accomplished through revegetation of areas disturbed but not permanently incorporated into the proposed BLRT Extension project. There are an estimated 9.2 acres of temporary easement in TWRP that would be cleared for construction purposes and revegetated following construction. The BNSF right-of-way and an additional 2.1 acres of permanent easement proposed to be acquired from TWRP would be permanently cleared of existing vegetation. Revegetation criteria (species mix, density, and similar) will be developed in coordination with MPRB staff. The 2.1 acres of permanent easement acquired from TWRP will be replaced with land adjacent to park property that can readily be incorporated into the park landscape, or will be mitigated through a negotiated financial settlement. Section 8.7.1.2 of the Final EIS discusses the park-related enhancements that were evaluated as measures to minimize harm to the park resource. These enhancements include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Relocation of the trail adjacent to Bassett Creek to the west, out of BNSF right-of-way ■ Construction of a stair access from the Plymouth Avenue bridge to the trail adjacent to Bassett Creek ■ Construction of a trail connection from TWRP to the Sochacki Park complex to the north

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Construction of a new trail head at the Golden Valley Road/Theodore Wirth Parkway intersection ■ Reconstruction of the Theodore Wirth Parkway bridge, which is owned by MPRB ■ Reconstruction of the Golden Valley Road/Theodore Wirth Parkway intersection including intersection features that would enhance pedestrian and bicycle safety ■ Minimization of visual effects through ongoing coordination regarding design of station elements and retaining walls
119AW	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Parkland adjacent to alignment is maintained in its natural open space character for enjoyment and exploration by park visitors.	Temporary parkland occupied during the construction of the proposed BLRT Extension project will be restored to an as good or better condition following construction of the proposed BLRT Extension project. In many cases, adjacent parkland will be enhanced with improved trail facilities and connections that will allow greater access to park resources by park visitors.
119AX	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	No net loss to potential Blanding's turtle habitat in Bassett Creek and adjacent open water.	The potential for impacts to the Blanding's turtle is addressed in Section 5.8 of the Final EIS. This issue has been addressed in consultation with DNR, which has concurred (e-mail correspondence dated February 9, 2016) with the Council's and FTA's assessment that with adherence to DNR guidelines regarding the Blanding's turtle (guidelines which are presented in the DNR Blanding's turtle fact sheet), impacts to the species would be negligible. Impacts to wetland types 2 and 3 (likely turtle habitat) will be avoided in accordance with the DNR guidelines.
119AY	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Oak trees near the proposed Golden Valley Road Station are preserved.	The Council has surveyed stands of trees at Golden Valley Road and will coordinate with MPRB and other stakeholders to determine an appropriate strategy for preservation or mitigation. Coordination efforts will focus on identifying whether any trees that will be disturbed during construction can be preserved and, if not, whether those that will be disturbed are good candidates for transplanting elsewhere on MPRB property.
119AZ	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Maintain or improve water quality of Bassett Creek	Please see response to Comment 119AO.
119BA	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	6 - Noise & Vibration Effects	The natural and quiet character of Bassett's Creek Park is not negatively impacted by LRT	Bassett's Creek Park is located over 1,000 feet to the south of the proposed BLRT Extension project alignment. No noise or other impacts are anticipated at Bassett's Creek Park.
119BB	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	6 - Noise & Vibration Effects	Visual and noise impacts do not reduce the quiet natural character of Bassett's Creek Park.	Please see response to Comment 119BA
119BC	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The planting of dozens of trees in the median of TH 55 in the early 2000s are, in addition to a canopy that emphasizes the green space and character of the drive, are also part of a long term University of Minnesota forestry study, the results of which will be prematurely shortened by the BLRT construction and destruction of the trees. This needs to be reflected in future analysis of the impacts to this corridor.	Trees along the median of Olson Memorial Highway will be mitigated through relocating where feasible or replanting on MPRB or public right-of-way in coordination with MPRB forestry staff. On November 4, 2015, MPRB passed a resolution addressing the proposed BLRT Extension project resolving, amongst other items, to support the removal of trees in the median of Olson Memorial Highway as part of proposed BLRT Extension project, with the continued cooperation between the Council and MPRB forestry staff to identify trees which would be good candidates for re-locating elsewhere on MPRB-owned property. Conversations between the Council, MPRB forestry staff, and the University of Minnesota in the Fall of 2015 yielded the information that the research study of trees planted in the median of Olson Memorial Highway has ended.
119BD	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Replacement trees have similar character and potential for research purposes.	On November 4, 2015, MPRB passed a resolution addressing the proposed BLRT Extension project resolving, amongst other items, to support the removal of trees in the median of Olson Memorial Highway as part of proposed BLRT Extension project construction. This resolution included direction for the continued cooperation between the Council and MPRB forestry staff to identify trees in the median of Olson Memorial Highway that would be good candidates for re-locating elsewhere on MPRB-owned property. With construction of the proposed BLRT Extension project,

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								there will be limited opportunity to re-plant trees or other landscaping in the median of Olson Memorial Highway due to the need to maintain clear sight lines for LRT operators, passengers and pedestrians crossing Olson Memorial Highway.
119BE	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	8 - Transportation System Effects	Enhance or sustain the ease of access and safe connection for residents in North Minneapolis neighborhoods to recreation opportunities offered within Theodore Wirth Regional Park.	The proposed BLRT Extension project scope approved by the CMC includes the reconstruction of the Plymouth Avenue Bridge, the Theodore Wirth Parkway Bridge, and the Golden Valley Road Bridge—which span the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor into TWRP. All of these bridges will be improved to include a pedestrian/bicycle facilities meeting current design standards. This reconstruction will allow for connectivity to TWRP trail systems for residents in North Minneapolis neighborhoods. MPRB, in a resolution taken November 4, 2015, supported the construction of a Plymouth Avenue station as part of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Later in November 2015, the inclusion of a Plymouth Avenue station in the proposed BLRT Extension project’s scope and budget was recommended by the CMC for Council action.
119BF	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Architectural APE should include entire park parcels where the intent of the parkland was preservation of a viewshed as in Valley View/Glenview Terrace Park.	Please see response to Comment 119N.
119BG	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Architectural APE research dates not indicated. Contributing features of the Grand Rounds district not indicated.	The Phase I and II architecture history survey for the proposed BLRT Extension project, which details the architectural APE, was completed in November of 2012. The Final EIS clarifies this matter. Boundaries for the GRHD were confirmed. The GRHD nomination is currently being reevaluated; updates are included in the Final EIS. Please see the response to Comment 119BF for additional information.
119BH	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Archaeological APE research completed in November 2012 should have included the Germania Brewery site approved by SHPO in March 2012 (Two Pines 3-2012)	Please see response to Comment 119K.
119BI	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Visual inspection of archaeological APE on public park land was not addressed. It was not disclosed if the consultant conducted on site pedestrian surveys of park land.	Visual inspection of the archaeology APE was completed primarily from public right-of-way (see page 8 of the Phase IA Archaeology Report in Appendix H of the Final EIS).
119BJ	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Grand Rounds-Theo Wirth section of the historic district boundary is incorrect. Theo Wirth Park NRHP district segment does not extend west of the extension of France Avenue (though there is parkland there it was acquired after the POS).	Boundaries for the GRHD, Theodore Wirth Segment have been updated and match the boundaries depicted in the draft National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) nomination for the GRHD, which is the basis for MnHPO’s determination of eligibility for the district. The updated boundary does not extend west of the extension of France Avenue.
119BK	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Grand Rounds-Theo Wirth section of the historic district boundary is incorrect. Theo Wirth Park NRHP district segment includes parcels east of the BN RR corridor both north and south of Plymouth Avenue.	Boundaries for the GRHD, Theodore Wirth Segment have been updated and match the boundaries depicted in the draft NRHP nomination for the GRHD, which is the basis for MnHPO’s determination of eligibility for the district. The updated boundary includes parcels east of the BNSF rail corridor both north and south of Plymouth Avenue.
119BL	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The overall park cultural landscape as well as contributing features within the park are not discussed or evaluated.	Recognizing concerns expressed by MPRB in its Draft EIS comments, the Council and FTA completed a TWRP Cultural Landscape Study in September 2015. The purposes of this study were to 1) provide a historic context for the park; 2) to identify viewsheds where the proposed BLRT Extension project may be visible; 3) to identify the physical characteristics of the landscape; and 4) to identify contributing elements of the GRHD within the APE and viewsheds where properties may be affected by the proposed BLRT Extension project. A copy of this study can be found in Appendix H of the Final EIS. The study was shared in draft form with MPRB staff in its role as a consulting party to the proposed BLRT Extension project Section 106 process.
119BM	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Bassett Creek Park has also been recommended NRHP eligible (Blondo 2-2014)	The study to document cultural landscape elements in TWRP includes the area around Bassett Creek, including Bassett Creek Park. According to information from the MnHPO inventory files, Bassett Creek Park is not identified as individually eligible or contributing; however, the GRHD nomination is currently being reevaluated. The status of Bassett Creek Park was confirmed and updates are included in the Final EIS.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
119BN	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Archaeological NHRP eligible site-Germania Brewery (Two Pines 3-2012) is not shown on the figure or included in the research.	Please see response to Comment 119K.
119BO	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The waterbody named "Bassett Lake" does not exist. Lagoons in Bassett Creek are a cultural landscape feature created in the 1930s. The Lagoon North of Plymouth Ave station is Lagoon E.	References to "Bassett Lake" have been removed from the Final EIS.
119BP	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Description of Bassett Creek meandering through a golf course is incorrect. The creek meanders through a distinct area of the park which contains a series of important natural areas with varied native plant communities including upland oak forest, wet meadow and riparian floodplain forest and meadow. This are [sic] is not part of a "golf course" but is important on its own as a natural habitat area.	The Council understands the importance of the mosaic of habitat types throughout the open space adjacent to Bassett Creek in and around TWRP, and other nearby parks. The reference to the creek "meandering through a golf course" has been removed from the Final EIS.
119BQ	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The description of Segment D Common does not signify the importance of the median elm trees to the character of this segment as a wide, grand city boulevard. While it is not an official parkway, it has parkway characteristics which make it a distinct landscape type, different from a typical highway, (which it is west of Theodore Wirth Regional Park). These remnant and hybrid elm specimens have been used for the past two decades for research on disease resistance. The median also includes some remnant elms which have natural resistance and may be important for future development of disease resistant cultivars. In addition, future expected loss of ash trees on side boulevard due to EAB [emerald ash borer] will make the loss of middle-aged elms in the central median more pronounced. No trees will buffer or beautify this grand city boulevard.	On November 4, 2015, MPRB passed a resolution addressing the proposed BLRT Extension project resolving, amongst other items, to support the removal of trees in the median of Olson Memorial Highway as part of proposed BLRT Extension project construction. Please see Comment 119BD. This resolution included direction for the continued cooperation between the Council and MPRB forestry staff to identify trees in the median of Olson Memorial Highway that would be good candidates for re-locating elsewhere on MPRB-owned property. With construction of the proposed BLRT Extension project, there would be limited opportunity to re-plant trees or other landscaping in the median of Olson Memorial Highway due to the need to maintain clear sight lines for LRT operators, passengers and pedestrians crossing Olson Memorial Highway. Conversations between the Council, MPRB forestry staff, and the University of Minnesota in the Fall of 2015 yielded the information that the research study of trees planted in the median of Olson Memorial Highway has ended.
119BR	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Glenview Terrace/Valley View Park determination of "minimal effect" is incorrect from MPRB's perspective. This parcel was acquired by Theodore Wirth as part of the Theo Wirth Parkway primarily to preserve its viewshed. The viewshed begins at Sunset Hill overlook at 26th Ave N and the view terminates at the RR corridor. This viewshed will be highly impacted by temporary and permanent effects of the LRT project. High overhead lines will be visible and high frequency trains will be visible and likely be audible from the high vantage point at Sunset Hill.	The analysis of viewshed impacts of the proposed BLRT Extension project from Sunset Hill resulted in a "No Visibility" finding. The current extent of parkland and its orientation, as well as adjacent development and dense vegetation in the southwestern corner of Glenview Park, do not afford any views of TWRP or the proposed BLRT Extension project from Sunset Hill. The results of assessing noise impacts for the proposed BLRT Extension project are included in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS and indicate that there would be no adverse noise impacts associated with proposed BLRT Extension project operations. Please see response to Comment 119AB for a more detailed response to concerns expressed by MPRB regarding potential noise impacts of the proposed BLRT Extension project.
119BS	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Theodore Wirth Regional Park (omit Golf course). Theodore Wirth Regional Park is mischaracterized along the project corridor. This part of the park is not the golf course. It is a consciously preserved natural landscape which serves as an important refuge for park visitors, plants, and animals. It is a quiet buffer to the neighborhood and natural habitat with passive recreation features including a well-used trail. Current rail operation is so infrequent that this character has persisted and been planned since the early 1900s.	The Council understands the importance of the mosaic of habitat types and park visitor experiences throughout the open space adjacent to Bassett Creek in the eastern portion of TWRP. The reference Theodore Wirth Golf Course has been removed from the Final EIS except for where the subject of discussion is the actual golf course. The trail adjacent to the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor will be reconstructed and will remain a resource for park visitors. Please see response to Comment 119AB for a more detailed response to concerns expressed by MPRB regarding potential noise impact of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Please see response to Comment 119BL for a more detailed response to concerns about visual and historic character of the park.
119BT	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Theodore Wirth Parkway impacts as per comments on Glenview Terrace/Valley View Park above. [assumption is that this refers to comment 119BR]	The Council acknowledges that proposed BLRT Extension project elements would be visible to some users of Theodore Wirth Parkway. Proposed BLRT Extension project elements within the Theodore Wirth Segment of the GRHD will be designed in accordance with the SOI standards in order to create transportation infrastructure that appropriately fits into the surrounding landscape. A Section 106 MOA has been

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								developed by FTA and MnHPO including the participation of Council and other parties. The Section 106 MOA sets forth commitments to avoid, minimize, and mitigate the potential adverse effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on cultural and historic resources (see Section 4.4 of the Final EIS). A copy of the draft Section 106 MOA is included in Appendix H of the Final EIS. An executed copy of this document will be included in the proposed BLRT Extension project's Record of Decision.
119BU	Wielinski	Liz	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	119	Email & US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Plymouth Avenue Bridge over Bassett Creek, Theo Wirth Park Trail and BNSF RR, the trail impact is omitted and this is a HIGH IMPACT AREA.	The Council and MPRB have coordinated to address impacts to this trail. The TWRP trail would be relocated and reconstructed as part of the proposed BLRT Extension project. See the Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation (Chapter 8 of the Final EIS) for additional information.

City of Minneapolis

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
121A	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	The City of Minneapolis supports the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) route	See Master Response 2.
121B	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	The City of Minneapolis supports the purpose and need for this project.	See Master Response 2.
121C	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Two local north/south streets that currently have median openings on Olson Highway are proposed to be closed, thereby limiting vehicular access to right-in/right-out movement (Russell Avenue North and Elmwood Avenue North). Bicycle and pedestrian crossings must be maintained through the alignment, across LRT tracks and Olson at both intersections.	As documented in Section 3.4.4 of the Final EIS, there are currently nine unmarked, unsignalized mid-block crossings as well as six marked crossings at signalized intersections, several of which are not Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)–compliant. The proposed BLRT Extension project would provide ADA-compliant crossings at seven signalized crossings, and three ADA-compliant mid-block signalized crossings. The details of these crossings have been developed in coordination with the city of Minneapolis through the issue resolution process. The Council assumes that by “Elmwood” Avenue the city of Minneapolis is referring to either James Avenue or Humboldt Avenue. According to our documentation, Elmwood (rather than Elmwood) Avenue does not actually cross Olson Memorial Highway, but connects with James Avenue and Humboldt Avenue. Signalized pedestrian/bicycle crossings at James Avenue and Humboldt Avenue, as well as at Russell Avenue are included in the proposed BLRT Extension project scope and cost estimate.
121D	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Bicycle and pedestrian crossings exist at four additional locations in alignment with streets that do not currently include a vehicle median break (but do have sidewalks) along Olson Highway (Queen Avenue North, Sheridan Avenue North, Newton Avenue North, and Logan Avenue North). Bicycle and pedestrian crossings must be maintained through the alignment, across LRT tracks and Olson at all four intersections.	As documented in Section 3.4.4 of the Final EIS, there are currently nine unmarked, unsignalized mid-block crossings as well as six marked crossings at signalized intersections, several of which are not ADA-compliant. The proposed BLRT Extension project would provide ADA-compliant crossings at seven signalized crossings, and three ADA-compliant mid-block signalized crossings. The details of these crossings have been developed in coordination with the city of Minneapolis through the issue resolution process. This includes agreement on the elimination of the crossings at Queen Avenue North, Sheridan Avenue North, Newton Avenue North, and Logan Avenue North. The Council and the city have agreed on eliminating these crossings because of the improved intersection and mid-block crossings that have been incorporated into the proposed BLRT Extension project.
121E	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Diverted vehicular traffic must be accommodated in a manner that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood context.	While no significant changes to vehicular traffic circulation is expected with the proposed BLRT Extension project, the Council will coordinate with MnDOT and city of Minneapolis Public Works Department for any changes in vehicular circulation as part of the operations phase of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Vehicular traffic is discussed in Section 3.3 of the Final EIS. Any detours required during construction would be coordinated with the city and communicated to the public, in accordance with the proposed BLRT Extension project Construction Communication Plan.
121F	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	The City of Minneapolis is opposed to the placement of the Operations and Maintenance Facility for this line within the City of Minneapolis.	The Operations and Maintenance Facility (OMF) is not located in the City of Minneapolis. There were two alternative locations identified in the Draft EIS, both in the City of Brooklyn Park. The Final EIS identifies the proposed BLRT Extension project’s OMF location in the City of Brooklyn Park near Oak Grove Parkway.
121G	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Both stations within the corporate boundaries of Minneapolis (Penn and Van White) must be constructed.	Both the Penn Avenue and Van White Boulevard stations are included in the proposed BLRT Extension project scope and cost estimate approved by the Council in December 2015.
121H	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Construction of both the Golden Valley Road Station and the Plymouth Avenue Station is necessary to adequately serve the corridor travelshed, including a significant portion of North Minneapolis. Though these stations are located outside of Minneapolis corporate boundaries, they are located close	Both the Golden Valley Road and Plymouth Avenue stations are included in the proposed BLRT Extension project scope and cost estimate approved by the Council in December 2015.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
							enough to ensure improved access to the regional fixed rail system for residents in North Minneapolis, and will improve ridership.	
121I	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Conduct additional study to ensure the narrowing of Olson Highway so that the combination of street and LRT line will help to catalyze a denser, more urban development pattern within the corridor; one that will ensure that new development along the line is truly transit oriented, rather than highway-oriented. The existing highway environment needs to be redesigned and modified in order to provide greater balance. Specifically, the roadway needs to be designed in order to accommodate the necessary vehicular traffic while also accommodating and enhancing connectivity between transit, pedestrian, and bicycle networks. The project office will need to work on this critical topic with Hennepin County Community Works and the City of Minneapolis as station area planning progresses.	Chapter 2 of the Final EIS summarizes the issue resolution process that the BLRT Extension Project Office conducted with the city of Minneapolis after the Draft EIS was published on these two issues: design of Olson Memorial Highway (Technical Issue [TI]-2) and at-grade crossing at 7th St (TI-1). Chapter 3 – Transportation of the Final EIS addresses specific improvements to Olson Memorial Highway. Two stations would provide access to the communities along the highway: Penn Avenue Station and Van White Boulevard Station. While a six-lane roadway would be maintained, the lane widths would be reduced to 11 feet to reduce pedestrian crossing length. The design speed and posted speed limit would be reduced to 35 mph. Existing sidewalks would be replaced with 6-foot-wide sidewalks on the north and south sides of the highway. Pedestrian refuges would be added in the median of the highway. ADA-compliant pedestrian crossings of Olson Memorial Highway would be facilitated by proposed signalized intersections at Bryant Avenue North, Van White Boulevard, Humboldt Avenue, James Avenue, Morgan Avenue; and midblock crossings between Newton Avenue and Oliver Avenue, Penn Avenue, Russell Avenue, and Thomas Avenue. The proposed BLRT Extension project would provide space on the north side of Olson Memorial Highway for a 10-foot two-way cycle track (to be constructed by others) between Thomas Avenue and Van White Memorial Boulevard. The proposed BLRT Extension project would construct a multi-use trail on the north side of the reconstructed westbound Olson Memorial Highway bridge. The 7th Street intersection design resolution process resulted in pedestrian and bicycle improvements to the intersection. The proposed BLRT Extension project would modify the intersection of 7th Street/Olson Memorial Highway by relocating the LRT transition from the center of the intersection to the east of the intersection, eliminating existing and/or proposed lanes for every approach and improving pedestrian crossing movements.
121J	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Specific ridership (not a range) at individual stations must be determined (both boarding and alighting). Further work is needed to determine pedestrian capacity and needed infrastructure improvements at the Downtown Minneapolis stations given that the Bottineau Corridor will be the fourth LRT line to run along the high-volume 5th Street corridor.	Section 3.1 of the Final EIS reports ridership forecasts for boarding and alighting data by station. Infrastructure improvements to the areas surrounding the Minneapolis stations have been developed in coordination with city staff through the issue resolution process.
121K	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Safety and security at station locations and routes to/from stations is critical. It is recommended that measures such as (but not limited to) surveillance cameras and street lighting (per the City of Minneapolis street lighting policy) be installed and that station design allows for visibility at stations.	Section 4.7 of the Final EIS addresses safety and security. Safety for rail users, area residents, local pedestrians and bicyclists, operators and vehicle occupants is an important consideration for the proposed BLRT Extension project. The framework for ensuring the safety of these groups will be established through conformance with the Metropolitan Council's SSMP and the Metro Transit Security and Emergency Preparedness plan. Proposed BLRT Extension project operations in conformance with these plans will necessarily be closely and continuously coordinated with local area law enforcement, medical, fire, transportation and other organizations with related emergency responsibilities within the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor.
121L	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	The City of Minneapolis requires that local stormwater policies and ordinances be adhered to. Stormwater management, wetland and floodplain mitigation must consider not only the specific area of impact, but broader impacts on the local area and regional system.	Proposed BLRT Extension project stormwater designs are being developed in accordance with city and watershed policies and ordinances. Wetland and floodplain mitigation is being coordinated with the Minnesota WCA Local Governmental Unit (LGU) representatives, DNR, and USACE. These agencies require analysis of local and regional effects in permit application documents. Wetland and floodplain mitigation requirements can be found in Sections 5.2 (Floodplains) and 5.3 (Wetlands) of the Final EIS. Appendix I of the Final EIS contains the Section 404 permit application, noting compensatory mitigation requirements for the affected water resources.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
121M	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	The City of Minneapolis does not support park-and-ride facilities within City limits. Vacant lots near the proposed Van White Station are needed for TOD redevelopment, which will help improve density and ridership at that station.	None of the stations within the Minneapolis city limits would include park-and-ride facilities.
121N	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Traction power substations and signal bungalows must be appropriately placed and the visual impact mitigated. Traction Power Substations should be appropriate for the community context, should be landscaped, should be fenced for safety, and should be designed with architectural fencing instead of chain link fence.	Potential locations for traction power substations (TPSSs) and signal bungalows have been developed in coordination with city staff. Visual impacts of TPSSs and signal bungalows have been considered. Section 4.5 of the Final EIS presents mitigation strategies for these LRT elements, which include fencing and landscaping features for visual screening purposes.
121O	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Utilities and street infrastructure disrupted as part of the project must be replaced at the project's expense.	Replacement of utilities and street infrastructure that are disturbed as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project is included in the scope and cost estimate.
121P	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Noise and vibration from the LRT operations must be mitigated.	Sections 5.6 and 5.7 of the Final EIS describe impacts and proposed mitigation for noise and vibration, respectively. All impacts will be mitigated in accordance with Council mitigation guidelines.
121Q	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	The City of Minneapolis is opposed to LRT pre-emption at signalized crossings.	Transit priority would be used along Olson Memorial Highway into downtown Minneapolis. See Transit/Traffic Signal Operating Schemes Technical Memorandum (December 6, 2011).
121R	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	The City of Minneapolis supports efforts to minimize project impacts on identified historical or cultural resources.	Section 4.4 of the Final EIS presents the adverse effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on listed and eligible historic properties. The city of Minneapolis and the Minneapolis Historic Preservation Commission are consulting parties in the Section 106 compliance process, and are anticipated to be concurring parties to the Section 106 MOA that provides details regarding minimization and mitigation requirements for historic properties.
121S	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	The project must minimize tree loss; salvage trees where possible and replace trees per the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board urban tree policy. Boulevard design should be consistent with the Minneapolis Design Guidelines for Streets and Sidewalks.	The Council has coordinated with MPRB on MPRB's tree policy and will continue to adhere to this policy as design advances. Boulevard designs will be coordinated with city staff through the issue and design resolution processes.
121T	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Public art must be integrated into station design.	Review of the current New Starts requirements indicates that public art is not eligible for federal funding. All public art would need to be funded locally. At this time a local funding source for public art has not been identified.
121U	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Pedestrian Level Street Lighting should be evaluated in accordance with the City of Minneapolis Street Lighting Policy. Traffic impacts to the Olson Highway/I-94 bridge need to be mitigated. Any ornamental railings and artwork must be salvaged.	Observance of the city of Minneapolis lighting policies and bridge material salvage requests are so noted and will be incorporated into design documents as appropriate. Traffic impacts to the Olson Memorial Highway/Interstate Highway 94 (I-94) bridge have been assessed through the design process; no adverse traffic impacts would occur as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Additional information about traffic impacts can be found in Section 3.3 of the Final EIS.
121V	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Catenary poles along Olson Highway should reflect the same style used along University Avenue (painted tapered tubular design).	Design details of the catenary poles will be established in coordination with MnDOT, Hennepin County and the city of Minneapolis through the preliminary and final design phases of the proposed BLRT Extension project.
121W	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Embedded track should be constructed along the entire length of Olson Highway.	Track along Olson Memorial Highway would generally be ballasted except at stations, street crossings and a segment of roadway between I-94 and 7th Street.
121X	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Best practices for mitigating the construction impacts for local businesses should be implemented.	Impacts to local business during construction activities are largely the result of inaccessibility. A Construction Communication Plan will be developed that includes approaches for advance communication of information regarding roadway closures and access changes. Council staff will work with potentially affected businesses during construction to maintain customer and employee access as practicable.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
121Y	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Traffic impacts along the corridor need to be mitigated, especially traffic impacts to the Olson Highway/I-94 Bridge, the segment east of I-94 into the Interchange, and the at-grade crossing at 7thStreet/10thStreet.	Traffic impacts to the Olson Memorial Highway/I-94 bridge have been assessed and addressed in the proposed BLRT Extension project design details; no adverse traffic impacts would occur as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project. The segment of Olson Memorial Highway and the 7th Street/10th Street intersection were discussed in detail with city staff during the issue resolution process. City, Hennepin County, MnDOT, and Council staff agreed upon a design solution that results in some reduction in intersection level of service, but enhances the pedestrian and bicycle environment. This design solution includes the elimination of a free right, elimination of one of the through lanes on the eastern leg of the intersection, introduction of dual right turn lanes for the eastbound to southbound movement (the highest frequency movement), improved cross-walks, medians with pedestrian refuges, and shifting the location of the LRT tracks so as to avoid a skewed crossing of bike lanes. Additional information about traffic impacts can be found in Section 3.3 of the Final EIS.
121Z	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	1 - Purpose and Need	Page 1-10, Section 1.3 – The purpose statement is just about transportation for businesses and people. It should also include reference for serving and creating transit-supportive development opportunities along the line, particularly near station areas. This is inherent in how station areas are designed so should be identified up front as part of the purpose of this project.	Please see the description of the proposed BLRT Extension project need in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS. The project need includes “providing efficient, travel-time competitive transit service that supports economic development goals and objectives of local, regional, and statewide plans.” This need statement was used in the identification and evaluation of the proposed BLRT Extension project, including the station locations.
121AA	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	1 - Purpose and Need	Page 1-25, Table 1.5-1 – The development section of this table should more specifically reference development near station areas, in addition to the more general language here.	Please see response to Comment 121Z.
121AB	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	The City of Minneapolis concurs that LRT on the D1 alignment is the preferred alternative. For the D1 and D Common portion of the LPA that runs along Olson Memorial Highway (Hwy 55) there are significant impacts to the bike, vehicular, and pedestrian function for the surrounding neighborhoods; there are potential visual impacts; and there is limited development potential. The corridor is currently a barrier between the communities to the north and south of the highway and the addition of the LRT should not further complicate this condition; it should resolve this condition by connecting communities. Decisions about the impacts of the D1 and D Common alignment on Olson Memorial Highway are based on assumptions of traffic operations and do not consider all of the above noted impacts. The future design and function of LRT on Olson Memorial Highway should not be precluded by these traffic assumptions and should be based on a study of the feasibility of, but not limited to, a combination of travel lane reductions, travel lane narrowing, elimination or relocation of frontage roads, and other pedestrian access and safety strategies with the intent of creating developable parcels at station areas and along Olson Memorial Highway. The DEIS, station area planning, and future stages of the project should consider the form, function, and visual impacts of Olson Memorial Highway to mitigate any negative impacts and to create significant development opportunity and pedestrian and bike access and safety. The completed traffic study for Olson Memorial Highway, while acceptable for studying traffic impacts, based on current operating assumptions, does not address the larger issues of development potential, connections between neighborhoods, and the barrier that Olson Memorial Highway creates between neighborhoods and that will be	Chapter 3 – Transportation of the Final EIS addresses improvements to Olson Memorial Highway. Two stations would provide access to the communities along the highway: Penn Avenue Station and Van White Boulevard Station. While a six-lane roadway would be maintained, the lane widths would be reduced to 11 feet to reduce pedestrian crossing length. The design speed and posted speed limit would be reduced to 35 mph. Existing sidewalks would be replaced with 6-foot-wide sidewalks on the north and south sides of the highway. Pedestrian refuges would be added in the median of the highway. ADA-compliant pedestrian crossings of Olson Memorial Highway would be facilitated by proposed signalized intersections at Bryant Avenue North, Van White Sochacki Park., Humboldt Avenue, James Avenue, Morgan Avenue; and midblock crossings between Newton Avenue and Oliver Avenue, Penn Avenue, Russell Avenue, and Thomas Avenue. The proposed BLRT Extension project would provide space on the north side of Olson Memorial Highway for a 10-foot two-way cycle track (to be constructed by others) between Thomas Avenue and Van White Memorial Boulevard. The proposed BLRT Extension project would construct a multi-use trail on the north side of the reconstructed westbound Olson Memorial Highway bridge. Existing excess MnDOT right-of-way on the south side of Olson Memorial Highway would be left largely intact and available for transit oriented development. These proposed BLRT Extension project elements were developed in coordination with the city of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, MnDOT, and the Council.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
							exacerbated by the addition of LRT without appropriate mitigation or planning. Additional study is needed to consider this issue in relation to station area planning, enhancing TOD opportunities and creating nodes where population and employment density can be increased.	
121AC	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Page 2-13, Table 2.4-1 – The Golden Valley Rd and Plymouth Avenue stations are needed for reasons beyond the initial forecasted ridership such as access to transit, economic opportunities, access to jobs, and access to Theodore Wirth Regional Park from other parts of the region.	Please see response to Comment 121H.
121AD	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Page 2-14, Operations and Maintenance Facility – The city supports proposed OMF sites in Brooklyn Park.	Please see response to Comment 121F.
121AE	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Page 2-18, Traction Power Substations (TPSS) – The DEIS states that TPSS locations are anticipated to be within the existing right-of-way. If in fact private property acquisition is needed, there should be early notification of impacted property owners to ensure time for coordination/negotiation. The City of Minneapolis will also want to review in more detail the location of the TPSS sites as they are refined. It should be a priority to place these in unobtrusive locations, such as under overpasses, and to appropriately screen them from view with architectural fencing and landscaping.	Potential locations for TPSSs have been developed in coordination with city staff. The Council prioritized the use of existing property needed for other proposed BLRT Extension project purposes over the acquisition of private property for TPSS placement. Visual impacts of TPSSs have been considered. Section 4.5 of the Final EIS presents potential mitigation strategies for TPSSs, which include fencing and landscaping features for visual screening purposes.
121AF	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Page 2-18, Trackway – Embedded track should be utilized on the D1 and D Common portions of the project in the Hwy 55 corridor.	Please see response to Comment 121W.
121AG	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	General Comment - The construction of LRT should be designed and built in a way to enhance connectivity rather than compounding disconnectivity between places and neighborhoods.	Section 4.2 of the Final EIS focuses on issues of community cohesion. In general, improvements to pedestrian crossings along the entire proposed BLRT Extension project corridor coupled with significant trail enhancements would result in better connections across the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor and between communities along the corridor.
121AH	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3.3.5 –More study is needed to look at traffic, pedestrian, and development impacts at Hwy 55 and Penn, Van White, and the 7th St/6th Ave area near Target Field.	The Final EIS and the Transportation Technical Report include information about the traffic and pedestrian environments at Penn Avenue, Van White Boulevard, and the 7th/6th Street area. All three intersections would have improved pedestrian connections—these improvements can be seen in Figures 3.4-1, 3.4-2, and 3.4-4 of the Final EIS. Traffic analyses indicate that the Van White Boulevard and Penn Avenue intersections with Olson Memorial Highway would operate at LOS D or better in 2040 with the proposed BLRT Extension project in place. The level of service at the 7th/6th street area intersection is projected to be LOS E in 2040 with the proposed BLRT Extension project in place, as compared to a projected LOS D in 2040 under the No-Build scenario. This is because of revisions to the intersection geometry that were developed at the request of and in coordination with the city of Minneapolis to achieve a balance between the needs of pedestrian and bicycle traffic and vehicular traffic. The city of Minneapolis is aware of and accepts the reduction in vehicular traffic level of service that would occur under the proposed BLRT Extension project.
121AI	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3-4, Affected Environment – Please analyze the transit service area past the southern edge at Highway 55. For example, Route 9 serves the neighborhood immediately to the south, but is not mentioned here.	The Final EIS provides an updated figure of the existing transit service, including Route 9. See Figure 3.1-1 of the Final EIS.
121AJ	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3-6, Table 3.1.1 – More information is necessary regarding the elimination of route 19H; Consider adding evaluation of	Modifications to bus routes to better serve the proposed BLRT Extension project were considered during the development of the ridership model; however, these

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
							Route 30.	routes are not finalized. The addition, modification, or elimination of any route, including routes 19H and 30, will be subject to a detailed route planning process that will take place as the proposed BLRT Extension project is developed further. Please see response to Comment 121CK.
121AK	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3-15, Footnote – The CCLRT is a good place to start with the process. However, some concerns were raised by the stakeholders along CCLRT in response to perceived deficiencies and limitations in the outreach. It would be better to state it would be the intent to “build upon” what was done along CCLRT rather than to say it would simply be replicated.	While the Council believes that the Central Corridor LRT (CCLRT) transit service study process was successful overall, it acknowledges that there are opportunities to make changes to address specific community needs. The Council will engage the cities along the line, as well as other key stakeholders in the transit service area such as Maple Grove Transit, to design an outreach plan for transit service planning along the proposed BLRT Extension project that builds on the process used for CCLRT and adapts or makes adjustments to address community needs. This effort will start with coordination through the proposed BLRT Extension project Communications Steering Committee, which has representatives from each city along the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor.
121AL	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3-31, Alignment D2 – The restriction of traffic on many cross-streets (cul-de-sacs and right-in/right-out) can have a negative impact on traffic flows in the larger area. Any necessary modifications to the vehicular circulation system must be made in a way that is urban in character, not suburban. Modifications that eliminate vehicular connectivity should not be de facto interruptions to the pedestrian and bicycle networks that currently exist or potentially might be built in order to enhance the urban grid.	Alignment D2 has been eliminated from further consideration.
121AM	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3-31, Table 3.2-2 – More information will be necessary about the bridge modifications to assess their impacts.	All bridge modifications have been discussed in detail with city of Minneapolis staff through the issue resolution process. The city of Minneapolis has reviewed and approved the bridge modification concepts as identified in Appendix E of the Final EIS. The city will continue to be involved in the design review process and will be able to provide input on bridge modification details as the proposed BLRT Extension project design progresses.
121AN	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3-32, Alignment D – The elimination of the pedestrian crossing of TH 55 on the west side of Lyndale is problematic. This crossing connects two residential neighborhoods, and there are few nearby alternatives for those wishing to cross on foot. Removal of a designated crossing may encourage illegal and potentially unsafe crossing in the vicinity. Is there a potential to add a pedestrian actuated signal to ensure it does not interfere with normal signal operations when no pedestrian is present?	Under the current design (Appendix E of the Final EIS), a marked, signalized pedestrian crossing of Olson Memorial Highway on the west side of Lyndale Avenue is included.
121AO	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3-36, Alignment D1 – The closure of pedestrian crossings at three consecutive streets crossing Highway 55 (Queen, Russell, and Sheridan) creates a fairly large gap in the pedestrian network. Will there be any barriers to discourage or prevent crossing? Was there any assessment if a significant number of people currently use these crossings?	As documented in Section 3.4.4 of the Final EIS, there are currently nine unmarked, unsignalized mid-block crossings as well as six marked crossings at signalized intersections, several of which are not ADA-compliant. The proposed BLRT Extension project would provide ADA-compliant crossings at seven signalized crossings, and three ADA-compliant mid-block signalized crossings. The details of these crossings have been developed in coordination with the city of Minneapolis through the issue resolution process. Specific to the elimination of crossings at Queen Avenue North, Russell Avenue North, and Sheridan Avenue North; a signalized pedestrian crossing has been included at Russell Avenue North in the proposed BLRT Extension project design. With the improved pedestrian crossings at Penn Avenue and Thomas Avenue North, there would be signalized pedestrian crossings at every other street along this segment of Olson Memorial Highway. At locations where crossings have been eliminated, there would be some sort of barrier to discourage illegal crossing of the highway and LRT facilities.
121AP	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3-37, Alignment D2 – As with vehicle traffic, this route alignment greatly curtails pedestrian connectivity in this area.	Alignment D2 has been eliminated from further consideration.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
							This is indicated later on p. 4-36.	
121AQ	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3-37, Alignment D - The closure of pedestrian crossings at three consecutive streets crossing Highway 55 (Oliver, Newton, Logan, and James) creates gaps in the pedestrian network. Will there be any barriers to discourage or prevent crossing, and what would those likely be? Was there any assessment if a significant number of people currently use these crossings? How will remaining pedestrian crossings be enhanced?	As documented in Section 3.4.4 of the Final EIS, there are currently nine unmarked, unsignalized mid-block crossings as well as six marked crossings at signalized intersections, several of which are not ADA-compliant. The proposed BLRT Extension project would provide ADA-compliant crossings at seven signalized crossings, and three ADA-compliant mid-block signalized crossings. The details of these crossings have been developed in coordination with the city of Minneapolis through the issue resolution process. Specific to the elimination of crossings at Oliver Avenue North, Newton Avenue North, Logan Avenue North, and James Avenue North; signalized pedestrian crossings have been included at James Avenue North, and between Oliver Avenue North and Newton Avenue North in the proposed BLRT Extension project design. With the improved pedestrian crossings at Penn Avenue and Humboldt Avenue, there would be signalized pedestrian crossings at every other street along this segment of Olson Memorial Highway. At locations where crossings have been eliminated, there would be some sort of barrier to discourage illegal crossing of the highway and LRT facilities.
121AR	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3-45, 3.5.3 Alignment D2 – Removal of parking may negatively impact businesses and residences in the area that depend on on-street parking due to limited off-street parking. It is unclear from later in the text (3-53) if the project would propose funding the construction of off-street parking to mitigate the loss of on street spaces.	Alignment D2 has been eliminated from further consideration.
121AS	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3.36 – Under Alignment D1, the non-signalized pedestrian crossings of TH 55 at the intersections with Sheridan, Russell, and Queen Avenues would be closed. The nearest pedestrian crossings are at Thomas Avenue to the west and Penn Avenue to the east. It is expected that pedestrian crossings will increase at proximate signalized intersections due to diverted traffic from closed crossings and increased activity at and around station areas. Pedestrian safety enhancements should be made at these crossings, especially at the unsignalized intersection of Thomas Avenue. General strategies to improve pedestrian safety and comfort should include, but are not limited to, a combination of the following: travel lane reduction, travel lane narrowing, curb extensions, pedestrian median waiting areas, durable enhanced crosswalk markings, and landscaping.	Please see response to Comment 121AO regarding the number and location of signalized crossings between Penn Avenue and Thomas Avenue. Please see response to Comment 121AB regarding strategies to improve pedestrian safety and comfort.
121AT	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3.37 – Under Alignment D2, pedestrians would be allowed to cross the LRT guideway only at signalized intersections along West Broadway Avenue and along Penn Avenue. Along West Broadway the unmarked pedestrian crossings of 27th Avenue/Thomas Avenue and Sheridan Avenue would be closed. The nearest pedestrian crossings are at 29th Avenue, 26th Avenue, and Penn Avenue. Along Penne Avenue, the unmarked pedestrian crossings of 21st, 17th, 15th, 14th, 12th, and 8th Avenues would be closed. The nearest pedestrian crossings that would remain open are at West Broadway Avenue, Golden Valley Road, 16th Avenue, Plymouth Avenue, Oak Park Avenue, and TH 55. It is expected that pedestrian crossings will increase at proximate signalized intersections due to diverted traffic from closed crossings and increased activity at and around station areas. Pedestrian safety enhancements should be made at these crossings. General strategies to improve pedestrian safety and comfort should include, but are not limited to, a combination of the following: travel lane reduction, travel lane narrowing, curb	Alignment D2 has been eliminated from further consideration.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
							extensions, pedestrian median waiting areas, durable enhanced crosswalk markings, and landscaping.	
121AU	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3.37 – Under Alignment D2, the crossing of West Broadway Avenue at 27th Avenue/Thomas Avenue would be closed. The 2011 Minneapolis Bicycle Master Plan identifies Thomas Avenue as a bicycle boulevard from 42nd Avenue to Oak Park Avenue. This bikeway is planned, but currently unfunded. A closure of 27th Avenue/Thomas Avenue at West Broadway Avenue would create a barrier and disrupt a continuous bicycle boulevard route along Thomas Avenue. The future bikeway would need to be rerouted to cross West Broadway Avenue at 26th or 29th Avenue.	Alignment D2 has been eliminated from further consideration.
121AV	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3.37 – Under Alignment D2, the crossing of Penn Avenue at 8th Avenue would be closed. The 2011 Minneapolis Bicycle Master Plan identifies 8th Avenue as a signed bicycle route from Theodore Wirth Park to Van White Boulevard. This bikeway is planned, but currently unfunded. A closure of 8th Avenue at Penn Avenue would create a barrier and disrupt a continuous bikeway along 8th Avenue. The future bikeway would need to be rerouted to cross Penn Avenue at Oak Park Avenue.	Alignment D2 has been eliminated from further consideration.
121AW	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3.37 – Under Alignment D2, the signalized intersection of Oak Park Avenue at Penn Avenue would remain open. The 2011 Minneapolis Bicycle Master Plan identifies Oak Park Avenue as a bicycle boulevard from Theodore Wirth Park to Irving Avenue. This bikeway is planned, but currently unfunded. Maintaining east-west bicycle access at the intersection of Oak Park Avenue and Penn Avenue would preserve a continuous route for a future bikeway.	Alignment D2 has been eliminated from further consideration.
121AX	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3.37 – Under Alignment D2, bicyclists would share roadway lanes with vehicular traffic on West Broadway and Penn Avenues. There are currently no bicycle facilities on West Broadway and Penn Avenues, so the existing conditions would be maintained. However, future conditions may include a bicycle facility. The 2011 Minneapolis Bicycle Master Plan identifies bike lanes on Penn Avenue between 42nd Avenue and the south I-394 Frontage Road. With the addition of the LRT guideway system along Penn Avenue, it appears that there will not be enough right-of-way to accommodate bike lanes of a minimum standard width. Under Alignment D2, bike lanes on Penn Avenue between West Broadway Avenue and TH 55 would not be feasible. Access Minneapolis, the City of Minneapolis' transportation management plan includes a provision for such cases: If a bikeway identified on the 2011 Minneapolis Bicycle Master Plan cannot be installed on the target street, a parallel bikeway should be installed that serves the same travel shed. Under Alignment D2, this provision would need to be executed.	Alignment D2 has been eliminated from further consideration.
121AY	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3.37 – Under Alignment D Common Section, the non-signalized pedestrian crossings of TH 55 at the intersections of Oliver, Newton, Logan, and James would be closed. It is expected that pedestrian crossings will increase at proximate signalized intersections due to diverted traffic from closed crossings and increased activity at and around station areas. Pedestrian safety enhancements should be made at these	Please see response to Comment 121AQ regarding the number and location of signalized crossings between Penn Avenue and Thomas Avenue. Please see response to Comment 121AB regarding strategies to improve pedestrian safety and comfort.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
							crossings. General strategies to improve pedestrian safety and comfort should include, but are not limited to, a combination of the following: travel lane reduction, travel lane narrowing, curb extensions, pedestrian median waiting areas, durable enhanced crosswalk markings, and landscaping.	
121AZ	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 3.37 – The existing marked pedestrian crossing of TH 55 at West Lyndale Avenue would also be closed due to the number of lanes that would need to be crossed, the resulting number of vehicle conflicts, and poor signal operations. It is recommended that two considerations are made with respect to this proposed closure. First, evaluate if the hazards identified can be mitigated through travel lane reduction, lead pedestrian intervals, protected signal phasing, durable and enhanced crosswalk markings, or other pedestrian safety measures. Second, if the crossing is closed, ensure that pedestrian access is physically restricted to ensure that there is no expectation that this is a safe and legal pedestrian crossing.	Under the current design (Appendix E of the Final EIS), the existing marked pedestrian crossing of Olson Memorial Highway at West Lyndale Avenue not be closed, but a marked, signalized pedestrian crossing of Olson Memorial Highway on the west side of Lyndale Avenue is included.
121BA	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	General comments for Section 3.4 Pedestrians and Bicycles. Evaluating the alternatives from the perspective of pedestrian and bicycle impacts, the Locally Preferred Alternative D-D1 has less of a negative impact than Alternative D-D2. Both Alternatives D-D1 and D-D2 significantly impact the urban street grid by closing off local pedestrian and bicycle access at many crossings. The relative severity of impacts is greater for Alternative D-D2 because the urban street grid is more intact along West Broadway Avenue and Penn Avenue than along TH 55. West Broadway Avenue and Penn Avenue currently have narrower street widths, with fewer travel lanes and more pedestrian destinations. TH 55 is currently much wider with a greater number of travel lanes and a limited number of pedestrian destinations. To preserve existing pedestrian environments, it would be better to close crossings along TH 55 where the walkability is quite low, rather than close crossings along West Broadway Avenue and Penn Avenue, where the walkability is relatively higher.	The factors raised by the city of Minneapolis in this comment were considered during the selection of the alternative that has become the proposed BLRT Extension project. While pedestrian impacts on the D1-D Common alignment are less than those on the D2 alignment, the Council has still evaluated pedestrian impacts on the D1-D Common alignment and incorporated design features to mitigate those impacts. Section 3.4 of the Final EIS addresses pedestrian impacts and mitigation.
121BB	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	For the entire chapter, it should be kept in mind that the construction of LRT should be designed and built in a way to enhance connectivity rather than compounding disconnectivity between places and neighborhoods.	Section 4.2 of the Final EIS focuses on issues of community cohesion. In general, improvements to pedestrian crossings along the entire proposed BLRT Extension project corridor coupled with significant trail enhancements would result in better connections across the corridor and between communities along the corridor.
121BC	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 4.3.4.1–Traction Power Station locations are important, and should be strategically sited/mitigated, especially if one is needed in Theodore Wirth Park.	Please see response to Comment 121AE; also note that no TPSSs would be located within TWRP.
121BD	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 4-5, Alignment D – the language about Urban Neighborhoods should be amended to read “Urban Neighborhood is a predominantly residential area with a range of densities that may include other small-scale uses, including neighborhood-serving commercial, and institutional and semi-public uses (for example, schools, community centers, religious institutions, public safety facilities, etc.) scattered throughout. More intensive nonresidential uses may be located in neighborhoods closer to Downtown and around Growth Centers.	The suggested additional language provides a more complete description of urban neighborhoods, and is noted. However, Section 4.1 of the Final EIS presents a summarized version of the information presented in the Draft EIS, and this level of specificity, while accurate, is not required to understand land use compatibility issues for the proposed BLRT Extension project.
121BE	Pflaum	Donald	City of	121	Email	4 - Social and	Page 4-5 – For the D1 Alignment the DEIS states: “As shown in	The Final EIS does not present the language used in the Draft EIS, but does reference

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
			Minneapolis			Economic Effects	Exhibit 4-11, the primary land uses are park and low-density residential uses with no plans for changes in the future. Along TH 55, existing and future planned land uses are primarily low-density residential uses.” Language should be added to say that “future land use in the station areas will be evaluated in the station area planning process, which may result in amended land use policy and maps as a part of the adopted station area plans.”	<i>The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth</i> and how that plan calls for ongoing investment in and development of corridors served by light rail. See Section 4.1 of the Final EIS.
121BF	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 4.6.4.1- Acquisition impacts are small in Minneapolis using the preferred alternative, but the potential redevelopment opportunities are also small, due to station location and the elevation/disconnection with neighbors to the east.	Anticipated acquisitions in the City of Minneapolis are presented in Section 4.3 of the Final EIS. An estimated 2.11 acres of permanent easement and just under 1 acre of temporary easement are anticipated in Minneapolis. The design of the proposed BLRT Extension project along the Olson Memorial Highway segment has preserved excess MnDOT right-of-way along the south side of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor for potential redevelopment purposes.
121BG	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 4-6 – For the D common alignments, add language to say that “future land use in the station areas will be evaluated in the station area planning process.” (1) At the Van White Station area there a several large vacant properties that are potential development sites and other underutilized sites that could be intensified with development. Station area planning will evaluate and recommend the most appropriate form and type of transit oriented development for these parcels and the surrounding station area, which may result in amended land use policy and maps with the adoption of the station area plans. (2) At the Penn Avenue/Hwy 55 station area, while there are not large vacant parcels and the area is predominantly single-family homes, station area planning will evaluate and recommend the most appropriate form and type of land use for the surrounding station area. At this station area higher density and intensity land uses will depend on a long-term strategy of parcel assemblage and strategies that could include the narrowing and/or elimination of travel lanes on Hwy 55 and frontage roads along Hwy 55, all which should be studied in the station area planning process. Station area planning will evaluate and recommend the most appropriate form and type of transit oriented development for these parcels and the surrounding station area, which may result in amended land use policy and maps with the adoption of the station area plans.	The Final EIS references <i>The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth</i> and how that plan calls for ongoing investment in and development of corridors served by light rail. See Section 4.1 of the Final EIS. This includes the areas around the Van White Boulevard Station and the Penn Avenue Station. The design of the proposed BLRT Extension project along the Olson Memorial Highway segment has preserved excess MnDOT right-of-way along the south side of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor for potential redevelopment purposes.
121BH	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 4-18, Minneapolis – The section describing the Near-North neighborhood references areas in the Sumner-Glenwood neighborhood. The section should be revised.	This has been corrected in Section 4.2 of the Final EIS.
121BI	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 4-33, Alignment D2 – The project would have direct and significant impacts to community character and cohesion that would need to be mitigated.	Alignment D2 has been eliminated from further consideration.
121BJ	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 4-39, Table 4.3-3 – Alignment D2 would result in major impacts in terms of property acquisitions, and would involve the displacement of a large number of residents, some of which are low income. This would need to be mitigated.	Alignment D2 has been eliminated from further consideration.
121BK	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 4-61, Table 4.4-1 – Alignment D2 would have an adverse effect on the Homewood historic district, as well as significant visual impacts on area resources.	Alignment D2 has been eliminated from further consideration.
121BL	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 4-74 – Impacts from Alignment D1 on Wirth Park should be mitigated with additional planting and screening as needed, since the project will involve thinning out the vegetation in the	Mitigation commitments for the proposed BLRT Extension project include restoration of vegetation removed during the course of construction in areas outside the existing BNSF right-of-way. In the area of TWRP, vegetation restoration specifics

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
							area. This is suggested later on p. 4-76. However, vegetation should not be allowed to block station areas and their access points in a way that is unsafe and obscures activity.	will be coordinated with MPRB staff. Vegetative cover in station areas and station access points will be developed in conformance with the Council's SSMP.
121BM	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 4-84, Design Elements – Safety and security should be addressed not only in station area design, but along major pedestrian routes leading to the stations (including those within the 0.25 mile radius called out earlier in this section). These should be visible, well lighted, and regularly monitored. This should be true throughout the corridor, including residential areas, parklands, and rail corridors that otherwise might have little traffic and activity, and therefore may result in travelers being more isolated.	Section 4.7 of the Final EIS addresses safety and security. Safety for rail users, area residents, local pedestrians and bicyclists, operators and vehicle occupants is an important consideration for the proposed BLRT Extension project. The framework for ensuring the highest level of safety to these groups will be established through conformance with the Council's SSMP and the Metro Transit Security and Emergency Preparedness plan. Operating the proposed BLRT Extension project in conformance with these plans will necessarily be closely and continuously coordinated with local area law enforcement, medical, fire, transportation and other organizations with related emergency responsibilities within the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor.
121BN	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	City Water Utilities - This comment is to address the large water mains that may be affected by the future Bottineau LRT line as indicated by the current layout shown on the Met Council web page (http://www.metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Projects/Future-Projects/Bottineau-Transitway/Bottineau-Maps/Bottineau-Transitway-Map-Large.aspx). There are many smaller water mains that cross under the proposed Bottineau line and the final condition of those mains will need to be addressed eventually. The large water mains of concern are as follows: There is a 36-inch water main in Aldrich Avenue North crossing under Olson Memorial, there is a 24-inch water main in Penn Avenue North crossing under Olson Memorial and there is a 48-inch water main crossing under the existing tracks just north of Golden Valley Road at the western border of the City. These mains need to remain in place and at a minimum will need to be cathodically protected under the tracks and isolated on either side of the future track alignment. Concrete encasement of each of these mains may be necessary and if deemed necessary, the existing pipe to be concrete encased shall be removed and replaced with new pipe prior to concrete encasement. This work to alter the existing pipe shall only occur during the time frame between the months of October and April inclusive.	Utility location excavations and pre-construction surveys will be performed in general accordance with the MnDOT policy of Subsurface Utility Engineering. These procedures will help minimize the number of unintended disruptions in utility service. Jurisdictions with utilities inside the proposed BLRT Extension project area will be coordinated with for appropriate design and schedule considerations. Utility impacts are presented in Section 5.1 of the Final EIS.
121BO	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Page 5-9 – Table 5.1-3, Alignment D - In addition to the sanitary sewer line running located on the south side of TH55/ 6th Ave N, there are several sanitary sewers crossing TH 55/ 6th Ave N	Please see response to Comment 121BN.
121BP	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Page 5-11, Overhead Utilities – More information is needed about the potential need for relocation of overhead utility poles, particularly those requiring relocation outside of transitway right-of-way. Would this require additional land purchases and/or easements, over and above what is already identified? Is there a potential to move some of the power lines underground as part of this project? What are the costs? What models are being used in other metropolitan areas to address and mitigate the conflicts brought about by overhead utilities and urban development? From the engineering drawings, it appears this will result in high voltage transmission lines right on the edge of the BNSF right-of-way that is adjacent to residential areas. Is there accommodation of a needed easement for this outside the ROW, for both maintenance and to account for the fall distance of the poles?	Easements identified in Section 4.3 of the Final EIS include those necessary for relocation of overhead transmission and distribution lines. Details regarding the potential for placement of distribution lines underground will be coordinated with the utility owner. Transmission lines are present within the BNSF rail corridor, and along the northern portion of West Broadway Avenue in Brooklyn Park. Transmission lines would be relocated within existing or proposed transportation rights of way, and would remain overhead utilities. Design and location details of transmission poles would be determined by the utility owner (Xcel Energy).

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
121BQ	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Page 5-21, Alignment D1 – More information is needed about potential location of floodplain storage mitigation, and its impacts on the surrounding area, including parkland, the golf course, and any nearby residential areas that might be impacted.	Floodplain mitigation is discussed in Section 5.2.5 of the Final EIS. Two mitigation sites are proposed. The first is located west of the BNSF rail corridor and north of Olson Memorial Highway on MPRB and Canadian Pacific Railway property. The other is located in city of Robbinsdale property at the edge of Grimes Pond. The site on MPRB and Canadian Pacific Railway property (16,800 CY of compensatory storage) will be designed in coordination with MPRB staff to ensure that the site fits into the landscape. The mitigation at Grimes Pond is quite small (200 CY of compensatory storage) and will be incorporated into the grading for the LRT bridge over the pond. No floodplain mitigation will affect the golf course or residential property. Floodplain mitigation strategies have been discussed with the BCWMC, MPRB, and the cities of Minneapolis and Golden Valley, and staff from those governmental units have approved the final mitigation sites. The Council will continue to coordinate approvals for floodplain impacts and mitigation strategies with the BCWMC, the City of Minneapolis, DNR, and FEMA. FEMA approval of a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) will be required if larger mitigation site is constructed in advance of the construction of the proposed BLRT Extension project.
121BR	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 5-23, Figure 5.2-6 – The locations identified for potential floodplain mitigation appear to be on land currently being used for a trail loop around the perimeter of Wirth Park that connects with the Luce Line Trail and various park amenities; would this require a trail relocation?	Floodplain mitigation for the proposed BLRT Extension project would be addressed in two locations. 16,800 CY of compensatory floodplain mitigation would be needed in the Bassett Creek reach between Olson Memorial Highway and Golden Valley Road; and 200 CY of compensatory mitigation would be required in the Grimes Pond area. The compensatory floodplain mitigation for impacts in the Bassett Creek area would be constructed at the site identified in Figure 5.2-5 of the Final EIS. The Council has determined that the full 16,800 CY of mitigation can be achieved at this site. The existing trail would be incorporated into the final floodplain mitigation design. The 200 CY of mitigation required for impacts in the Grimes Pond area would be achieved by excavating additional storage at the edge of Grimes Pond.
121BS	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Page 5-24, Wetlands – There are significant wetland impacts outside the city limits. To mitigate the wetlands new wetlands must be created. It should be noted that there is no room for replacement wetlands within the city. Vacant parcels within the city are needed for redevelopment. The construction of this line should not contribute to the pollution of the Bassett Creek Valley watershed; it should continue toward – or at least not complicate – the clean up of this watershed.	Wetland mitigation information is presented in the joint Section 404/WCA permit application; mitigation will be conducted at a 2:1 ratio. Mitigation will be accomplished through a combination of wetland creation and the purchase of wetland bank credits. This mitigation plan has been developed in coordination with USACE and WCA LGU representatives. No wetland mitigation sites have been identified within the City of Minneapolis limits. Section 5.9 of the Final EIS addresses stormwater management and water quality. Stormwater BMPs (including temporary construction measures such as silt fencing, ditch checks, temporary seeding and mulching; and permanent measures such as detention/retention basins, infiltration basins, swales, bio-retention features) will be implemented during the construction and operation of the proposed BLRT Extension project. These measures will not complicate the cleanup of the Bassett Creek watershed, in fact they may help improve water quality.
121BT	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	6 - Noise & Vibration Effects	Page 5-49, Noise – The project noise levels for D1 and D2 reflect moderate to severe impacts compared with existing ambient noise levels. How will this be mitigated?	Section 5.6 of the Final EIS provides an updated analysis of the noise impacts for the proposed BLRT Extension project. Alignment D2 has been eliminated from further consideration, so only Alignments D1 and D Common have been assessed for noise impacts in the Final EIS. In the City of Minneapolis, there would be 38 moderate impacts (dwelling units) and no severe impacts before mitigation. Twenty-five moderate impacts would not require mitigation under FTA and Council noise mitigation guidelines. Four moderate impacts would require mitigation, and would be addressed through interior testing, with sound insulation being implemented if warranted.
121BU	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	6 - Noise & Vibration Effects	Page 5-61, Table 5.6-9 – Noise barriers are called out as a potential mitigation strategy for D1 noise impacts. More information is needed regarding the type, placement, and size of these walls. This mitigation measure should also be considered	The updated noise analysis in the Final EIS considered one noise barrier within the City of Minneapolis along the first block of Xerxes Avenue immediately north of Plymouth Avenue. However, this noise barrier did not meet the criteria established in the Council’s noise mitigation guidelines. The moderate impacts at these locations

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
							in context of other factors, such as blocking views of the park amenity from adjacent residential communities, likelihood of graffiti/tagging on barriers in less populated areas, and public safety issues associated with areas blocked from view by barriers. These issues should be addressed through a robust and inclusive community engagement process to ascertain community preference. Additionally, more information is needed regarding the potential use of sound insulation along D1 and D2 – how would this be implemented? This could be an environmental justice issue.	do not meet the threshold for mitigation as defined by the Regional Transitways Guidelines (March 2016) (see Appendix F of the Final EIS). Furthermore, this barrier would have partially or completely blocked the view of TWRP from the residences on that block. Therefore this noise barrier is no longer being recommended as a mitigation strategy, and interior testing would be the primary mitigation strategy for the four moderate impacts within the City of Minneapolis requiring mitigation. The need for sound insulation would be determined through interior testing, which assesses the outdoor-indoor transmission loss (i.e., the reduction in noise levels when noise travels from outside a home through the home walls, doors, and windows to the indoor environment). If there is insufficient noise transmission loss (i.e., the indoor environment remains too noisy), sound insulation will be proposed. These outdoor-indoor noise criteria are applied consistently to all homes; therefore, there will be no disproportionately high and adverse effect on environmental justice populations.
121BV	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	6 - Noise & Vibration Effects	Page 5-71, Table 5.7-6 – The D2 option would need proactive outreach early in the design process to KMOJ and medical care facilities regarding noise and vibration issues early in the process to determine if special mitigation needed. While the analysis suggests this is not the case, this could possibly be disputed.	Alignment D2 has been eliminated from further consideration; therefore, this is no longer an issue.
121BW	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Page 5-92, 5.8.5 – This section says there will be no impact on the wetland habitat of Blanding’s Turtle. However, the floodplain mitigation section says there will be new floodplain storage, likely constructed near to existing wetland areas, required as part of the project, which could impact the wetlands. This should be addressed in more detail. (This is discussed to an extent on p. 8-20)	The potential for impacts to the Blanding’s turtle is addressed in Section 5.8 of the Final EIS. This issue has been addressed in consultation with the DNR, which has concurred (e-mail correspondence dated February 9, 2016) with the Council’s and FTA’s assessment that with adherence to DNR guidelines regarding the Blanding’s turtle (guidelines which are presented in the DNR Blanding’s turtle fact sheet), impacts to the species would be negligible. The proposed BLRT Extension project avoids all impacts to wetland types 2 and 3 as required by the DNR guidelines.
121BX	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Page 5-93 – 5.9.1 States that Physical Infrastructure (storm sewer) associated with stormwater management is discussed in Section 5.1, but Section 5.1. (page 5.8) says the existing storm sewers are discussed in detail in the Stormwater Technical Report (Appendix F) which does not discuss storm sewer infrastructure in detail. It just discusses stormwater management and mentioned the need to reconfigure storm sewer utilities. The impacts to Old Basset Creek tunnel crossing in particular should be discussed in more detail.	Section 5.9 of the Final EIS summarizes existing stormwater infrastructure and proposed stormwater improvements. The Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan Technical Memorandum (see Appendix F of the Final EIS) addresses existing stormwater infrastructure in detail, and depicts existing stormwater infrastructure on maps in the appendix section of the technical memorandum. The Old Basset Creek Tunnel is discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the technical memorandum.
121BY	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Page 5-97 – Table 5.9-2 – Line MPCA (Cities) indicates that these requirements are also the Cities’. This is not correct. This is a copy of Table 3 from the stormwater technical report, but it does not say Cities under MPCA. Neither table actually lists the City requirements.	The Final EIS lists Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) stormwater requirements and the requirements of the cities of Minneapolis, Golden Valley, Robbinsdale, Crystal, and Brooklyn Park separately. See Table 5.9-1 of the Final EIS.
121BZ	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Page 5-101, Table 5.9-4 – For Alignment D, are the ditches identified for infiltration existing, and do they have adequate size and capacity for what is proposed? Looking at the cross sections provided, ditches do not appear in most of them. For alignments D2 and D, have locations been identified for the proposed pond and infiltration BMPs? This urban environment is fairly constrained, with limited land available for improvements such as these. Maps are shown for locations along Alignments A-C, but not for the others.	Proposed stormwater BMPs are summarized in Section 5.9 of the Final EIS and are presented in detail in the Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan Technical Memorandum, Section 4.4.1. Table 2 in that section indicates that proposed stormwater BMPs along the Minneapolis portion of Segment D include tree trenches, bioretention, wet ponds, underground detention, hydrodynamic separators, and ditches. Details of these BMPs will be developed as the design progresses, and stakeholders, including the city of Minneapolis, will have the opportunity to review and comment on stormwater BMP designs.
121CA	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Page 5-110, Alignment D – The analysis does not take this into account directly, but the presence of institutions serving vulnerable populations (e.g. youth and elderly), including a day care, school, library, and low income housing, suggests a priority	Section 5.10 of the Final EIS summarizes the air quality analysis conducted for the proposed BLRT Extension project. No air pollutant concentrations during the operating phase of the proposed BLRT Extension project would exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, and no mitigation is required. The State of Minnesota

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
							in finding ways to mitigate air quality impacts. This includes optimizing travel to avoid lengthy queues and idling at intersections. This is also potentially an environmental justice issue, since low income and minority populations are disproportionately impacted. When there are deficiencies in modeling (as noted here), there should be a commitment to following up with adjustments as needed once the project has advanced.	does not require permits related to air quality for the proposed BLRT Extension project. Since there are no impacts, there can be no disproportionate impacts and there is not an environmental justice issue.
121CB	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 6-6, Table 6.3-1 – While the text states that the actions listed here are in no way dependent on the completion of the Bottineau transitway, it is possible that some additional development may occur in the Downtown/North Loop station areas of Alignment D at least in part related to improved transit connectivity through this and other projects (although some of it will occur regardless).	The specific issue of land use and development associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project is addressed in Section 6.4.2 of the Draft EIS, and in Section 6.2.2 of the Final EIS. Both documents acknowledge the potential for additional development focused around LRT stations.
121CC	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Additional development is intended and expected along the Olson Highway portion of the project. For the D common alignments, future land use in the station areas will be evaluated in the station area planning process. (1) At the Van White Station area there are several large vacant properties that are potential development sites and other underutilized sites that could be intensified with development. Station area planning will evaluate and recommend the most appropriate form and type of transit oriented development for these parcels and the surrounding station area, which may result in amended land use policy and maps with the adoption of the station area plans. (2) At the Penn Avenue/Hwy 55 station area, while there are not large vacant parcels and the area is predominantly single-family homes, station area planning will evaluate and recommend the most appropriate form and type of land use for the surrounding station area. At this station area higher density and intensity land uses will depend on a long-term strategy of parcel assemblage and strategies that could include the narrowing and/or elimination of travel lanes on Hwy 55 and frontage roads along Hwy 55, all which should be studied in the station area planning process. Station area planning will evaluate and recommend the most appropriate form and type of transit oriented development for these parcels and the surrounding station area, which may result in amended land use policy and maps with the adoption of the station area plans.	FTA and the Council acknowledge that Station Area Planning is a key element of orderly transit-oriented development, and note that Station Area Planning has been completed for the stations in the City of Minneapolis (Van White Memorial Boulevard and Penn Avenue), as well as stations that may influence development in the city (Plymouth Avenue and Golden Valley Road). Station Area Planning has been led by Hennepin County, but Council staff have been involved as well to facilitate coordination between the development of LRT station infrastructure and adjacent land use plans.
121CD	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 6-9, 6.4.1 – This section states that bicycle and pedestrian activity is likely to increase as a result of this project. However, the project proposes closing a number of currently active pedestrian crossings. How are these two things being reconciled? Will the project support pedestrian connectivity in other ways? Construction of LRT should be designed and built in a way to enhance connectivity rather than compounding disconnectivity between places and neighborhoods. Any necessary modifications to the vehicular circulation system must be made in a way that is urban in character, not suburban. Modifications that eliminate vehicular connectivity should not be de facto interruptions to the pedestrian and bicycle networks that currently exist or potentially might be built in order to enhance the urban grid.	Please see response to Comment 121I.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
121CE	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 6-13, 6.4.10 – The potential to negatively impact lower income populations due to increased property values is called out as an indirect and cumulative impact. No mitigation is identified. However, regional planning for affordable housing specifically prioritizes supporting funding affordable units near transit stations. While this wouldn't be undertaken as part of the Bottineau transitway project itself, it could be considered a form of mitigation. This was a major discussion topic along the CCLRT alignment, and has resulted in significant investment in new affordable housing there.	This issue of impacts to environmental justice populations through increased property values and corresponding property tax rates is discussed in Section 6.2.10 of the Final EIS. This section also provides an overview of the Council's role in addressing affordable housing issues, including review of the housing element of local comprehensive plans, funding affordable housing development, working with local governments to define their share of regional affordable housing needs, administering the state's largest Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program, and providing technical assistance to local governments. Section 6.4.10 of the Final EIS concludes that because of the Council's affordable housing programs, no additional mitigation is required.
121CF	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 7-3, Table 7.3-1 – If available, it would also be interesting to be able to contrast the minority percentages with other transitway corridors in the region, to allow for more ready comparison of the strategies being used in each area. While the methodology focuses on equal treatment of all populations in the study area, it should be noted that Bottineau has a higher overall concentration of low income and minority populations, and environmental justice should take into account not just approaches within the Bottineau corridor but along other comparable corridors as well.	The environmental justice analysis in the Final EIS (Chapter 7) was conducted in accordance with the FTA Circular C4703.1, <i>Environmental Justice Policy Guidance for Federal Transit Administration Recipients</i> . The analysis includes a review of proposed BLRT Extension project area demographics coupled with an extensive outreach program to understand the presence or absence of environmental justice populations. The analysis confirmed that there are notable environmental justice populations in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor, and appropriately addressed the potential for disproportionately high and adverse impacts on those populations.
121CG	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 7-21, 7.4.3 – The list of ways that input from the meetings impacted the project and DEIS to date is a good start. It would be helpful to understand if there were any major concerns raised by the community about the project, and how those were addressed.	Information regarding concerns and issues raised at proposed BLRT Extension project-related public meetings is presented in Chapter 9 of the Draft EIS, in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS, and in the response to comments on the Draft EIS, included in Appendix G of the Final EIS.
121CH	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 7-23, Safety and Security – This should consider ways to create safe routes to the transit station in addition to the conditions at the stations.	Please see response to Comment 121K. The measures and guidelines discussed in that comment apply to approaches to the station platforms. Furthermore, roadway and sidewalk improvements are included in the proposed BLRT Extension project scope at each station location.
121CI	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 7-25, Pedestrian and bicycle facilities – the Hwy 55 corridor will have impacts on bike and pedestrian facilities that need to be mitigated.	Please see response to Comment 121AB.
121CJ	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	6 - Noise & Vibration Effects	Page 7-27, Visual/Aesthetics – If the noise barriers are constructed as mitigation, this will have some visual impacts on the community (including potentially blocking views of the park); it doesn't appear that this is taken into consideration here; while they are not fully defined, it appears that they will be near to low income communities.	Please see response to Comment 121BU.
121CK	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Page 7-33, 7.5.3.1 – As the project advances, it will be important to ensure that overall service levels on connecting bus routes remain at current levels or better. There could be an unintended negative impact on local riders if local bus service is replaced in any way by light rail, resulting in longer headways and station locations that are farther apart. This does not appear to be the plan, but there will no doubt be a route study at some point to look at potential changes to nearby routes.	Section 3.1.3.1 of the Final EIS specifically addresses this issue, and states that: "The alternatives analyzed in the travel demand forecast model include specific network modifications to existing transit service including changes in routing, frequency, and travel time. Network modifications are focused on providing an integrated 'feeder' bus network to connect people to proposed BLRT Extension project stations. Bus networks and transit plans will continue to be refined as the proposed BLRT Extension project progresses; final bus network changes will be subject to a robust public involvement process in accordance with Title VI requirements."
121CL	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 7-34, 7.5.3.3 – Will there be an effort to hire DBE/WBE firms and employees during the construction phase? Local employment in the project would be a significant benefit.	The Council will include Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) participation goals in proposed BLRT Extension project construction contracts. By way of comparison, the Central Corridor (Green Line) LRT project achieved over 16 percent DBE participation in its construction contracts, against an overall DBE goal of 15 percent.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
121CM	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Wetlands in Golden Valley are part of the Basset Creek Valley Watershed (BCV) and these flow into the corporate boundaries of the City of Minneapolis. This line should not contribute to the pollution of the BCV watershed; it should continue toward – or at least not complicate – the clean up of this watershed.	Please see response to Comment 121BS.
121CN	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	The City of Minneapolis recognizes that the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board is the local park authority responsible for determining parkland impacts.	Comment noted. The Council is working closely with MPRB regarding park impacts.
121CO	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Page 8-19, 8.4.1.2 – The 4(f) evaluation notes that the project will only take a small amount of land in Wirth Park. However, earlier in the document it makes it clear that it will be removing over 10 acres of wetland with the proposed alternative – while the plan for stormwater is to accommodate it largely within existing ditches. Is this all within railroad right-of-way? And is there an assurance that any potential drainage impacts to the larger area will be taken into account, including those outside the project’s construction limits?	Please see response to Comment 121CN.
121CP	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Page 9-1, 9.1.1 – Goals should clearly call out the intention to proactively involve underrepresented groups, including low income populations and communities of color. It appears this was done, but it is not stated up front this was a goal.	Section 9.1.3.5 of the Final EIS addresses this issue; it states: “A variety of electronic and ‘traditional’ (hard-copy) communication methods were used for the proposed BLRT Extension project. Although electronic communications might appear inappropriate for a project area with a substantial number of low-income residents, area organizers (such as the members of the Blue Line Coalition) advised that electronic media remains an effective method of outreach to low-income communities. Computers at area libraries are well-used, and smartphones are increasingly being used to access websites and other social networking applications. Communication methods are summarized below. Specific outreach efforts to target environmental justice populations are summarized in Chapter 7 – Environmental Justice of this Final EIS.”
121CQ	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	2 - Fiscal Effects and Schedule	Page 10-2, Table 10.1-1 – Does the right-of-way cost estimate for D2 take into account cost of relocation assistance for residents from the homes that would be removed? And does the construction cost of D1 take into account the construction of noise barriers and other noise mitigation features, and the cost of wetlands bank purchases?	Alignment D2 is no longer under consideration; however, the cost estimate did include a relocation assistance allocation. The construction cost estimate for the proposed Blue Line Extension project (which includes Alignment D1) includes the cost of noise and wetland mitigation.
121CR	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	2 - Fiscal Effects and Schedule	Page 10-3, Construction Costs – Is there a map or graphic to show the limits of construction to demonstrate where improvements included in the cost estimates will be made? This is needed to determine what projects will be identified as mitigation/betterments outside the scope of the main project and therefore needing additional funding to be completed.	Limits of disturbance (LOD) are shown in Appendix E of the Draft EIS and are represented by a red dashed line. Betterments (currently referred to as Locally Requested Capital Improvements or LRCIs) were not considered at the Draft EIS phase of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Revised LOD are shown in the Final EIS engineering drawings (see Appendix E of the Final EIS). The proposed BLRT Extension project does not include any LRCIs.
121CS	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Page 11-11, Alternative B-C-D1 – The significant wetlands impact is identified as differentiator, but needs to be better qualified as it is a negative for this alternative (i.e. doesn’t directly support its status as a preferred alternative).	The Final EIS clarifies in Section 12.2 that, while Alternative B-C-D1 (the proposed BLRT Extension project) is the environmentally preferable alternative, it does not have the least impact to the physical environment. The disproportionately high and adverse impacts of the D2 alignment on environmental justice populations are the primary differentiator between the D2 and D1 alignments.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
121CT	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Wetlands in Golden Valley are part of the Basset Creek Valley Watershed (BCV) and these flow into the corporate boundaries of the City of Minneapolis. This line should not contribute to the pollution of the BCV watershed; it should continue toward – or at least not complicate – the clean up of this watershed.	Please see response to Comment 121BS
121CU	Pflaum	Donald	City of Minneapolis	121	Email	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Appendix E; Alignment D – The City of Minneapolis is working on a possible art installation, the John Biggers Seed Project, on Bridge 27785 over I-94. City staff has been consulting Hennepin County and MnDOT. Consultation and coordination between the applicable agencies regarding the proposed LRT project and this art installation should continue.	The Council has been coordinating with the city of Minneapolis on proposed BLRT Extension project design issues throughout the Project Development phase of the New Starts process, and will continue to coordinate with the city during final design and construction. Modifications to the I-94 bridge are included in these coordination efforts.

Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
2A	Klapel	Susan	Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe	2	US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The THPO for the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe has reviewed the documentation and determined that the Mille Lacs Band does not have any known recorded sites of religious or cultural importance in these areas.	Section 4.4 of the Final EIS presents a summary of the cultural resource impacts from the proposed BLRT Extension project. FTA and the Council appreciate the confirmation of the absence of known religious or culturally important sites in the proposed BLRT Extension project area.
2B	Klapel	Susan	Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe	2	US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	County Sheriff's Office and office of the State Archaeologist should be notified if human remains found; all work shall cease immediately.	Human remains are not anticipated; however, if found, the County Sheriff's Office and the Office of the State Archaeologist will be notified. This requirement will be incorporated in the Construction Mitigation Plan for the proposed BLRT Extension project, and included in the Section 106 MOA.

Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
106A	de Lambert	Jim	Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission	106	US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	BCWMC will not allow filling within the BCWMC-established floodplain without mitigation. Proposals to fill within the floodplain must obtain BCWMC approval and provide compensating storage (1:1 basis) and/or channel modifications so that the flood level is not increased at any point along the creek due to fill. DEIS identifies two areas within Theodore Wirth Regional Park as potential sites to provide compensating floodplain storage. The design of the compensatory storage sites would need to be coordinated with the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, appropriate city/cities, and the approving agencies (including the BCWMC). We encourage the Metropolitan Council to contact BCWMC as early in the design process as possible to discuss these storage sites.	The proposed BLRT Extension project impacts approximately 17,000 CY of floodplains, all of which is located within BCWMC. Floodplain mitigation is discussed in Section 5.2.5 of the Final EIS. Two mitigation sites are proposed. The first is located west of the BNSF rail corridor and north of Olson Memorial Highway on MPRB and Canadian Pacific Railway property, and is located within the BCWMC. The other is located in city of Robbinsdale property at the edge of Grimes Pond. The site on MPRB and Canadian Pacific Railway property (16,800 CY of compensatory storage) will be designed in coordination with BCWMC and MPRB staff to ensure that the site fits into the landscape. The mitigation at Grimes Pond is quite small (200 CY of compensatory storage) and will be incorporated into the grading for the LRT bridge over the pond. Floodplain mitigation strategies have been discussed with BCWMC, MPRB, and the cities of Minneapolis and Golden Valley, and staffs from those governmental units have approved the final mitigation sites. The Council will continue to coordinate approvals for floodplain impacts and mitigation strategies with BCWMC, the city of Minneapolis, DNR, and FEMA.
106B	de Lambert	Jim	Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission	106	US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	BCWMC must review and approve crossings of the Bassett Creek trunk system, including changes to existing crossings. DEIS notes Alignment D1 will cross a backwater channel of Bassett Creek, just north of TH 55.	Crossings and other potential impacts to the Bassett Creek trunk system have been discussed with BCWMC, the Mississippi Watershed Management Organization, the city of Minneapolis, and MnDOT. The proposed BLRT Extension project proposes the following modifications to the Bassett Creek trunk system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ East of I-94 – tree trenches will be used to treat runoff prior to draining to the Bassett Creek tunnels. ■ West of I-94 – two storm sewer trunk lines will extend from approximately Penn Avenue to the old Bassett Creek tunnel where it crosses Olson Memorial Highway near Dupont Avenue North. ■ Additional drainage to the old Bassett Creek tunnel and the east channel of Bassett Creek will be pre-treated through bioretention basins, underground detention BMPs, and the corridor protection ditch between the LRT and freight rail tracks. The modification details are described in Section 4.4.1 of the Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan Technical Memorandum, included in Appendix F of the Final EIS.
106C	de Lambert	Jim	Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission	106	US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Floodplain management policies are listed in Section 5.2.2.2 of the BCWMC's 2004 Watershed Management Plan. Please also see the BCWMC's submittal and design requirements for projects ("Requirements for Improvements and Development Proposals," 2008). These documents can be found on the BCWMC website: www.bassettcreekwmo.org .	The floodplain and stormwater analyses and design requirements used for the proposed BLRT Extension project include the most up-to-date BCWMC policies and requirements. These are listed in Section 2.2.2 of the Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan Technical Memorandum, provided in Appendix F of the Final EIS.
106D	de Lambert	Jim	Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission	106	US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Within the Bassett Creek watershed (Alignment D1), the project will increase the amount of impervious surface by 15 acres, a 40% increase within the Alignment D1 project area. The increased impervious surface will be in close proximity to the creek and will result in increased runoff rates if not controlled. Best management practices must be implemented to ensure flood profiles are not increased along Bassett Creek. BMPs should be implemented to treat runoff to minimize pollutants	The Council is working with BCWMC (the permitting authority as authorized under Minnesota Statute Chapter 103B) to incorporate the appropriate BMPs in the design that will manage volume and rate control throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project area. Such efforts will counteract potential high peaks of stream flow in Bassett Creek and will serve to retain and treat potential pollutants thus preventing them from entering the Creek. BMPs may include bio-infiltration, bio-filtration, stormwater retention and detention, permeable pavements, and tree trenches.
106E	de Lambert	Jim	Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission	106	US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	BCWMC strongly encourages the Metropolitan Council to implement best management practices to treat transitway runoff to ensure that the project does not increase pollutant-loading to adjacent water bodies.	The Council is working with BCWMC to design and implement BMPs that will effectively pre-treat runoff from the transitway before reaching Bassett Creek. The pre-treatment strategies will remove pollutants in compliance with applicable local, state, and federal standards.
106F	de Lambert	Jim	Bassett Creek	106	US Mail	5 - Environmental	BCWMC expects the proposed project design to include	Stormwater design throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project area will

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
			Watershed Management Commission			Effects	stormwater treatment and erosion control measures that will reduce the amount of phosphorus and sediment carried by stormwater runoff to Bassett Creek. The BCWMC also expects the Metropolitan Council to consider measures to minimize the amount of increased impervious surfaces resulting from the project.	incorporate BMPs that may include sediment forebays, bio-infiltration, bio-filtration, stormwater retention and detention, permeable pavements, tree trenches, grit chambers and SAFL Baffles. Such structures are effective in allowing sediments laden with phosphorus and other pollutants to be captured and can be effectively cleaned out. Thus, the amount of such contaminants entering Bassett Creek can be greatly reduced with the use of these BMPs. Other techniques such as silt fencing and rapid post-construction revegetation can contribute to effective erosion control. Permeable pavements and the use of ballasted track rather than embedded track will reduce the effect of increases in impervious surfaces.
106G	de Lambert	Jim	Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission	106	US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Permanent and temporary construction BMPs must be implemented to control chlorine, fuels, oils, metals and other construction runoff. Adequate permanent and temporary construction BMPs must be implemented as part of the project.	The Council is working to locate construction staging in areas that would have a low probability of impacting receiving waterbodies. Permanent and temporary BMPs will include pre-treatment of storm runoff. These may include temporary sedimentation basins during construction and other techniques such as vegetated ditches, bio-infiltration, and various configurations of stormwater retention and detention. Hazardous and regulated materials stored on site during construction will be managed in conformance with the NPDES permit requirements and/or the requirements in a contractor-prepared Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures (SPCC) plan. The NPDES permit will be obtained in advance of construction activities, and an SPCC plan be developed prior to construction activities.
106H	de Lambert	Jim	Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission	106	US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The Draft EIS proposes the construction of infiltration basins in ditches adjacent to the transitway to provide some water quality treatment before runoff is discharged to Bassett Creek. All proposed water quality treatment facilities will be reviewed for conformance to the design requirements outlined in the "Requirements for Improvements and Development Proposals," (2008). The BCWMC is in the process of updating its Watershed Management Plan, which could include significant new standards for stormwater management. We expect approval of the BCWMC Plan sometime in fall 2015, which means the new standards will likely be in place before engineering design begins on the transitway project.	The Council is designing stormwater treatment in accordance with BCWMC requirements that will include infiltration basins in locations appropriate for the site-specific soil and groundwater conditions. BMP designs will conform to the design standards in effect at the time of the design. Pollutant and sediment load modeling will be used to design for compliance with local, state, and federal standards. See also the response to Comment 106C.
106I	de Lambert	Jim	Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission	106	US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The Draft EIS does not appear to include the maintenance measures the Metropolitan Council proposes to undertake to ensure the effectiveness of stormwater management features. The Final EIS should describe the maintenance measures and it should also identify the parties responsible for inspections, the parties responsible for maintenance, and the inspection and maintenance schedules.	The Council acknowledges that many stormwater management BMPs within the proposed BLRT Extension project area would require periodic maintenance and inspection. Maintenance of stormwater BMPs would be determined in coordination with the proposed BLRT Extension project stakeholders including the Council, MnDOT, Hennepin County, and the project cities and other LGUs. Final determinations of responsibility for long-term maintenance of BMPs will be determined prior to the start of construction.
106J	de Lambert	Jim	Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission	106	US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	Temporary and permanent best management practices must be implemented to control construction and post-development erosion and runoff from the site. BCWMC is particularly concerned about erosion and sediment control during construction because of the proximity of Alignment D1 to numerous water resources, Alignment D1 is immediately adjacent to Grimes Pond and South Rice Pond, and adjacent to or very near Bassett Creek and its adjacent wetlands. Extra care will need to be taken during construction to avoid sediment and other pollutants from entering these water resources. The EIS should acknowledge the extra difficulty in preventing erosion and sedimentation along the portions of the route with numerous water resources in close proximity, such Alignment D1.	The Council team acknowledges the importance of preventing sediment-laden construction runoff from entering Bassett Creek and the other water resources adjacent to the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. The construction contractor will be required to meet the additional requirements of the NPDES permit for activities within one mile of impaired waters, which includes Bassett Creek. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be designed that will specify temporary erosion and sediment controls, such as temporary seeding, biorolls, rock logs, rock weepers, erosion control blankets, hydraulic soil stabilizers, silt fence (machine-sliced, heavy-duty, and super-duty), flotation silt curtain, and temporary sedimentation basins. The SWPPP will also include permanent erosion and sediment controls, such as permanent seeding and vegetation establishment, erosion control blankets and or hydraulic soil stabilizers, and permanent stormwater treatment BMPs. This is discussed in Section 5.9.5 of the Final EIS.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
106K	de Lambert	Jim	Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission	106	US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	In addition to the NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit from the MPCA (as noted in Section 5.9.5 of the Draft EIS), the BCWMC reviews projects for erosion and sediment control. The BCWMC's erosion and sediment control plan requirements are outlined in "Requirements for Improvements and Development Proposals" (2008). The BCWMC's erosion and sediment control policies are also listed in Section 6.2 of the BCWMC Watershed Management Plan.	The proposed BLRT Extension project will incorporate BCWMC requirements in the SWPPP section of the proposed BLRT Extension project plans; the SWPPP will be provided to BCWMC at the same time it is provided to MPCA for review and approval. See also the response to Comment 106H.
106L	de Lambert	Jim	Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission	106	US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	The BCWMC wetland goal is to achieve no net loss of wetlands in the Bassett Creek watershed in conformance to the Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) and associated rules (Minnesota rules 8420). The portion of the preferred alternative (B-C-D1) and Alternative B-C-D2 in BCWMC is in Minneapolis, Golden Valley and Robbinsdale. Minneapolis and Golden Valley are the local governmental units (LGUs) responsible for administering the WCA in their cities; BCWMC is the LGU for administering WCA in Robbinsdale. Table 5.3-4 in the Draft EIS shows the total wetland disturbance or fill for Alignment D1 (part of preferred alternative) to be 6.1 acres. All of this wetland disturbance or fill along Alignment D1 is within BCWMC. At least two acres appears to be in Robbinsdale. For the portion of Alignment C within BCWMC, there appears to be 0.4 acres of wetland disturbance or fill; this is located in Robbinsdale. Alignment D2 includes 0.7 acres of wetland disturbance or fill, all of which is in BCWMC and in Robbinsdale. BCWMC will be responsible for administering WCA for the Robbinsdale portions of the alignments. Wetland management policies are listed in Section 8.0 of the BCWMC Watershed Management Plan. The BCWMC's submittal and design requirements for projects are included in "Requirements for Improvements and Development Proposals" (2008).	The Council is aware of and is developing the proposed BLRT Extension project in accordance with the BCWMC regulations concerning no net loss. Further, the Council is aware of the various WCA LGUs and their jurisdictions throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project area. Coordination meetings with all WCA LGUs as well as USACE, the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR), and the Hennepin County Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) to discuss wetland delineations, wetland jurisdictions, and wetland impacts and mitigation. Final wetland impact and mitigation areas are presented in the joint Section 404/WCA permit application, including a breakdown of impacts by WCA LGU. Approximately 5.78 acres of total wetland impact are anticipated within the areas under the jurisdiction of BCWMC. Of those 5.78 acres of impact, approximately 3.11 acres will require mitigation at a 2:1 ratio (i.e. approximately 6.22 acres), based on WCA requirements. Note that the proposed BLRT Extension project is Alternative B-C-D1 as presented in the Draft EIS; therefore, the impacts associated with Alignment D2 are no longer germane to this issue.
106M	de Lambert	Jim	Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission	106	US Mail	5 - Environmental Effects	In late 2014, the City of Minneapolis (through the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board) will be constructing a BCWMC capital improvement project to stabilize a reach of Bassett Creek between Golden Valley Road and Irving Avenue North at an estimated cost of \$856,000. The portion of the creek stabilization project between Golden Valley Road and Highway 55 is adjacent to or very near Alignment D1. The creek stabilization project will be completed before the Bottineau Transitway project construction would begin. However, the planning, design and construction of the Bottineau Transitway project needs to ensure the integrity of the BCWMC's creek stabilization project. We will provide you with the as-built plans for the creek stabilization project.	The Council recognizes the importance of the Bassett Creek stabilization project in improving water quality and the predictability of the Creek during extreme storm events. The Council's design for the proposed BLRT Extension project will be coordinated with the creek stabilization design. Should disturbance of the creek stabilization elements be required to build the proposed BLRT Extension project, those elements will be restored when construction is completed in that area, and temporary stormwater construction BMPs will be implemented to avoid streambank erosion during construction. To achieve design coordination, the Council will appreciate reviewing the as-built plans for the creek stabilization project.

Federal Aviation Administration

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
128A	Peek	Andy	Federal Aviation Administration	128	Email & US Mail	3 - NEPA Process & Public Involvement	As a Cooperating Agency for the Bottineau Transitway Project, FAA Minneapolis Airports District Office (ADO) is continuing to seek FAA Regional and Headquarters concurrence on the conclusions of the February 10, 2014 Crystal Airport Runway Protection Zone Alternatives Analysis (RPZ AA). Upon completion of the RPZ AA, we will forward our comments for incorporation into the Final EIS. When the Final EIS is available, the FAA ADO will want to ensure the proposed transportation project is consistent with the findings of the RPZ AA.	The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Dakota-Minnesota Airports District Office approved the alignment changes to the February 20, 2014 Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) Alternatives Analysis (AA) in a letter dated December 28, 2015. Section 3.6 of the Final EIS provides additional information on coordination with FAA and permitting requirements.

US Department of the Interior

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
143A	Darby	Valincia	US Department of the Interior	143	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	The Northern long-eared bat (<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>) (NLEB) was proposed for federal listing under the Endangered Species Act on October 2, 2013. At this time, no critical habitat has been proposed for the NLEB. Although species proposed for listing are not afforded protection under the ESA, when a species is listed, the prohibitions against jeopardizing its continued existence and unauthorized “take” are effective immediately, regardless of an action’s stage of completion. We recommend adding the NLEB to Section 5.8.3, Endangered Species and addressing potential project impacts to the species. Based on the information provided in this EIS, Alternative D-1 will likely result in the loss of some summer roosting and foraging habitat. We recommend quantifying available summer roost habitat that will be removed as a result of this project and assessing those impacts to the species. We recommend that all tree clearing associated with this project be conducted outside the summer maternity roost season for the NLEB. The summer maternity season in Minnesota is from April 1 through September 30. If tree clearing cannot be accomplished outside of this time period, surveys should be conducted to determine presence/absence of the species and consultation should be initiated with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service’s Twin Cities Field Office.	Section 5.8 of the Final EIS describes the preferred habitats of rare, threatened, and endangered species in the study area and the expected impacts to plants and animals and their habitat from the No-Build Alternative and proposed BLRT Extension project. Since the publication of the Draft EIS, the NLEB has been listed as a threatened species under the Environmental Site Assessment (ESA). The US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has issued a Final 4(d) Rule regarding impacts to the northern long-eared bat (NLEB). Based on the absence of NLEB hibernacula and maternity roost trees in the proposed BLRT Extension project area, FTA has made a determination under Section 7 of the ESA of “May Affect, Incidental Take Not Prohibited” in accordance with the Final 4(d) Rule and guidance. The USFWS concurred with FTA’s determination on May 16, 2016. The Final 4(d) Rule regarding the NLEB indicates that as long as a project is more than 0.25 mile from a known hibernaculum and more than 150 feet from any known occupied maternity roost tree, no tree clearing restrictions are required, and no surveys need to be conducted. The proposed BLRT Extension project meets these criteria; therefore, no clearing restrictions and no surveys will be implemented.
143B	Darby	Valincia	US Department of the Interior	143	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	...the analysis of impacts to eligible 4(f) properties is not entirely straightforward, and it seems much of the decision making has been put off waiting for further analysis and consultation. Alternatives are anticipated to result in direct impacts to recreational facilities including the Rush Creek Regional Trail, Theodore Wirth Regional Park, and the Minneapolis Public Schools Athletic Field. Alternatives are anticipated to have direct impacts to two historic properties, the Homewood Historic District and the Grand Rounds Historic District (Theodore Wirth segment). Based upon the existence of an alternative that would avoid direct use of the Minneapolis Public Schools Athletic Field and the Homewood Historic District, the FTA believes that it can avoid a 4(f) use of these properties. Based on measures to minimize harm, the FTA proposes a <i>de minimis</i> finding under section 4(f) for the direct impacts to the Rush Creek Regional Trail and the Grand Rounds Historic District (Theodore Wirth segment). Finally, the FTA has determined that its preferred alternative will result in a direct use of the Theodore Wirth Regional Park.	FTA has revised its preliminary use determinations for certain park and historic resources along the proposed BLRT Extension project, and provided a pre-publication copy of the Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation to the US Department of the Interior (USDO I) for review and comment on May 18, 2016. The preliminary use determinations presented by FTA in the Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A <i>de minimis</i> use of TWRP ■ A <i>de minimis</i> use of Glenview Terrace Park ■ A direct use of the GRHD ■ A direct use of the Osseo Branch historic railroad district In addition, the need for a Section 6(f) conversion of a portion of Sochacki Park: Sochacki Management Unit was identified. USDO I indicated in its response dated [DATE] that [SUMMARIZE RESPONSE]. The Final Section 4(f) Evaluation results will be documented in the proposed BLRT Extension project Record of Decision. The Section 6(f) conversion process will be completed under separate environmental review in accordance with National Park Services guidelines; the conversion process must be completed before construction of the proposed BLRT Extension project can begin.
143C	Darby	Valincia	US Department of the Interior	143	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	The Section 4(f) Evaluation appears rather preliminary in that additional design will be needed to determine the full extent of some impacts to or avoidance of resources, and impacts to the two historic properties will need concurrence from the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on a “no adverse effect” determination under section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.	Adverse effects to historic properties are presented in the proposed BLRT Extension project Determination of Effects Report, included in Appendix H of the Final EIS. MnHPO has concurred with FTA’s adverse effect determinations. The adverse effects have informed the Section 4(f) Evaluation, and the following uses of historic properties have been identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A direct use of the GRHD ■ A direct use of the Osseo Branch historic railroad district The Section 4(f) analysis considered avoidance alternatives and measures to minimize harm, and found that there was no feasible and prudent alternative to the two Section 4(f) uses, and that all possible planning to minimize harm had been incorporated into the proposed BLRT Extension project. USDO I concurred with FTA’s

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								preliminary determinations of use for these two properties on [DATE]. [LIST THEM].
143D	Darby	Valincia	US Department of the Interior	143	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Therefore, the Department would concur with the FTA that there were no feasible or prudent avoidance alternatives to the preferred alternative presented which results in impacts to Theodore Wirth Regional Park.	Please see the Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation (Chapter 8 of the Final EIS) which presents FTA's preliminary determination that the proposed BLRT Extension project would constitute a <i>de minimis</i> use of TWRP. This preliminary determination was made based on the fact that the proposed BLRT Extension project would require a small portion of park property, and that the acquisition of that property and the implementation of the proposed BLRT Extension project as a whole would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes which qualify the park for protection under Section 4(f). FTA will request MPRB's concurrence on the <i>de minimis</i> determination for TWRP following the publication of and consideration of comments on the Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation.
143E	Darby	Valincia	US Department of the Interior	143	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Impact mitigation for all other 4(f) properties is dependent upon additional design information, as well as consultation with the SHPO and other consulting parties. Therefore, the Department cannot concur that all possible planning needed to minimize harm to 4(f) resources has been employed.	The Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation (Chapter 8 of the Final EIS) presents measures to minimize harm that have been developed in coordination with the agencies with jurisdiction. In general, these include enhanced trail connections for park resources, revegetation (including removal of invasive species and replanting with native species) of temporarily disturbed areas, and implementation of designs that meet the SOI standards. The Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation presents FTA's preliminary determination that two properties (the GRHD and the Osseo Branch historic railroad district) would be subject to a direct use by the proposed BLRT Extension project. Sections 8.7.2.10 and 8.7.2.11 present the "all possible planning to minimize harm" analysis for these properties.
143F	Darby	Valincia	US Department of the Interior	143	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	The Department will withhold its final concurrence that there are no feasible or prudent avoidance alternatives and that all possible planning needed to minimize harm to the 4(f) resources have been employed until more information is included in the final evaluation.	The Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation has been published with the Final EIS for the proposed BLRT Extension project (see Chapter 8 of the Final EIS). A copy of the Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation has been provided to the USDO I for review and concurrence. The document presents information regarding the lack of prudent or feasible alternatives to the 4(f) uses discussed, and demonstrates that FTA has implemented the necessary planning to minimize harm.

Minnesota Department of Transportation

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
151A	Corbett	Michael	Minnesota Department of Transportation Metro District	151	Email	3 - NEPA Process & Public Involvement	Partnering with MnDOT is essential during project development, engineering, and construction to help ensure timely and appropriate identification of and resolution to any impacts to MnDOT facilities. As the project progresses, work with MnDOT to ensure that all impacts to State Highway infrastructure (e.g. along TH 55 in Minneapolis, and crossings over TH 100, TH 610, and I-94) are reviewed and approved through the layout approval process, consistent with policy and criteria outlined in the MnDOT Road Design Manual.	The Final EIS provides a list of Cooperating and Participating Agencies in Table 9.3-1. MnDOT is listed as a Cooperating Agency; MnDOT has a seat on the CMC as well as the Technical Project Advisory Committee. Cooperating and Participating Agencies began active participation early in the environmental review process. The proposed BLRT Extension project would have impacts on several MnDOT facilities; therefore, FTA and the Council will continue to coordinate and partner with MnDOT on the development of design details through the preliminary and final design phases of the proposed BLRT Extension project. For those roadways owned by MnDOT, MnDOT design standards will be followed, unless determined otherwise by both MnDOT and the Council. Permits will also be obtained through MnDOT, as required. MnDOT staff (including right-of-way, design, cultural resources, and administrative staff) actively participate on the development of proposed BLRT Extension project and are co-located with Council staff.
151B	Corbett	Michael	Minnesota Department of Transportation Metro District	151	Email	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	MnDOT has expectations that detailed design considerations along the Bottineau corridor where State Highways are impacted will be compatible and coordinated with MnDOT's multimodal objectives. These objectives include extensive collaboration with local partners and residents to achieve an improved transportation corridor that promotes and invites all non-motorized traffic to move along and across the corridor in a safe and convenient manner.	The Council has coordinated extensively with MnDOT, Hennepin County, the city of Minneapolis, and other stakeholders on the design of Olson Memorial Highway (Olson Memorial Highway—the only State Highway along which the proposed BLRT Extension project would traverse) throughout the issue resolution process. The improvements to Olson Memorial Highway address both motorized and non-motorized traffic. Chapter 3 – Transportation of the Final EIS addresses improvements to Olson Memorial Highway. Two stations would provide access to the communities along the highway: the Penn Avenue Station and the Van White Boulevard Station. While a six-lane roadway would be maintained, the lane widths would be reduced to 11 feet to accommodate pedestrian crossing length. The design speed and posted speed limit would be reduced to 35 mph. Existing sidewalks would be replaced with 6-foot-wide sidewalks on the north and south sides of the highway. Pedestrian refuges would be added in the median of the highway. ADA-compliant pedestrian crossings of Olson Memorial Highway would be facilitated by proposed signalized intersections at Bryant Avenue North, Van White Sochacki Park, Humboldt Avenue, James Avenue, Morgan Avenue, midblock between Newton Avenue and Oliver Avenue, Penn Avenue, Russell Avenue, and Thomas Avenue. The proposed BLRT Extension project would provide space on the north side of Olson Memorial Highway for a 10-foot two-way cycle track (to be constructed by others) between Thomas Avenue and Van White Memorial Boulevard. The proposed BLRT Extension project would construct a multi-use trail on the north side of the reconstructed westbound Olson Memorial Highway bridge. See Appendix E of the Final EIS for design information.
151C	Corbett	Michael	Minnesota Department of Transportation Metro District	151	Email	3 - NEPA Process & Public Involvement	As design work develops, continue to partner and work with MnDOT Metro District staff and functional groups to resolve project development technical issues identified by MnDOT and other key stakeholders.	The Council continues to partner with MnDOT throughout the design process, and MnDOT staff is co-located with Council staff working on the development of the proposed BLRT Extension project (e.g., staff from the MnDOT Cultural Resources Unit, right-of-way staff, design staff, and administrative staff are facilitating project actions during the environmental review process and into construction).
151D	Corbett	Michael	Minnesota Department of Transportation Metro District	151	Email	7 - Alternatives, Engineering & Design	It is anticipated that all trunk highway impacts will be reviewed and approved through the layout approval process and proposed alterations will use the policy and criteria presented in the MnDOT Road Design Manual. Additional information on MnDOT's Geometric Design and Layout Development process can be found at: http://www.dot.state.mn.us/design/geometric/index.html	The Council will develop and submit design plans to MnDOT for review and approval in accordance with MnDOT's Geometric Design and Layout Development Process.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
151E	Corbett	Michael	Minnesota Department of Transportation Metro District	151	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	It appears that drainage permits will be required where the corridor crosses and parallels state roads within MnDOT's right of way. MnDOT expects these determinations will be made when the final design plan is submitted.	Drainage permit requirements are being determined as drainage designs are advanced. The Council anticipates the potential for needing drainage permits from MnDOT, and will coordinate with MnDOT on acquiring these permits as designs are finalized.
151F	Corbett	Michael	Minnesota Department of Transportation Metro District	151	Email	4 - Social and Economic Effects	Any use of or work within or affecting MnDOT right-of-way requires a permit. It is anticipated that more specific impacts to MnDOT right-of-way will be identified during the FEIS and Project Development (Preliminary Engineering) phases.	MnDOT is leading the right-of-way acquisition process for the proposed BLRT Extension project. The Council will follow permitting requirements of MnDOT for work in the right-of-way.

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
152A	Kain	Kevin	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	152	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	Please be aware that Shingle Creek and Bassett Creek are listed on the MPCA Inventory of Impaired Waters located on the MPCA website at http://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/tmdl/tmdl-303dlist.html . We recommend you utilize the MPCA Special Waters and Impaired Waters Search mapping tool to identify special or impaired waters located near proposed projects. The mapping tool is located on the MPCA website at: http://pca-gis02.pca.state.mn.us/CSW/index.html . Shingle Creek and Bassett Creek are listed as impaired for turbidity and fecal coliform. The impairment will dictate additional increased stormwater treatment during construction and require additional increased permanent treatment post construction. These requirements will be included in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System/State Disposal System (NPDES/SDS) Construction Stormwater (CSW) permit. The project proposer should determine that compliance with these increased stormwater water quality treatments can be achieved on the Project site or elsewhere. Information regarding the MPCA's Construction Stormwater Program can be found on the MPCA's website at http://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/stormwater/stormwater-c.html . Questions regarding Construction Stormwater Permit requirements should be directed to Roberta Getman at 507-206-2629.	The Council is aware of the 303(d) listing of Bassett Creek and Shingle Creek, and the implications of this listing on proposed stormwater management. Constraints on this linear transportation project would require a state-of-the-science innovative approach to stormwater management including a treatment train such as infiltration, pervious pavements, cisterns, SAFL Baffles, grit chambers, retention and detention. Impaired waters in the proposed BLRT Extension project area are shown in Figure 5.9-1 of the Final EIS. The specific impairments and Total Maximum Daily Load requirements for each impaired water are listed in Table 5.9-2 of the Final EIS. Stormwater treatment features on the proposed BLRT Extension project are being designed to comply with the treatment requirements for these impaired waters. Permanent stormwater treatment features will be shown on the design plans, and construction stormwater treatment features will be shown on the SWPPP documents which are required to be submitted as part of the NPDES permitting process and reviewed and approved by MPCA.
152B	Kain	Kevin	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	152	Email	3 - NEPA Process & Public Involvement	The permanent treatment requirements are old - the 2013 CSW permit now requires one inch from the new impervious over one acre added to be retained on site. Table 5.9-2 needs to be updated, and their proposed ponds will need to be reevaluated to meet the new requirement.	The MPCA permit treatment requirements have been updated and are shown in Table 5.9-1 of the Final EIS. Volume control is listed as requiring 1.0 inch of runoff from new impervious surfaces created by the proposed BLRT Extension project to be retained on site. Designs of ponds and other stormwater BMPs have been developed in accordance with this requirement.
152C	Kain	Kevin	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	152	Email	3 - NEPA Process & Public Involvement	In Section 5.9.5, the statement "Due to the linear nature of the project, BMPs that are compatible with linear corridors would be used to the extent possible without the need to purchase additional right-of-way" would not comply with the 2013 CSW permit. The requirement is to meet the one inch water quality volume unless infeasible. Part of the specific requirements for linear projects: For work on linear projects with lack of right-of-way where the Permittee(s) cannot obtain an easement or other permission for property needed to install treatment systems capable of treating the entire water quality volume on site, the Permittee(s) must maximize the water quality volume that can be treated prior to discharge to surface waters. Treatment can be provided through other methods or combination of methods such as grassed swales, filtration systems, smaller ponds, or grit chambers, prior to discharge to surface waters. A reasonable attempt must be made to obtain right-of-way during the project planning process. Documentation of these attempts must be in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) per Part 111.A.5.m. in the section addressing infeasibility.	As noted in the response to Comment 152B, stormwater BMPs have been designed to meet the 1.0 inch retention standard. In some cases, this can be met through the implementation of BMPs within the existing linear corridor. However, in several cases, new or augmented stormwater treatment features are proposed on right-of-way parcels outside the linear corridor. An overview of major stormwater treatment facilities is shown in Figure 5.9-2 of the Final EIS and summarized in Tables 5.9-5 through 5.9-10. Documentation of the stormwater management planning and design process will be provided in the SWPPP, which will be reviewed and approved by MPCA as part of the NPDES permitting action. Any alteration required to the treatment plan will be coordinated with MPCA, according to the standards required for the NPDES permit.
152D	Kain	Kevin	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	152	Email	8 - Transportation System Effects	Disruption to traffic operations, including lane closures, short-term intersection and roadway closures, as well as detour will occur during construction of the Project and would cause localized increases in congestion. Therefore, traffic control measures should be developed during subsequent stages of the	Mitigation measures for short-term (construction) impacts to roads and traffic would be implemented by the Council prior to and during construction through the Construction Mitigation Plan, which includes a Construction Communication Plan and a construction staging plan. MnDOT, Hennepin County, and all municipalities affected by construction activities related to the proposed BLRT Extension project

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
							project to address these construction phased-impacts. Traffic flow and access to adjacent development must be maintained throughout the construction period. Construction related impacts must also be minimized within the neighborhoods adjacent to the project area. Amanda Smith (Amanda.smith@state.mn.us) would like to see a copy of the construction phasing plan when it is developed.	would require compliance with applicable state and local regulations related to the closing of roads and the effects of construction activities. Contractors will be required to comply with all guidelines established in the Minnesota Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (2015). Construction staging and mitigation documents will be reviewed by appropriate jurisdictions, and required permits will be secured by construction contractors. Traffic-control plans will be developed by the contractor based on information identified in the construction documents and the Construction Mitigation Plan. Traffic-control plans will be reviewed by appropriate jurisdictions and the Council before construction activities begin. A copy of the Construction Mitigation Plan will be provided to MPCA for review.
152E	Kain	Kevin	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	152	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	The effects of this Project on air quality were conducted through analysis of predicted impacts on CO concentrations. Analysis was conducted on five intersections in the study area, one representing the worst-case condition along each alignment under consideration. Based on these results, concentrations of CO in the study area would not exceed state one hour or eight hour standards. Therefore, the construction of the Project is not expected to cause any exceedance of the state CO standards. Based on the qualitative assessment presented in the Draft EIS, the Project would not cause exceedances of other criteria pollutants.	The Council concurs with MPCA's statements regarding the analysis of the proposed BLRT Extension project's impact on carbon monoxide concentrations. The analysis in the Final EIS (see Section 5.10.4.1) confirms the results of the analysis presented in the Draft EIS.
152F	Kain	Kevin	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	152	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	The Draft EIS has provided a detailed qualitative analysis of MSATs. Since the traffic volumes for this project are below the threshold of 140,000 vehicles per day, a quantitative MSAT analysis is not required. Based on the qualitative assessment provided in the Draft EIS, it is not anticipated that this Project will cause a significant increase in MSAT emissions.	The Council concurs with MPCA's statements regarding the analysis of the proposed BLRT Extension project's impact on concentrations of Mobile Source Air Toxics. The analysis in the Final EIS (see Section 5.10.4.1) confirms the results of the analysis presented in the Draft EIS.
152G	Kain	Kevin	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	152	Email	6 - Noise & Vibration Effects	The Draft EIS includes a detailed noise analysis. However, the noise analysis was conducted using Leq, rather than L10 and L50, which are the applicable state noise standards. The Project must comply with state noise standards and the final noise mitigation plan must address these state standards.	MPCA, the Council, and FTA have developed an approach to addressing the state noise standards. Information regarding this approach and the results are contained in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS. Section 5.6.1.4 discusses MPCA and FTA noise criteria for LRT operations, and demonstrates how compliance with FTA noise criteria are more protective of noise sensitive receptors for transit operations. Section 5.6.4.2 discusses construction-phase noise impacts and the requirements for compliance with MPCA noise rules. A construction Noise Control Plan will be prepared prior to the initiation of construction activities.

Three Rivers Park District

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
160A	Vlaming	Jonathan	Three Rivers Park District	160	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	The DEIS indicates that the FTA is proposing a de minimis determination for Rush Creek Regional Trail for construction of the OMF located in an east/west alignment north of 101st Avenue. The de minimis classification proposal is new information for Three Rivers and the DEIS is incorrect in stating that Three Rivers “provided input regarding potential de minimis use of park property”. The de minimis proposal requires additional discussion and collaboration between Three Rivers and the Bottineau Transitway project team as the project advances.	Additional coordination has occurred subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS as well as additional engineering. As described in the Final EIS (Chapter 8 – Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation), through advances in proposed BLRT Extension project design there would be a temporary occupancy of 1.1 acres of park property adjacent to Rush Creek Regional Trail by the proposed BLRT Extension project, and no actual Section 4(f) use of the property. FTA will request Three Rivers Park District concurrence on the temporary occupancy determination following the publication of the Final EIS, and will document that concurrence in the Record of Decision.
160B	Vlaming	Jonathan	Three Rivers Park District	160	Email	5 - Environmental Effects	<p>The Rush Creek Regional Trail corridor is one of a handful of metro regional trail corridors that were acquired prior to development of the surrounding area, and involved a significant investment in land acquisition to provide a natural-resources rich greenway buffer between the trail and future development. Over 250 acres were secured for this trail greenway. The trail meanders through a greenway composed of woodlands, prairie and wetlands, and provides a rare experiential trail setting offering solitude and escape from the sights and sounds of neighboring developments that have risen from the farm fields once adjacent to the trail greenway. Over 372,000 annual visitors now enjoy this trail greenway and the respite from modern life it offers. The success of this trail greenway reflects solid long-range planning and investments starting nearly 30 years ago.</p> <p>Encroachment into the trail greenway by the OMF site threatens to disrupt the experiential setting offered by the trail greenway. The trail greenway offers two trails – a paved trail for bicyclists, in-line skaters and others who prefer a smooth surface, and an unpaved trail – originally designed for horses when the area was rural - and now used by runners and walkers looking for an even more natural setting. The paved trail comes within 400 feet of the OMF site, and the unpaved trail is directly adjacent to the OMF site.</p> <p>The DEIS does not provide enough information (OMF scale, noise impacts, visual impacts, air quality impacts, hours of operation, secondary impacts such as traffic to/from the site, etc.) to accurately determine if the OMF impact on the regional trail greenway corridor is de minimis. Consequently, at this time Three Rivers staff can not recommend to the Three Rivers Board of Commissioners that the direct use of the trail greenway corridor for the OMF site warrants de minimis status.</p> <p>The DEIS does recognize that de minimis resolution of 4(f) property impacts requires agreement by the agency with jurisdiction over that property. Three Rivers will work with the Bottineau Transitway design team to assess the potential impacts of the OMF site on the regional trail and its visitors, and will work collaboratively to find creative solutions that meet the needs of Three Rivers, trail users, and the Bottineau Transitway project.</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges the unique attributes of the Rush Creek Regional Trail corridor and worked with project stakeholders including the Three Rivers Park District to develop an alternative for the OMF that avoids permanent impacts to the corridor. The location and orientation of the OMF has been moved to avoid incorporation of any property from the Rush Creek Regional Trail corridor, and would not impede trail users. Landscaping would be implemented to screen the OMF from trail users; this is discussed in Section 4.5 of the Final EIS.</p> <p>Rush Creek Regional Trail property would no longer be required for the OMF site; therefore, a <i>de minimis</i> use is no longer FTA’s Section 4(f) determination. FTA considered noise and visual impacts and other proximity impacts, and determined that they would not alter or impact the overall use or function of Rush Creek Regional Trail; therefore, there would be no constructive use of the trail facility. The Council has coordinated with the Three Rivers Park District on identifying an OMF location and configuration that meets the needs of the proposed BLRT Extension project and the park district.</p>

City of Golden Valley

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
181A	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		Greater effort and attention must be given to...The likely impacts on the aesthetic and recreational aspects of Mary Hills Nature Area with an eye on preserving and enhancing the park for future users.	The Final EIS finds that there are no long-term impacts to the recreational attributes caused by the proposed BLRT Extension project on Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit (see Chapter 8 – Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation of the Final EIS). There would be impacts to Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit during construction, which are also discussed in Chapter 8 – Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation. Commitments to mitigate for these short-term effects, including commitments to maintain park access for users and for the replacement of trees and other plantings that may need to be removed as part of construction, are included in the Final EIS. These commitments have been developed in coordination with the city. Concurrence from the city of Golden Valley will be requested following the publication of the Final EIS regarding the proposed temporary occupancy. FTA’s final Section 4(f) determinations will be documented in the Record of Decision.
181B	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		Greater effort and attention must be given to...Projected traffic impacts (during and after construction) and impacts to infrastructure on Golden Valley Road, Wirth Parkway, and surrounding local streets near each station location, and how those impacts might be addressed. Consideration should be given to a design of Golden Valley Road that incorporates multiple modes of transportation, including transit, bicycles, pedestrians, and the proposed Bassett Creek Regional Trail.	No mitigation measures are warranted for long-term impacts to roads and traffic because the identified avoidance measures would prevent any adverse impacts resulting from construction of the proposed BLRT Extension project. As shown in Table 3.3-2 of the Final EIS, the proposed BLRT Extension project includes a variety of roadway modifications that would avoid new congested intersections. The traffic operations analysis indicates that the Golden Valley Road/Theodore Wirth Parkway intersection would have approximately the same vehicular traffic level of service in 2040 with either the No-Build Alternative or the proposed BLRT Extension project (LOS B in the AM peak, and LOS E in the PM peak). The proposed BLRT Extension project does include improvements on Golden Valley Road (for the extent that would be reconstructed as part of the proposed BLRT Extension project) providing for multi-modal improvements, including construction of the portion of the Bassett Creek Regional Trail that are within the LOD. Additional information can be found in Section 3.3.
181C	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		Highlight impacts of station location(s) on immediately surrounding areas, including the effects of noise, lights, vibration, litter, pollution, and auto and bus traffic. The design of a given station should strive to safeguard the personal safety of transit users as they arrive at, depart from, or wait at the platform.	The proposed BLRT Extension project’s environmental impacts are discussed in detail in Chapters 3 through 8 of the Final EIS. Chapter 3 discusses transportation impacts. Chapter 4 presents the community and social analysis. Chapter 5 addresses physical environment impacts. Chapter 6 discusses indirect impacts and cumulative effects. Chapter 7 presents the environmental justice analysis. Chapter 8 is the Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation Chapter 9 presents the agency coordination and public involvement efforts. Chapter 10 summarizes the financial analysis. Chapter 11 presents the analysis of a proposed joint development project, and Chapter 12 is the summary evaluation of the No-Build Alternative and the proposed BLRT Extension project. Specific to noise, and vibration, the impacts discussion for these topic areas can be found in Chapter 5. Roadway and transit discussions are in Chapter 3 of the Final EIS, and visual impacts as well as the safety and security of transit users are discussed in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS.
181D	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		The mitigation of visual impacts from lights and lighting along the Bottineau Transitway and around potential station locations [should be addressed].	Light emissions were evaluated as part of the visual quality impact analysis and mitigation measures, including provisions for shielding lights to avoid “spillover” impacts, are included in the Final EIS.
181E	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		The mitigation of noise impacts for properties where noise barriers were not specifically identified in the Draft EIS. In general the study of noise levels was inadequate and more locations must be examined.	Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Recognizing concerns expressed by the city of Golden Valley in its comment letter, the Council added an additional noise monitoring site in Golden Valley at Bonnie Lane (just west of the proposed Golden Valley Road Station) as part of the assessment of the proposed BLRT Extension project impacts completed for the Final EIS. (See Section 5.6 of the Final EIS for a discussion of noise impacts and a summary of mitigation commitments.) After the implementation of mitigation measures which include a noise barrier adjacent to Kewanee Way just north of Golden Valley Road,

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								and interior testing in one home just south of Golden Valley Road, one moderate and one severe impact would remain.
181F	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		The location of mitigation efforts for flood plain impacts along the corridor, especially in areas that may impact parks and natural areas [should be addressed].	Section 5.2 of the Final EIS describes mitigation efforts for floodplain impacts, and lists the agencies with which the Council will work to properly permit the work done on floodplain mitigation. A total of 17,000 CY of floodplain impact have been identified. 16,800 CY of this impact are in the reach of Bassett Creek that lies between Golden Valley Road and Olson Memorial Highway in the City of Golden Valley. Mitigation for this impact will be achieved through the excavation of compensatory flood storage just north of Olson Memorial Highway; this site is shown in Figure 5.2-5 of the Final EIS.
181G	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		Issues of accountability if the mitigation measures fail in the future and ownership and the responsibility for maintenance of infrastructure such as pipes and culverts should be examined.	The Council continues to refine design details and the specifics of how mitigation commitments will be implemented in coordination with city staff from each of the corridor cities. Details regarding items such as ownership and maintenance of pipes and culverts will be addressed during final design and construction phases of project development. Mitigation commitments and responsibility for those commitments will be reported in the anticipated Record of Decision for the proposed BLRT Extension project.
181H	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		Beyond the quantitative measurement of noise and vibration, the City is interested in a qualitative analysis of the impacts the Bottineau Transitway project might generate - especially with Mary Hills Nature Area and Theodore Wirth Park.	The assessment of potential noise and vibration impacts of transit projects is set forth in FTA's 2006 Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment manual. The results of applying this quantitative analysis of impacts is included in Sections 5.6 and 5.7 of the Final EIS. After the implementation of mitigation measures which include a noise barrier adjacent to Kewanee Way just north of Golden Valley Road, and interior testing in one home just south of Golden Valley Road, one moderate and one severe impact would remain. No vibration impacts from proposed BLRT Extension project operations have been identified. Chapter 8 – Amended Draft 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation of the Final EIS discusses the proposed BLRT Extension project's potential for proximity impacts to Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit, and presents FTA's preliminary determination that such proximity impacts would not adversely affect the features, attributes, or activities qualifying the property for protection under Section 4(f). The analysis in Chapter 8 for TWRP indicates that the direct use of approximately 2.1 acres of the park by the proposed BLRT Extension project would be considered a <i>de minimis</i> use based on FTA's preliminary determination that such use would not adversely affect the features, attributes or activities qualifying the property for protection under Section 4(f).
181I	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		Parking options and passenger drop-off access at the proposed Golden Valley Road station [should be considered]. Consideration should be given to the construction of a park and ride facility at or near the Golden Valley Road station location.	Through the issue resolution process, a park-and-ride lot with 100 surface parking spaces and additional bus and passenger drop-off areas has been incorporated into the proposed BLRT Extension project design to provide direct access to the Golden Valley Road Station. A summary of the issue resolution process, and the impact of this process on defining the proposed BLRT Extension project can be found in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS.
181J	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		A more complete accounting of the impacts to Golden Valley residents, neighborhoods, streets, and the entire transportation system during the lengthy construction period [should be addressed].	Construction-phase impacts on neighborhoods and the transportation system in the City of Golden Valley from the proposed BLRT Extension project would generally occur between 2018 and 2020, with the potential for some construction impacts in late 2017 depending on the timing of proposed BLRT Extension project approvals. Construction-phase impacts may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Intermittent impacts on bus operations, including temporary stop relocations, route detours, or suspensions of service on streets that are under construction ■ Intermittent impacts on roadways, including lane closures, short-term roadway and intersection closures, and detours ■ Intermittent impacts on bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including temporary closures or detours, and the presence of construction debris such as excess dirt and gravel

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Temporary removal of on-street parking spaces to facilitate construction vehicle movement, loading, and unloading <p>These impacts will be mitigated through the implementation of a Construction Communication Plan that could include the following strategies to minimize disruptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Issuing and distributing regular construction updates ■ Providing advance notice of roadway closures, driveway closures, and utility shutoffs ■ Conducting public meetings ■ Establishing a 24-hour construction hotline ■ Preparing materials with information about construction ■ Addressing property access issues ■ Assigning staff to serve as liaisons between the public and contractors during construction
181K	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		<p>Many areas of Golden Valley have substandard soils which are unsuitable for construction with proper correction or engineering. A good portion of the Transitway corridor through Golden Valley is located within floodplain, lowland or wetland areas. In addition, there are areas in Golden Valley that were found to be filled with construction debris in the past. The presences of contaminated materials is likely. A careful and detailed analysis of the soils, including possible contamination, must be included as part of the project. Mitigation measures must be consistent with all applicable laws [and] must be included in the project if contaminated material is discovered.</p>	<p>Extensive soils investigation, including conducting geotechnical borings, was undertaken by the Council in 2015. The results of this analysis are summarized in Sections 5.4 and 5.5 of the Final EIS. The Council is aware of the previous dumping that occurred during the 1960s in this area. A Phase I ESA has been conducted to further evaluate the presence of contamination along the entire proposed BLRT Extension project corridor and the results of this investigation are summarized in Section 5.5 of the Final EIS. Twenty four sites with a high potential for contamination and 135 sites with a medium potential for contamination were identified in the Phase I ESA; this information will be used to develop a Phase II ESA work plan. Information gathered during the Phase II ESA process (currently scheduled for the summer 2016 through mid-2017) will be incorporated into the proposed BLRT Extension project's Response Action Plan (RAP), which will include a Construction Contingency Plan for unidentified contamination. The Phase II ESA and its resultant RAP and Construction Contingency Plan will be completed with the oversight and approval of the MPCA, during final design and engineering and prior to the start of construction.</p>
181L	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		<p>Pedestrian movement throughout Mary Hills Nature Area by users on both sides of the existing rail line constitute an important community connection. The City requests a study of a safe pedestrian-only crossing.</p>	<p>The Final EIS addresses how park and trail user accessibility to potentially affected recreational areas will be maintained. There would be no short- or long-term impacts to trails in Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit (see Chapter 8 – Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation of the Final EIS for further discussion). With reconstruction of the Golden Valley Road bridge over the BNSF rail corridor, the proposed BLRT Extension project would construct a bicycle/pedestrian facility facilitating a connection to the planned Bassett Creek Regional Trail on the south side of Golden Valley Road. The proposed BLRT Extension project would also construct a trail connection underneath the reconstructed Golden Valley Road Bridge, providing a continuous off-road trail connecting Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit to TWRP.</p>
181M	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		<p>The proposed alignment for the Bottineau Transitway...is to be located within and adjacent to Theodore Wirth Regional Park, as well as the Mary Hills Nature Area and Glenview Terrace Park. These areas are unique natural and recreational amenities to the City as well as the northwestern Twin Cities region. The Comprehensive Plan for the City establishes clear goals that provide protection of these natural areas. The City shall be involved in all decisions that impact the parks.</p>	<p>The Final EIS finds that there are no ecological, noise, visual, vibration or other aesthetic interferences that would substantially impair the activities, features or attributes of Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Nature Area, Glenview Terrace Park, or TWRP (see Chapter 8 – Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation of the Final EIS). Based on the criteria that are used to determine a temporary occupancy, FTA has determined that there would be short-term needs to be in some limited portions of Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Nature Area. The temporary occupancy of the Mary Hills Nature Area Unit of Sochacki Park was disclosed in an Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation which is published as Chapter 8 of the Final EIS. Concurrence in this temporary occupancy will be requested from the city of Golden Valley following the publication of the Final EIS, and the final Section 4(f) determination will be</p>

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								included in the Record of Decision. FTA has made preliminary <i>de minimis</i> determinations with respect to TWRP and Glenview Terrace Park. Concurrence on these determinations will be requested from MPRB following publication of the Final EIS and review of public comments, and the final Section 4(f) determination will be included in the Record of Decision.
181N	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		Any impacts to the floodway or floodplain must be mitigated in accordance with the laws and policies of the regulating agencies. The City recognizes that mitigation within the existing rail corridor will be challenging; it encourages the County [sic] to work closely with the City of Golden Valley, the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission (BCWMC), the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, and other BCWMC member cities to identify potential flood storage areas outside of the railroad rights-of-way, if necessary.	The proposed BLRT Extension project would impact approximately 17,000 CY of floodplains, all of which would be located within the BCWMC. Floodplain mitigation is discussed in Section 5.2.5 of the Final EIS. Two mitigation sites are proposed. The first is located west of the BNSF rail corridor and north of Olson Memorial Highway on MPRB and Canadian Pacific Railway property, and is located within the BCWMC. The other is located in City of Robbinsdale property at the edge of Grimes Pond. The site on MPRB and Canadian Pacific Railway property (16,800 CY of compensatory storage) will be designed in coordination with BCWMC and MPRB staff to ensure that the site fits into the landscape. The mitigation at Grimes Pond is quite small (200 CY of compensatory storage) and will be incorporated into the grading for the LRT bridge over the pond. Floodplain mitigation strategies have been discussed with BCWMC, MPRB, and the cities of Minneapolis and Golden Valley, and staffs from those governmental units have approved the final mitigation sites. The Council will continue to coordinate approvals for floodplain impacts and mitigation strategies with BCWMC, the cities of Golden Valley and Minneapolis, DNR, and FEMA.
181O	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		Wetland impacts will need to be mitigated in accordance with the laws and policies of the regulating agencies. The City of Golden Valley is the local government unit responsible for administration of the Wetland Conservation Act. If necessary, the County [sic] should identify potential mitigation solutions outside the railroad right-of-way that are satisfactory to the local partners.	The Final EIS describes in detail several types of impacts to wetlands including direct impacts, indirect impacts, and potential cumulative effects and secondary impacts to wetlands. Section 5.3 discusses the wetland impacts for both short and long-term impacts as well as the avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures. The proposed BLRT Extension project would require coordination and permitting from local, state, and federal water resource agencies. The Council coordinated with the Wetlands Technical Evaluation Panel (which includes representation from the city of Golden Valley) regarding mitigation strategies prior to submitting the WCA and Clean Water Act Section 404 permit applications. The Council's analysis of preliminary mitigation strategies included establishing project-specific permittee-responsible mitigation sites and purchasing wetland mitigation bank credits. Based on this analysis, the Council determined that wetland impacts from the proposed BLRT Extension project will be mitigated through a combination of on-site wetland mitigation and purchases of private wetland credits from existing mitigation banks in suitable major watersheds and Bank Service Areas. (See Appendix I of the Final EIS, which includes a copy of the USACE Section 404/Minnesota WCA permit application, including mitigation commitments.)
181P	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		The Transitway project will need permits or approvals from all agencies regulating stormwater, including but not limited to the City, BCWMC, and Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. At a minimum, best management practices addressing erosion and sediment control will need to be implemented during construction. It is possible that rate control and stormwater treatment that reduces pollutants and runoff will be required, especially with the development of a transit station, park-and-ride facility, or other impervious surfaces.	Appropriate measures to avoid and minimize impacts to surface and groundwater will be implemented during construction and maintenance phases of the proposed BLRT Extension project. These include construction stormwater BMPs such as silt fences, ditch checks, erosion control mats, temporary mulching and/or seeding, and other appropriate practices to control runoff and sedimentation. Spill control plans will be required of construction contractors to address accidental releases of petroleum products or other controlled substances. As part of construction, an NPDES permit will be obtained from MPCA and subject to approval by the city and BCWMC. This permit will establish the measure which the Council and its contractors will implement during construction to protect surface and groundwater quality and the monitoring activities used to report on implementation of such measures.
181Q	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		The natural areas located within the LPA alignment are home to a vast array of wildlife. Care must be taken to avoid impacts to the habitat and travel ways of all wildlife, including endangered, threatened, or special concern species. The City requests more specific information about the location of fencing along the LPA alignment, as well as what type of fencing would be used. The	Section 5.8 of the Final EIS presents a summary of the assessment of wildlife habitat, impacts to wildlife habitat, and effects on threatened and endangered species. DNR concurred with the Council's assessment that there would be no adverse effects on Blanding's turtle populations with the implementation of DNR's guidelines. A copy of the guidelines is included in Appendix F of the Final EIS. FTA determined that the proposed BLRT Extension project may affect the Northern long-eared bat, but the

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
							movement and safety of wildlife through the natural areas may be impeded by certain types of fencing and the City would like to explore options for waivers from the requirement. In addition, new wildlife surveys may be warranted given the age of the surveys used in the Draft EIS.	potential for impacts was low, and incidental “takes” of the bat would not be prohibited. Locations of fencing will continue to be explored through the design process; decisions regarding fencing locations will likely be finalized between the 30 percent and 60 percent design stages. The Council acknowledges that fencing in areas of notable wildlife habitat may impede wildlife movement. Minimizing the use of fencing in these areas, or the provision of wildlife crossings (dry culverts or other passageways) are potential solutions.
181R	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		As the proposed project has the potential to impact areas within large parks and natural areas, and areas adjacent to Bassett Creek, the corridor has been studied for the presence of historic and cultural resources. Both the bridge over Bassett Creek in Theodore Wirth Regional Park (Bridge No. L9327) and the Grand Rounds Historic District have been identified as architectural resources that are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The City shall be involved in all decisions that impact these two resources.	Information on the potential for adverse effects to all NRHP listed and eligible resources within the proposed BLRT Extension project’s APE can be found summarized in Section 4.4 of the Final EIS, with detailed information included in Appendix H. There were no adverse effects determined to result for the bridge over Bassett Creek. There were adverse effects determined for the Theodore With Segment of the GRHD. A Section 106 MOA has been developed by FTA and MnHPO including the participation of the Council and other parties, including the city of Golden Valley. The Section 106 MOA sets forth commitments to avoid, minimize, and mitigate the potential adverse effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on the GRHD (page 18 of the Section 106 MOA). A copy of the draft Section 106 MOA is included in Appendix H of the Final EIS. Should the proposed BLRT Extension project move forward in the environmental review process, an executed copy of this document will be included in the proposed BLRT Extension project’s decision document.
181S	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		The Draft EIS has identified two potential station locations in the City of Golden Valley along the LPA and suggests that only one will be chosen for construction. Both of the station locations - at Golden Valley Road near Wirth Parkway and on Plymouth Avenue near Wirth Parkway - would potentially require the acquisition of property owned by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board.	Chapter 8 – Amended Draft 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation of the Final EIS discusses the proposed BLRT Extension project’s potential to use property from TWRP and FTA’s preliminary determination that such use would not adversely affect the features, attributes or activities qualifying the property for protection under Section 4(f).
181T	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		Prior Draft EIS information indicates that the Golden Valley Road station would serve mostly Golden Valley residents and business and the Plymouth Avenue station would serve mostly Minneapolis residents, businesses, and Wirth Park facilities, Golden Valley businesses in the immediate area include regional destinations (Courage Kenney [sic] Rehabilitation Institute, Minneapolis Clinic of Neurology, Regency Hospital of Minneapolis, Wirth Park) and local destinations (Church of St. Margaret Mary, Unity Christ Church, The Family Partnership). Additional businesses that would likely use the Golden Valley Road station via additional transit connections include Honeywell and General Mills, among others...The City believes overall transit ridership numbers would be maximized with a Golden Valley Road station location.	Constructing a station at Golden Valley Road (and a station at Plymouth Avenue) was included in the proposed BLRT Extension project’s scope and budget at the recommendation of the CMC (which included representation by the cities of Minneapolis and Golden Valley, and MPRB). This recommendation was formally acted on by the Council in December 2015. The effects on ridership of constructing a station at Golden Valley Road (and at Plymouth Avenue) are reported in Table 3.1-4 of the Final EIS.
181U	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		As part of Project Development, the City will require more detailed information about how buses would be incorporated into the station areas, including the amount and frequency of feeder buses serving the stations, and information about how bus drop-off and pick-up would function at the stations. The City is also interested in the expected revisions to the bus system as routes are reconfigured to serve the stations and the potential impact these changes would generate in Golden Valley.	Chapter 3 of the Final EIS discusses transit changes that may occur as a result of implementing the proposed BLRT Extension project. According to the draft Bus Feeder Plan, bus routes 7 and 30 would serve the Golden Valley Road Station with drop off areas on Golden Valley Road. Network modifications are focused on providing an integrated “feeder” bus network to connect people to proposed BLRT Extension project stations. Bus networks and transit plans will continue to be refined as the proposed BLRT Extension project progresses; final bus network changes will be subject to a robust public involvement process in accordance with Title VI requirements.
181V	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		As proposed, the parking options at either station location are limited or non-existent. The City needs more detailed	In the early stages of the proposed BLRT Extension project, shortly after entry into the New Starts Project Development phase, the Council worked closely with local

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
							information about how parking would function at the station locations. The number of parking spaces at each location and whether or not ramps are being considered must be determined. The City believes providing adequate parking at the stations is a necessity to avoid undesirable impacts on the surrounding streets and properties. The Draft EIS does not include plans for a park-and-ride facility at either location and land use and zoning controls that are currently in place at the proposed station location sites do not allow parking that is not associated with park uses. To allow for parking to be constructed, changes to land use and zoning controls would need to be made by the City Council. The City requests that funding be made available to allow for planning studies, which include consideration for parking options. Surrounding landowners have expressed concerns about their existing parking conditions so the integration of public and private parking conditions could be an opportunity for further study.	stakeholders to identify parking options in Golden Valley. This included the identification and review of several potential sites that could meet parking needs. The preferred site identified through this process is an approximately 100-space surface park-and-ride lot adjoining the Golden Valley Road Station (see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for a discussion of park-and-ride facilities associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project). Parking was not considered a viable option for the Plymouth Avenue Station. The city approved the proposed BLRT Extension project 15-percent design plans, including the construction of the Golden Valley Road park-and-ride. As the proposed BLRT Extension project advances, the Council will continue its coordination with the city to secure required permits and other approvals required for proposed BLRT Extension project infrastructure built in the city.
181W	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		The ridership levels and trip generation from the proposed station or a future park-and-ride facility may result in the need to modify, enhance, or expand the nearby transportation system, which includes roads, trails and sidewalk facilities -- specifically, Golden Valley Road as well as its intersection with Theodore Wirth Parkway. It is expected that the Bottineau Transitway Project would partner with the appropriate road authority to address and mitigate any traffic concerns.	As shown in Table 3.3-2 of the Final EIS, the proposed BLRT Extension project includes a variety of roadway modifications that would avoid new congested intersections, and, with one exception, the proposed BLRT Extension project would not worsen conditions at intersections that would be congested with the No-Build Alternative in 2040. The traffic operations analysis indicates that the Golden Valley Road/Theodore Wirth Parkway intersection would have approximately the same vehicular traffic level of service in 2040 with either the No-Build Alternative or the proposed BLRT Extension project (LOS B in the AM peak and LOS E in the PM peak). The Council is continuing coordination with the city of Golden Valley, Hennepin County, and MPRB on roadway modifications to this intersection. Additional information can be found in Section 3.3 of the Final EIS.
181X	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		Sidewalks currently serve both station locations. The existing sidewalk and trail system will require upgrades and/or expansion to meet accessibility design requirements and the needs of the community. It is expected that this would be accomplished as part of the site access evaluation and implementation. The City of Golden Valley owns and maintains concrete sidewalks on both sides of Golden Valley Road at the intersection with the proposed Transitway, though gaps in the sidewalk system exist on the north side of Golden Valley Road to the west. In addition, Three Rivers Park District has identified the Golden Valley Road corridor for the proposed Bassett Creek Regional Trail which would connect French Regional Park and the Medicine Lake Regional Trail to Wirth Regional Park and the trails along the Ground Rounds National Scenic Byway. This network of trails and sidewalks would also require year-round maintenance -- especially for accessibility purposes -- for LRT to succeed in this multi-modal transportation area. Funding for this maintenance should be discussed as part of Project Development.	Chapter 3 – Transportation of the Final EIS describes the proposed BLRT Extension project’s impacts to the transportation system, including the pedestrian environment and impacts to trails. As part of construction of the proposed BLRT Extension project, adequate sidewalk and other pedestrian and bicyclist infrastructure would be included to meet current design and ADA standards. At Golden Valley Road, the proposed BLRT Extension project would reconstruct the Golden Valley Road Bridge, including a bicycle/pedestrian facility that would connect to the planned Bassett Creek Regional Trail on the south side of Golden Valley Road. The proposed BLRT Extension project would also construct a trail connection underneath the reconstructed Golden Valley Road Bridge, providing a continuous off-road trail connecting Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit to TWRP. Maintenance of infrastructure associated with the operations of the proposed BLRT Extension project would be the responsibility of Metro Transit. Maintenance of other infrastructure (e.g., County Road bridges or regional park trails) would continue to be the responsibility of the respective owners of this infrastructure.
181Y	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		The City owns and maintains an asphalt trail in the Mary Hills Nature Area. This trail provides an important north-south connection from Golden Valley Road north into Robbinsdale via Sochacki Park. It is anticipated that a new Transitway may impact this trail and the City must be actively involved with any reconstruction or alignment of this trail. In addition, the City urges that the potential construction of a station at the Golden	The proposed BLRT Extension project would not have any long-term direct effects on the asphalt trail in Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit. As part of constructing the Golden Valley Road Station and the reconstruction of the Golden Valley Road bridge, the proposed BLRT Extension project would construct a trail providing a connection from an existing trail in TWRP, underneath the new bridge, to the existing trail in Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit. See Chapter 3 – Transportation of the Final EIS for a discussion of trails in the area of the Golden

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
							Valley Road location be done in a way that provides a trail connection between existing trails in Theodore Wirth Park and the Mary Hills Nature Area.	Valley Road Station and Chapter 8 – Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation of the Final EIS for a discussion of the effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on Section 4(f) resources, including resources near the Golden Valley Road Station.
181Z	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		The costs to reconstruct Golden Valley Road and the existing multi-modal facilities discussed above, in addition to any facilities deemed necessary to fully meet the anticipated needs, must be considered in the evaluation of the potential station location. The Final EIS should identify and pursue opportunities for a Hennepin County Community Works project related to the possible reconstruction of Hennepin County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 66. The project could work in conjunction with the proposed Bassett Creek Regional Trail, which is identified to be partially located within the CSAH 66 corridor.	Chapter 2 of the Final EIS provides a description of the proposed BLRT Extension project, including elements needed to support the safe and efficient function of the potential station location at Golden Valley Road. Proposed BLRT Extension project costs are summarized in Chapter 10 of the Final EIS and account for all elements of the proposed BLRT Extension project as defined and described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Reconstructing Golden Valley Road is not included; however, the cost estimate does include reconstructing the portion of Golden Valley Road that includes the Golden Valley Road bridge and an extent on either side of the bridge needed to provide adequate connections to the existing roadway (see Appendix E of the Final EIS, which includes a set of proposed BLRT Extension project design plans).
181AA	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		The potential noise and vibration impacts from the Bottineau Transitway are a significant concern. While current and possible future freight rail traffic also create noise, it is different from noise associated with a regional transit system. These effects should be studied in greater detail. The City needs more information about the presences of potential sound walls and other barriers that may cause visual obstructions to surrounding properties.	The proposed BLRT Extension project’s impacts on noise are summarized in Section 5.6 of the Final EIS. After the implementation of mitigation measures which include a noise barrier adjacent to Kewanee Way just north of Golden Valley Road, and interior testing in one home just south of Golden Valley Road, one moderate and one severe impact would remain. Vibration impacts are summarized in Section 5.7 of the Final EIS. There are no vibration impacts from proposed BLRT Extension project operations in the City of Golden Valley. The visual quality assessment for the proposed BLRT Extension project is presented in Section 4.5 of the Final EIS. Eight higher quality visual features were identified in the City of Golden Valley; the proposed BLRT Extension project would have a neutral impact on three, a potentially adverse impact on two, and an adverse impact on three. Mitigation for these impacts includes the potential visual screening of proposed BLRT Extension project elements.
181AA	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		Ways to incorporate natural buffers such as trees and other vegetative cover as well as natural boulder retaining walls should be considered.	The visual quality assessment for the proposed BLRT Extension project is presented in Section 4.5 of the Final EIS. Eight higher quality visual features were identified in the City of Golden Valley; the proposed BLRT Extension project would have a neutral impact on three, a potentially adverse impact on two, and an adverse impact on three. Mitigation for these impacts includes the potential visual screening of proposed BLRT Extension project elements. As design advances, the Council will develop visual quality guidelines, which will provide detail regarding visual screening requirements The Council will coordinate with the city of Golden Valley through a Design Resolution Team process to get input on these guidelines and on other proposed BLRT Extension project details, including vegetation restoration plans.
181AC	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		With high frequency transit service, the potential Transitway and transit station will have a visual impact on surrounding properties. Most notably will be the addition of lights and lighting that does not exist with the current freight rail. The effects of lighting must be studied and the screening of adjacent neighborhoods and park areas must be considered as part of this project.	The proposed BLRT Extension project’s impacts on visual quality are summarized in Section 4.5 of the Final EIS. Eight higher quality visual features were identified in the City of Golden Valley; the proposed BLRT Extension project would have a neutral impact on three, a potentially adverse impact on two, and an adverse impact on three. Light emissions were included in the visual quality impact analysis and mitigation measures, including provisions for shielding lights to avoid “spillover” impacts, are included in the Final EIS.
181AD	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		The Final EIS should further assess the impacts to properties along the corridor and look for ways for the County and the Metropolitan Council to address any negative impacts, including pursuing funding opportunities for improvements to homes that are negatively impacted or possible acquisition of homes adjacent to the corridor for the purposes of mitigation.	Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would not displace any residential properties in the City of Golden Valley.
181AE	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		Additional research should be done in the area of station and corridor noise mitigation. The City requests the study of the option to produce a quiet zone throughout the corridor, including the station stops between 36th Avenue North in	The proposed BLRT Extension project’s impacts on noise are summarized in Section 5.6 of the Final EIS. After the implementation of mitigation measures which include a noise barrier adjacent to Kewanee Way just north of Golden Valley Road, and interior testing in one home just south of Golden Valley Road, one moderate and

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Agencies

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
							Robbinsdale and Olson Memorial Highway in Golden Valley. This would include incorporating safe station train operation practices in order to eliminate the use of train bells or whistles while operating along the corridor and approaches into and departures from stations.	one severe impact would remain. The creation of a Quiet Zone is not possible in Golden Valley as there are no at-grade crossings shared by LRT and freight with other traffic. The noise analysis conducted to assess the potential impacts of the proposed BLRT Extension project was done using current Metro Transit operating assumptions, including the sound of audible warning devices at station platforms.
181AF	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		The proposed transitway and transit stations would likely require an increase in community resources, such as police, fire, public works maintenance, and traffic management. Since the proposed transit system is managed by the Metropolitan Council, it is anticipated that Metro Transit Police will be the primary law enforcement agency at the station.	The anticipated economic effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project are summarized in Section 4.6 of the Final EIS. Section 4.7 of the Final EIS addresses safety and security. Safety for rail users, area residents, local pedestrians and bicyclists, project construction workers, operators and vehicle occupants is an important consideration for the proposed BLRT Extension project. The framework for ensuring the highest level of safety to these groups will be established through conformance with the proposed BLRT Extension project site safety and health plan, construction contingency plan, the Council's SSMP and the Metro Transit Security and Emergency Preparedness plan. Transit operations in conformance with these plans will necessarily be closely and continuously coordinated with local area law enforcement, medical, fire, transportation and other organizations with related emergency responsibilities within the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. However, Metro Transit Police will be the primary law enforcement agency at stations along the proposed BLRT Extension project.
181AG	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		The City of Golden Valley owns water main, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer facilities in the area of the proposed route. Some of these facilities parallel or cross under the existing BNSF Railway. The City requires more information about how these facilities might be impacted by the Transitway. Record drawings and other information are available in the City's engineering office to assist in the planning and design of the project. The City shall be consulted on all design and construction considerations and field decisions involving City-owned utilities. The City of Minneapolis owns a 48-inch water main which passes under the BNSF Railway north of Golden Valley Road and Metropolitan Council Environmental Services owns a large sanitary sewer interceptor which parallels the BNSF railway in Wirth Park. The City shall be consulted along with the custodial agency on all design and construction considerations and field decisions involving these utilities.	The proposed BLRT Extension project's effects on utilities are discussed in Section 5.1 of the Final EIS. Coordination with utility owners will continue throughout future phases of the proposed BLRT Extension project, including engineering, final design, and construction. The Council will coordinate with the city of Golden Valley through a Design Resolution Team process to obtain input on city-owned and other utilities in order to minimize impacts.
181AH	Harris	Mayor Shephard	City of Golden Valley	181	US Mail		It has been estimated that as many as fifteen Xcel Energy transmission line towers may need to be relocated as a result of the proposed Transitway. The City's Right-of-Way Ordinance currently requires that any proposed reconstruction, relocation, or replacement of overhead utility lines over 300 feet be buried underground. The Code requirement may apply to this situation.	The Council has been coordinating with Xcel Energy, whose transmission line towers are currently located on BNSF right-of-way by permit. Xcel would reconstruct these towers as part of the construction of the proposed BLRT Extension project; however, the towers would remain on BNSF right-of-way and would remain overhead lines. As such, they would not be subject to local (Golden Valley) permitting requirements.



Appendix G

Response to Draft EIS Comments

2 Response to Comments – Businesses



This page intentionally left blank

Crystal Wine and Spirits

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
86A	Charlson	Eric	Crystal Wine and Spirits	86	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Their business is either going to be demolished or negatively impacted by the track crossing on Broadway.	Crystal Wine and Spirits has not been identified as a property requiring acquisition and/or displacement. Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. Access to Crystal Wine and Spirits does not change with implementation of the proposed METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit (BLRT) Extension project. Temporary access impacts during construction, if any, would be coordinated with business owners through a Construction Mitigation Plan that provides advance notice of closures, detours, alternate routes, and other construction effects.
86B	Charlson	Eric	Crystal Wine and Spirits	86	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects and 8 – Transportation System Effects	Concerned about loss of traffic and how customers will access parking lot.	The proposed BLRT Extension project would not affect access to Crystal Wine and Spirits parking lot. Access to Crystal Wine and Spirits parking lot would be maintained during and after construction using the same configuration as currently in place.
86C	Charlson	Eric	Crystal Wine and Spirits	86	Email	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	Trains are costly and ineffective mode of transportation because populations may disperse.	Light rail can have a positive impact on nearby business communities as transitways can provide a new connection for riders to access these businesses, and because pedestrian and vehicular traffic around stations and park-and-ride lots can increase. As an example, since 2009, the year before the Metropolitan Council’s (Council) Green Line LRT (Central Corridor) construction started, the neighborhoods between the Downtown East Station in Minneapolis and the Union Depot Station in St. Paul have experienced more than \$3 billion in commercial and residential development—including new construction, redevelopment, and expansion. In addition, businesses on the corridor prior to the Green Line’s opening reinvested in their businesses and related community efforts to create distinctive districts around the stations (www.metrocouncil.org/News-Events/Transportation/Newsletters/Connections-ground-businesses,-arts-on-METRO-Green.aspx). Research has shown that major transit investments such as light rail generally yield positive effects on property values. There is the potential for an increase in property values in the areas surrounding proposed light rail stations, as light rail access can increase the convenience and desirability of nearby residential, commercial, and office properties. Light rail transit can also contribute to existing market forces that can increase the potential for transit-oriented development or redevelopment. Development and redevelopment are regulated by the cities and are predominantly driven by regional and local economic conditions and allowable land uses as defined in locally adopted comprehensive plans. However, light rail lines can advance the timing and increase the intensity of development, especially in areas near proposed stations, within the limits allowed by local comprehensive plans.
86D	Charlson	Eric	Crystal Wine and Spirits	86	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Would rather see more energy efficient buses.	The Alternatives Analysis (AA) and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process examined numerous alignment and mode options detailed in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. During the AA process, bus and commuter rail modes were considered in addition to light rail transit (LRT). The bus alternative failed to move forward into the environmental review process because the bus mode would not attract as many riders as LRT and would have a worse cost-effectiveness index.

Marr-Don Apartment Building

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
105A	Forberg	Kathy	Marr-Don Apartments	105	Email	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Concerned about noise with track 17 to 25 feet from multifamily residential and train frequencies of 7.5 minutes.	<p>The Marr-Don apartment building was assessed as a sensitive noise receptor because of residential use. Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures consistent with Metro Transit’s Regional Transitways Guidelines (March 2016) have been recommended.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adjacent to the Marr-Don apartment building include implementation of a Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) Quiet Zone and wayside devices at the West Broadway Avenue (County State-Aid Highway 103) crossing. A noise wall will also be constructed on the east side of the proposed BLRT Extension project alignment between West Broadway Avenue and Corvallis Avenue. However, since the noise wall cannot extend through the West Broadway Avenue crossing, there would be residual noise impacts. Nine of the 18 units in the Marr-Don apartment building would still experience severe noise impacts. Therefore, interior testing will be conducted to determine indoor noise levels, and assess the need for additional mitigation such as insulated windows.</p> <p>The proposed BLRT Extension project tracks would be located approximately 55 feet west of the Marr-Don apartment building, and trains are planned to run at 10-minute frequencies.</p> <p>Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS.</p>
105B	Forberg	Kathy	Marr-Don Apartments	105	Email	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Concerned about vibration with track 17 to 25 feet from multifamily residential and train frequencies of 7.5 minutes.	<p>The Marr-Don property would not have any vibration or ground-borne noise impacts from the proposed BLRT Extension project.</p> <p>Vibration impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures have been recommended.</p> <p>Vibration is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS.</p>
105C	Forberg	Kathy	Marr-Don Apartments	105	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	Concerned about wind, dust, and pollution with track 17 to 25 feet from multifamily residential and train frequencies of 7.5 minutes.	<p>The air quality analysis conducted for the proposed BLRT Extension project indicates that there would be no long-term air quality impacts from the operation of the proposed BLRT Extension project. During construction, temporary dust impacts could occur in windy, dry conditions. The Council will implement dust-control measures such as use of watering truck to minimize dust, covering truck beds when hauling dirt on or off site, and minimizing truck idling.</p> <p>Section 5.10 of the Final EIS addresses short- and long-term air quality impacts.</p>
105D	Forberg	Kathy	Marr-Don Apartments	105	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Concerned about lack of privacy and comfort of residents with track 17 to 25 feet from multifamily residential and train frequencies of 7.5 minutes.	<p>The proposed BLRT Extension project track would be approximately 55 feet from the Marr-Don apartment building at its closest point. Trains are planned to run at 10-minute frequencies. The proposed noise wall will provide some level of visual screening.</p>
105E	Forberg	Kathy	Marr-Don Apartments	105	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	Concerned about safety and visibility at planned Broadway crossing near her multifamily property.	<p>All at-grade LRT/freight rail crossings, including the West Broadway Avenue crossing, have been designed to incorporate safety elements including raised medians and gates with flashers. These elements will make it extremely difficult for any vehicles to enter the crossing when a train is approaching. Similar warning signs will be located at pedestrian crossings to warn of approaching trains.</p>
105F	Forberg	Kathy	Marr-Don Apartments	105	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Requests email updates; similar to #111	<p>Community members can sign up for project email updates by providing an email address to BLRT Extension Project Office staff or by signing up on the website for the proposed BLRT Extension project at www.BlueLineExt.org.</p>
105G	Forberg	Kathy	Marr-Don Apartments	105	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Concerned about negative impacts to family business and negative effect on property value of investment	<p>Property values are affected by a variety of market conditions. Research has shown that major transit investments such as light rail generally yield positive effects on property values. There is the potential for an increase in property values in the areas surrounding proposed light rail stations, as light rail access can increase the convenience and desirability of nearby residential, commercial, and office properties. Light rail transit can also contribute to existing market forces that can increase the potential for transit-oriented development or redevelopment. Development and redevelopment are regulated by the cities and are predominantly driven by regional and local economic conditions and allowable land uses as defined in locally adopted comprehensive plans. However, light rail lines can advance the timing and increase the intensity of development, especially in areas near proposed stations, within the limits allowed by local comprehensive plans.</p> <p>Continuing population growth and a strengthening of the local economy within the proposed BLRT Extension</p>

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Businesses

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								<p>project corridor may contribute to redevelopment and increased property values.</p> <p>Business impacts from the proposed BLRT Extension project are anticipated to largely be temporary, and related to temporary construction closures and detours. These closures/detours will be communicated with business owners in advance of the construction activity. The Council has established a program for affected businesses to obtain relief from financial impacts caused by construction.</p>

Allina Health

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
130A	Pence	Alison	Allina Health	130	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Supports a station at Golden Valley Road and seeks that the station infrastructure is handicap accessible and friendly to those with complex disabilities.	<p>Both the Plymouth Avenue and Golden Valley Road stations are included in the proposed BLRT Extension project scope and budget.</p> <p>All LRT infrastructure, including the vehicles and stations, will be designed and constructed in accordance with the current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards as applicable to the associated elements of the BLRT systems. For example, the crosswalks to and from all proposed station platforms (and access to and from park-and-ride facilities where available) will be ADA-compliant as will be the platform elements and the vehicles. Section 3.3 of the Final EIS includes information about pedestrian access to stations.</p> <p>The Council engages the ADA community in design of the pedestrian access, stations, and light rail vehicles. The Community Advisory Committee includes representatives from the ADA community, and the Council will present design elements to the Council's Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee to seek feedback and provide input into design accessibility issues.</p>

Target Corporation

Target Corporation sent a letter of support for the project. See Communication #159; see also Master Response 2.

Sawhorse, Inc.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
188A	Rothbauer	John	Sawhorse, Inc.	188	US Mail	8 – Transportation System Effects	Page 4-79 of Draft EIS states 17 on-street parking will be lost but this property owners states his business owns the parking spaces.	The statement in the Draft EIS about 17 on-street parking spaces being lost in Robbinsdale at the Sawhorse property was made in error and has been corrected in the Final EIS. Sawhorse is disclosed as a full acquisition and displacement in the Final EIS. See Section 4.3 of the Final EIS for information about acquisitions and displacements.
188B	Rothbauer	John	Sawhorse, Inc.	188	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Property owner asked that his entire business be purchased for the project because of loss of adequate parking.	Sawhorse, located in Robbinsdale, is identified as a business displacement in the Final EIS. All property would be acquired in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. The Council is required to pay fair market value for property. Damages are determined by the appraiser on a parcel-by-parcel basis and will be included in the appraisal with the offer amount.

This page intentionally left blank



Appendix G

Response to Draft EIS Comments

3 Response to Comments – Civic and Community Organizations



This page intentionally left blank

Community Organizations: Verbal Testimony

Loppet Foundation

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
28A	Munger	John	Loppet Foundation	28	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	Concerns about the route through the park. They have been working with MPRB staff on these concerns.	The proposed METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit (BLRT) Extension project would result in the permanent incorporation of approximately 2.1 acres of property from Theodore Wirth Regional Park (TWRP). During construction, approximately 9.2 acres of temporary construction easements would be required within TWRP to grade land around the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor, to provide access during construction, and to provide floodplain and wetland mitigation. A short segment of an existing north-south trail that parallels the west side of the rail corridor (a portion of the trail is located on the private rail corridor right-of-way) would be realigned along with a shift of an approximately 400-foot stretch of Bassett Creek as part of the replacement of the Plymouth Avenue Bridge. Access to the park would remain open throughout construction. All areas of the TWRP property that would be affected by proposed BLRT Extension project’s construction activities would be restored to existing conditions or better and restoration plans would be developed and implemented in consultation with the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB). Chapter 8 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) provides additional information about the proposed BLRT Extension project’s impact to TWRP.
28B	Munger	John	Loppet Foundation	28	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	Concerned about impacts on trails and recreation.	There would be no permanent impacts to trails and recreational use in TWRP. The park would remain open throughout construction. A short segment of an existing north-south trail that parallels the west side of the rail corridor (a portion of the trail is located on the private rail corridor right-of-way) would be realigned along with a shift of an approximately 400-foot stretch of Bassett Creek as part of the replacement of the Plymouth Avenue Bridge. This work would require a temporary disruption to use of the trail during construction. Permanent enhancements to TWRP trails and recreation facilities include (in addition to the trail relocation above): construction of a stair access and bridge over Bassett Creek to connect the TWRP trail to Plymouth Avenue, construction of a trail connection between Theodore Wirth Parkway and Sochacki Park, and construction of a new trailhead incorporated into the Golden Valley Road Station park-and-ride. Chapter 8 of the Final EIS provides additional detail about the proposed enhancements to TWRP.
28C	Munger	John	Loppet Foundation	28	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Strong opinion that if the line does go the Wirth Park route that we think there’s a real opportunity to have a stop at Plymouth.	Both the Plymouth Avenue and Golden Valley Road stations are included in the proposed BLRT Extension project scope and cost estimate. The station at Plymouth Avenue provides an opportunity for North Minneapolis residents to access the light rail. The proposed BLRT Extension project would improve the transportation system by providing the proposed BLRT Extension corridor with more travel choices and faster travel times between residential areas, major destinations, and employment centers. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS presents a summary of the alternatives analysis conducted for the proposed BLRT Extension project and describes the location of all stations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor.
28D	Munger	John	Loppet Foundation	28	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Having a station for Wirth Park could help support healthy communities, especially with health disparities in North Minneapolis	See response to Comment 28C.

Alliance for Metropolitan Stability

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
32A	Adams	Russ	Alliance for Metropolitan Stability	32	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process & Public Involvement	Compliments the staff on the Bottineau Project for improved community engagement strategies.	Chapter 9 of the Final EIS provides a summary of public involvement for the Final EIS, including a summary of open houses held during Final EIS preparation. The Council engages and will continue to engage the public in the preliminary engineering process and into construction. The Council 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.
32B	Adams	Russ	Alliance for Metropolitan Stability	32	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	The Bottineau Corridor is an environmental justice corridor and connects two significant EJ populations in Minneapolis and Brooklyn Park.	The study area for the environmental justice (EJ) analysis documented 18.70 percent of the population below the poverty level and 48.40 percent of the study area population as minority groups. The proposed BLRT Extension project would benefit both EJ and non-EJ communities with reliable and higher-capacity service for transit riders, improved pedestrian and bicycle connections and access, and no permanent residential property displacements. The full list of community benefits can be found in Section 7.5 of the Final EIS. The Metropolitan Council (Council) engaged members of the Blue Line Coalition during the Final EIS development phase to better understand their concerns based on this comment in the Draft EIS and also conducted public outreach to identify additional EJ populations in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. The Council will continue to work with the Blue Line Coalition and conduct direct outreach to EJ populations as design advances. The Council has been working with Hennepin County on the Station Area Planning (SAP) efforts at each station, incorporating community input into the considerations of land uses, types of development, and other strategies to address neighborhood concerns and ensure that the investments have benefits to the local communities.
32C	Adams	Russ	Alliance for Metropolitan Stability	32	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Wants to develop a community compact for Bottineau similar to the one that was developed for SW that would have very specific equitable commitments by all governmental parties. Hands out copy of “Equity Commitments for SWRLT Community Compact.”	<p>The Council has developed a comprehensive public engagement process that has proven to be effective at addressing community concerns. The proposed Blue Line Extension project has included the use of advisory committees, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Corridor Management Committee (CMC) that includes a representatives from each City Council along the alignment, Hennepin County, Business Advisory Committee (BAC) chair, Community Advisory Committee (CAC) chair, and two community organization members. This group meets monthly and provides recommendations to the Council on project decisions. ■ CAC that includes neighborhood and community representatives and discusses topics of concern or interest to the community such as safety, noise impacts, station location and design, and accessibility features. ■ BAC that includes business and chamber representatives and discusses topics of concern or interest to the business community such as access, construction impacts, station location and design. ■ Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee is a formal advisory committee of the Council that provides input and advice on concerns and interests to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) community including accessibility, station design, and pedestrian features. Members of this advisory committee serve on the CAC and BAC and have also participated in station design workshops to provide feedback on station features to ensure that they take into consideration use by those with limited vision, mobility or hearing. <p>In addition to these formal advisory committees, the Council has conducted outreach and public engagement activities such as open houses, workshops and walking tours to seek public input on the design of the proposed BLRT Extension project. This approach to community engagement has proven effective on other Twin Cities transit projects, including the Blue Line (Hiawatha LRT) and Green Line (Central Corridor); therefore, a community compact was not necessary and was not created.</p>

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Community Organizations

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
32D	Adams	Russ	Alliance for Metropolitan Stability	32	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Wants to raise the goal on hiring for construction to 40% and make it easier for disadvantaged business enterprises to contract; use ZIP code employment goals for North MPLS.	<p>The Council has an established Disadvantaged Businesses Enterprises (DBE) program and includes specific goals in project contracts to increase participation by minority and women owned businesses. The Council has set a 3-year DBE goal of 15.5 percent for federal fiscal years 2013–2016.</p> <p>In addition to the DBE goal, the construction contracts would have a workforce goal for both minority and women workers. An additional equal opportunity (EO) consultant would be assigned to support these efforts when it gets closer to construction.</p> <p>To assist in achieving the DBE and workforce goals, the Council’s EO and the Council’s outreach and communication staff would hold workshops and networking mixers and attend events to inform people of employment and contracting opportunities. Other communication strategies would be used including social media, the BlueLineExt.org website, newsletters, and articles.</p>

Transit for Livable Communities

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
76A	Thoman	Barb	Transit for Livable Communities	76	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering & Design	The Bottineau Project is a really important link in an expanded transit system. The project, along with 2 arterial rapid bus, more express bus service, more local service, and additional rail lines are greatly needed in this region.	See Master Response 2 in Section G.4.1 of Appendix G of the Final EIS.

Community Organizations: Written Comments

North Hennepin Community College

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
108A	Barnier	Richard	Student Senate President, North Hennepin Community College	108	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Having light rail access or increased access to public transit is something that students feel is very important to the college and the community. With the incredible growth in Brooklyn Park coupled with increasing demand for education, this rail project would be a natural step in improving our community. The final idea I would introduce is the opportunity cost of less transit options. It takes a ton of time to ride the bus, transfer and actually get where you need to be. By having light rail and other expanded transportation options, we increase the opportunity capital of the students using these services. This means more time to work, raise a family or just study. I'm glad that this project continues to be considered and hope we can move from planning to implementation soon. The students, our future, depend on it.	See Master Response 2 in Section G.4.1 of Appendix G of the Final EIS.
108B	Davis	Tarsha	Student, North Hennepin Community College	108	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering & Design	wants stop at NHCC.	The proposed BLRT Extension project would include a station at North Hennepin Community College. The 85th Avenue Station in Brooklyn Park would be located immediately to the West of the North Hennepin Community College Campus on West Broadway Avenue (County State-Aid Highway 103). Chapter 2 of the Final EIS describes the proposed BLRT Extension project including the location of all stations.
108C	Pugh	Audua	Student, North Hennepin Community College	108	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	LRT would be improvement over current bus options to reach the campus. I know some students that have dropped out of school because it's difficult to get to NHCC on public transportation.	See Master Response 2 in Section G.4.1 of Appendix G of the Final EIS.
109A	Larson	Lisa	Interim President, North Hennepin Community College	109	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Supports the LRT, specifically B-C-D1 alternative. The project provides students access to North Hennepin Community College. Minneapolis residents can consider NHCC to pursue their educational or training needs. We believe this project will provide improved options, travel time and access. The project provides the opportunity for students and staff to take this as a transportation option rather than their own vehicle. The project provides access to employment opportunities for our students.	See Master Response 2 in Section G.4.1 of Appendix G of the Final EIS.

Alliance for Metropolitan Stability

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
131A	Vanhala	Joan	Alliance for Metropolitan Stability	131	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Bottineau LRT corridor is 52% people of color and 14% are transit dependent. Bottineau Corridor connects 2 significant environmental justice communities to our regional transitway system – Brooklyn Park and North Minneapolis. It is Important that the transit investment, the corresponding land use and economic development has community benefits for the low income communities and communities of color in the corridor have formed the Blue Line Coalition to secure community benefits for environmental justice communities in the Bottineau Corridor.	The study area for the EJ analysis documented 18.70 percent of the population below the poverty level and 48.40 percent of the study area population as minority groups. The proposed BLRT Extension project would benefit both EJ and non-EJ communities with reliable and higher-capacity service for transit riders, improved pedestrian and bicycle connections and access, and no permanent residential property displacements. The full list of community benefits can be found in Section 7.5 of the Final EIS. The Council engaged members of the Blue Line Coalition during the Final EIS development phase to better understand their concerns based on this comment in the Draft EIS and also conducted public outreach to identify additional EJ populations in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. The Council will continue to work with the Blue Line Coalition and conduct direct outreach to EJ populations as design advances. The Council has been working with Hennepin County on the SAP efforts at each station, incorporating community input into the considerations of land uses, types of development, and other strategies to address neighborhood concerns and ensure that the investments have benefits to the local communities.
131B	Vanhala	Joan	Alliance for Metropolitan Stability	131	Email	3 – NEPA Process & Public Involvement	AMS recommends a corridor wide community compact similar to the Red Line Community Compact in Baltimore. The community compact process should model best practices in community engagement and be a partnership between Metro Transit, Hennepin County, the cities, and the environmental justice communities within the Bottineau LRT corridor.	The Council has developed a comprehensive public engagement process that has proven to be effective at addressing community concerns. The Blue Line Extension project has included the use of advisory committees, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ CMC that includes a representatives from each City Council along the alignment, Hennepin County, BAC chair, CAC chair, and two community organization members. This group meets monthly and provides recommendations to the Council on project decisions. ■ CAC that includes neighborhood and community representatives and discusses topics of concern or interest to the community such as safety, noise impacts, station location and design, and accessibility features. ■ BAC that includes business and chamber representatives and discusses topics of concern or interest to the business community such as access, construction impacts, station location and design. ■ Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee is a formal advisory committee of the Council that provides input and advice on concerns and interests to the ADA community including accessibility, station design, and pedestrian features. Members of this advisory committee serve on the CAC and BAC and have also participated in station design workshops to provide feedback on station features to ensure that they take into consideration use by those with limited vision, mobility or hearing. In addition to these formal advisory committees, the Council has conducted outreach and public engagement activities such as open houses, workshops and walking tours to seek public input on the design of the proposed BLRT Extension project. This approach to community engagement has proven effective on other Twin Cities transit projects, including the Blue Line (Hiawatha LRT) and Green Line (Central Corridor); therefore, a community compact was not necessary and was not created.
131C	Vanhala	Joan	Alliance for Metropolitan Stability	131	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	The environmental justice communities’ resources have not been adequately documented in the draft environmental impact statement. Just along HWY 55 there are schools, libraries, public housing, and churches. To truly understand the impacts, the corridor environmental justice community resources need to be documented and included in the planning process. This includes businesses, schools, churches, libraries, community centers, social service agencies and non profits.	The framework for the EJ evaluation incorporated in Chapter 7 of the Final EIS is based on Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Circular 4703.1, which outlines a methodology that addresses Executive Order 12898 that includes both a robust public participation process and an analytical process that includes three basic steps: (1) Determine whether there are EJ populations potentially affected by the project; (2) If EJ populations are present, consider the potential effects of the project on the EJ population, including any disproportionate high and adverse effects; (3) Determine whether any adverse effect could be avoided, minimized, or mitigated. Chapter 7 of the Final EIS also lists organizations where outreach efforts were targeted to further identify EJ communities. The Council engaged members of the Blue Line Coalition during the Final EIS development phase to better understand their concerns based on

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Community Organizations

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								this comment in the Draft EIS and also conducted public outreach to identify additional EJ populations in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. This resulted in adding additional organizations, such as Summit Academy OIC into the Final EIS.
131D	Vanhala	Joan	Alliance for Metropolitan Stability	131	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	A very important environmental justice community resource has no mention in the draft environmental impact statement. Located directly adjacent to the Van White Station, Summit Academy OIC is the only community-based vocational training and job placement program in North Minneapolis. Summit Academy OIC should be engaged as a partner for hiring construction workers for the Bottineau LRT project and physical impacts to their site at the Van White Station during construction, station location, infrastructure investments for Summit OIC students access to the Bottineau LRT and the regional system.	The Council has implemented a comprehensive public outreach program that has engaged nearby communities and underrepresented groups, including the Summit Academy OIC. Coordination with these groups, including the Summit Academy OIC will continue throughout the course of the proposed BLRT Extension project. The Council has met with Summit Academy OIC leadership to discuss future construction hiring needs for the proposed BLRT Extension and Green Line LRT Extension projects. The Council engaged members of the Blue Line Coalition during the Final EIS development phase to better understand their concerns based on this comment in the Draft EIS and also conducted public outreach to identify additional EJ populations in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. This resulted in adding additional organizations, such as Summit Academy OIC into the Final EIS.
131E	Vanhala	Joan	Alliance for Metropolitan Stability	131	Email	3 – NEPA Process & Public Involvement	<p>Recommends that the Blue Line Extension Community Advisory Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Be a community driven body with staff support. b) Be a resource and check point for community engagement by reviewing and approving a corridor project community engagement plans. c) Identify issues and assign problem solving teams that include community members and project staff. d) Elect a representative member on the transitway corridor policy advisory committee/management committee. e) Be formed early in the scoping phase of the transitway corridor planning process. f) Membership will be selected by communities they represent. g) Elect a chairperson who represents a grassroots community. h) Have the ability to set their own agenda, pass motions, and make recommendations to the corridor policy advisory committee/management committee. i) Will be combined with Business Advisory Committees ensuring coordinated issues and efforts. j) CE Steering committee will support project staff with connections to underrepresented groups i.e.: Faith communities; Cultural communities; Place based groups; Communities of color ; Small and Ethnic businesses; Community Engagement Steering Committee members; Disability community; New immigrant communities; Low-income communities; Students at high schools, community colleges k) Orientation will include a focus on environmental justice, equitable development, and cultural awareness. l) Construction Communication Committees set up at least one month in advance of construction, with representatives appointed by community groups. 	<p>Section 9.2.1.4 of the Final EIS details the establishment of the CAC, which serves as a voice for the community and advises the CMC during the planning and implementation phases of the light rail line. The CAC has met on an approximately monthly basis to advise the proposed BLRT Extension project team. CAC meeting summaries and membership can be found on the website for the proposed BLRT Extension project, www.BlueLineExt.org.</p> <p>The Council formed the CAC by asking each city to designate representatives as well as inviting community based organizations to appoint members. The CAC comprises representatives from the Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee; Masjid An-Nur; MICAH; the Asian Economic Development Association; the cities of Brooklyn Park, Crystal, Golden Valley, Minneapolis, and Robbinsdale; and MPRB.</p> <p>The first CAC meeting was held jointly with the BAC in April 2015. At that meeting, members were asked about their top concerns and topics that they were most interested in discussing. The BLRT Extension Project Office staff also presented an overview of the outreach plan and types of activities. Another joint meeting with the BAC was held in October to review and recommend a revised project scope.</p> <p>In addition to the CAC, the Council added two grassroots representatives from the Blue Line Coalition as members of the CMC. The Blue Line Coalition is a community-based group working to advance local and regional equity and community health along the Blue Line corridor.</p> <p>The CAC and BAC would transition to smaller Construction Communication Committees for each city when it gets closer to construction.</p>
131F	Vanhala	Joan	Alliance for Metropolitan Stability	131	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Because of the overlapping transitway corridors and planning areas, AMS is recommending coordinated planning across these transit projects by Metro Transit, Hennepin County, and the City of Minneapolis.	Planning for the proposed BLRT Extension project involved extensive outreach and coordination with the affected public, agencies, and key stakeholders. Key stakeholder outreach activities conducted during EIS Scoping and the development of the EIS are summarized in Section 9.2 of the Final EIS. Stakeholder advisory committees included staff from the Council, Hennepin County, Metro Transit, the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor municipalities, and several others.
131G	Vanhala	Joan	Alliance for Metropolitan	131	Email	8 – Transportation	Olson Memorial Highway/HWY 55 is currently not pedestrian friendly or safe. The Bottineau LRT project has the potential to provide the	Chapter 3 – Transportation of the Final EIS addresses improvements to Olson Memorial Highway (Trunk Highway 55). Two stations would provide access to the communities

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Community Organizations

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
			Stability			System Effects	opportunity to reconstruct this corridor to be safe and welcoming for pedestrians and bikes with traffic calming strategies. Special attention should be given to redesigning HWY 55 with safe and livable crossing connections for pedestrians and bicycles. HWY 55 currently is a barrier within this environmental justice community. The Bottineau LRT project has the potential to exacerbate this barrier.	along the highway: Penn Avenue Station and Van White Boulevard Station. While a six-lane roadway would be maintained, the lane widths would be reduced to 11 feet to accommodate pedestrian crossing length. The design speed and posted speed limit would be reduced to 35 miles per hour (mph) (from 40 mph). Existing sidewalks would be replaced with 6-foot-wide sidewalks on the north and south sides of the highway. Pedestrian refuges would be added in the median of the highway. ADA-compliant pedestrian crossings of Olson Memorial Highway would be facilitated by proposed signalized intersections at Bryant Avenue North, Van White Boulevard, Humboldt Avenue, James Avenue, Morgan Avenue, midblock between Newton Avenue and Oliver Avenue, Penn Avenue, Russell Avenue, and Thomas Avenue. The proposed BLRT Extension project would provide space on the north side of Olson Memorial Highway for a 10-foot two-way cycle track (to be constructed by others) between Thomas Avenue and Van White Memorial Boulevard. The proposed BLRT Extension project would construct a multi-use trail on the north side of the reconstructed westbound Olson Memorial Highway bridge.
131H	Vanhala	Joan	Alliance for Metropolitan Stability	131	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	Recommends study on viability of new bus circulator in North Minneapolis and upgrades to bus shelters and transfer stations.	The Draft Feeder Bus Plan for the year 2040 includes a proposed Route 26 that would connect to the Penn Avenue and Van White Boulevard stations, circulating through North Minneapolis. The proposed bus network would be refined with input from the public prior to the proposed BLRT Extension project opening day. Additionally, planning for the C Line, Bus Rapid Transit along Penn Avenue began in 2013. The C Line would connect residents of North Minneapolis, near Penn Avenue, to BLRT stations, METRO Green Line stations, Brooklyn Center, and to downtown Minneapolis. Metro Transit has been working with the community on Better Bus Stops through a Ladders of Opportunity Grant from FTA. The goal is to add up to 150 shelters and improve an additional 75 existing shelters as part of the agency's work. For more information, visit this website: www.metrotransit.org/better-bus-stops .
131I	Vanhala	Joan	Alliance for Metropolitan Stability	131	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Throughout the Bottineau Corridor there are environmental justice small businesses. Every effort should be made to maximize the benefit and minimize the impacts of the project on these entrepreneurs.	Chapter 7 of the Final EIS includes additional discussion and analysis of the benefits of the proposed BLRT Extension project to the EJ communities, in addition to the evaluation of potential impacts. Ten business operations would be displaced as a part of the proposed BLRT Extension project. These businesses would be relocated in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and compensated by payment of fair market value for their property. Five of these business operations are considered EJ businesses, either serving EJ populations or are owned by minority or low income people. The Council would also provide information to the communities where businesses would be displaced about the businesses' new locations and/or other options to meet their needs. In addition, the Council has been engaged in an extensive outreach effort with various stakeholders along the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor, including local business operators that may be impacted by the proposed BLRT Extension project to receive insight into daily operations and develop strategies to minimize impacts. To mitigate impacts on businesses during construction, the Council will develop a Construction Mitigation Plan, a Construction Communication Plan, and a construction staging plan. These tools will help the Council notify businesses and patrons in advance about any access issues or closures. The construction staging plan will also help businesses and patrons affected by LRT construction understand when construction would occur in different areas of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Finally, a 24-hour construction hotline will be available for issue resolution and information about LRT construction.
131J	Vanhala	Joan	Alliance for Metropolitan Stability	131	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Displacement is currently a real issue in the Bottineau LRT Corridor. The Northwest suburbs face inevitable displacement of privately owned affordable housing in the station areas. Cities in the corridor, Hennepin County and the Met Council commit to working with local neighborhood associations, private and community nonprofit housing developers to fund the maintenance and preservation of a rich balance of housing choices that are affordable for current and future	Displacement is a significant impact, and the proposed BLRT Extension project has proactively avoided these impacts since the release of the Draft EIS. The evaluation of Alignments D1 and D2 considered several environmental and social issues and impact areas, and the selection of Alignment D1 for the proposed BLRT Extension project avoids impacts to the north Minneapolis neighborhood, including the large number of displacements. Moreover, since publication of the Draft EIS, modifications to the preliminary design have resulted in the avoidance of any residential property

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Community Organizations

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
							residents and workers. Each city should establish goals to develop mixed-income communities.	<p>displacements with the proposed BLRT Extension project. The Council has been has been working with Hennepin County on the SAP efforts at each station, incorporating community input into the considerations of land uses, types of development, and other strategies to address neighborhood concerns and ensure that the investments promote growth and have benefits to the local communities. Section 4.1 of the Final EIS summarizes land use plan compatibility.</p> <p>The proposed BLRT Extension project would displace five businesses that may serve the EJ community. Therefore, the proposed BLRT Extension project would have a disproportionately high and adverse impact on EJ communities currently served by these businesses in Robbinsdale, Crystal, and Brooklyn Park. Chapter 7 – Environmental Justice of the Final EIS discusses this in more detail. The specific businesses cited that likely have a predominantly minority and/or low-income clientele include: Northside Oriental Market; American Furniture Mart; Unified Staffing, Inc. (tenant of Schrader Building); Hart Custom Homes (owner and tenant of Schrader Building); and Brianna’s Hair Studio (tenant of Schrader Building). For impacts to the communities served by the displaced businesses, the Council shall provide notices to the affected EJ community with the business’ new location (if a suitable relocation was identified) with transit options to access the new business location, and/or other options to meet their needs.</p>
131K	Vanhala	Joan	Alliance for Metropolitan Stability	131	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	AMS recommends that Metro Transit/Hennepin County develop a system that connects job seekers with employment and entrepreneurial opportunities throughout the Bottineau corridor. A system should be developed to ensure people of color have opportunities to secure employment with the Bottineau project.	<p>The Council has an established DBE program and includes specific goals in project contracts to increase participation by minority and women owned businesses. The Office of Equal Opportunity has an EO consultant designated to the proposed BLRT Extension project to conduct outreach and monitor progress towards meeting those goals. The Council has set a 3-year DBE goal of 15.5 percent for federal fiscal years 2013–2016.</p> <p>In addition to the DBE goal, the construction contracts would have a workforce goal for both minority and women workers. An additional EO consultant would be assigned to support these efforts when it gets closer to construction.</p> <p>To assist in achieving the DBE and workforce goals, the Council’s EO and the Council’s outreach and communication staff would hold workshops and networking mixers and attend events to inform people of employment and contracting opportunities. Other communication strategies would be used including social media, the BlueLineExt.org website, newsletters, and articles.</p>
131L	Vanhala	Joan	Alliance for Metropolitan Stability	131	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Brooklyn Park will have 5 stations on the Bottineau LRT line. The city of Brooklyn Park is 50% people of color. Through the Community Engagement team the Alliance is working with 6 environmental justice community groups in the Northwest suburbs. They will continue to be active partners in the development of the Bottineau Transitway project and corridor.	<p>The Council will continue to work closely with the city of Brooklyn Park, the Blue Line Coalition, and EJ populations located in Brooklyn Park throughout the Engineering phase of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Station design, which would happen during the Engineering phase of the proposed BLRT Extension project, would incorporate pedestrian and bike amenities and would be ADA-compliant. The Council has been has been working with Hennepin County on the SAP efforts at each station, incorporating community input into the considerations of land uses, types of development, and other strategies to address neighborhood concerns and ensure that the investments have benefits to the local communities.</p>

Asian Media Access (and Twin Cities Regional Center)

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
133A	Hwang	Ange	Asian Media Access	133	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Bottineau LRT corridor is 52% people of color and 14% are transit dependent. Bottineau Corridor connects 2 significant environmental justice communities to our regional transitway system – Brooklyn Park and North Minneapolis. It is important that the transit investment, the corresponding land use and economic development has community benefits for the low income communities and communities of color in the corridor. Have formed the Blue Line Coalition to secure community benefits for environmental justice communities in the Bottineau Corridor.	The study area for the EJ analysis documented 18.70 percent of the population below the poverty level and 48.40 percent of the study area population as minority groups. The proposed BLRT Extension project would benefit both EJ and non-EJ communities with reliable and higher-capacity service for transit riders, improved pedestrian and bicycle connections and access, and no permanent residential property displacements. The full list of community benefits can be found in Section 7.5 of the Final EIS. The Council engaged members of the Blue Line Coalition during the Final EIS development phase to better understand their concerns based on this comment in the Draft EIS and also conducted public outreach to identify additional EJ populations in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. The Council will continue to work with the Blue Line Coalition and conduct direct outreach to EJ populations as design advances. The Council has been working with Hennepin County on the SAP efforts at each station, incorporating community input into the considerations of land uses, types of development, and other strategies to address neighborhood concerns and ensure that the investments have benefits to the local communities.
133B	Hwang	Ange	Asian Media Access	133	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Recommends a corridor wide community compact similar to the Red Line Community Compact in Baltimore. The community compact process should model best practices in community engagement and be a partnership between Metro Transit, Hennepin County, the cities, and the environmental justice communities within the Bottineau LRT corridor.	The Council has developed a comprehensive public engagement process that has proven to be effective at addressing community concerns. The Blue Line Extension project has included the use of advisory committees, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ CMC that includes a representatives from each City Council along the alignment, Hennepin County, BAC chair, CAC chair, and two community organization members. This group meets monthly and provides recommendations to the Council on project decisions. ■ CAC that includes neighborhood and community representatives and discusses topics of concern or interest to the community such as safety, noise impacts, station location and design, and accessibility features. ■ BAC that includes business and chamber representatives and discusses topics of concern or interest to the business community such as access, construction impacts, station location and design. ■ Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee is a formal advisory committee of the Council that provides input and advice on concerns and interests to the ADA community including accessibility, station design, and pedestrian features. Members of this advisory committee serve on the CAC and BAC and have also participated in station design workshops to provide feedback on station features to ensure that they take into consideration use by those with limited vision, mobility or hearing. In addition to these formal advisory committees, the Council has conducted outreach and public engagement activities such as open houses, workshops and walking tours to seek public input on the design of the proposed BLRT Extension project. This approach to community engagement has proven effective on other Twin Cities transit projects, including the Blue Line (Hiawatha LRT) and Green Line (Central Corridor); therefore, a community compact was not necessary and was not created.
133C	Hwang	Ange	Asian Media Access	133	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	The environmental justice communities’ resources have not been adequately documented in the draft environmental impact statement. Just along HWY 55 there are schools, libraries, public housing, and churches. To truly understand the impacts, the corridor environmental justice community resources need to be documented and included in the planning process. This includes businesses, schools, churches, libraries, community centers, social service agencies and non profits.	The framework for the EJ evaluation incorporated in Chapter 7 of the Final EIS is based on FTA Circular 4703.1, which outlines a methodology that addresses Executive Order 12898 that includes both a robust public participation process and an analytical process that includes three basic steps: (1) Determine whether there are EJ populations potentially affected by the project; (2) If EJ populations are present, consider the potential effects of the project on the EJ population, including any disproportionate high and adverse effects; (3) Determine whether any adverse effect could be avoided, minimized, or mitigated. Chapter 7 of the Final EIS lists organizations where outreach efforts were targeted to further identify EJ communities. The Council engaged members of the Blue Line Coalition during the Final EIS development phase to better understand their concerns based on this comment in the Draft EIS and also conducted

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Community Organizations

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								<p>public outreach to identify additional EJ populations in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. This resulted in adding additional organizations, such as Summit Academy OIC into the Final EIS.</p> <p>The proposed BLRT Extension project would displace five businesses that may serve the EJ community. Therefore, the proposed BLRT Extension project would have a disproportionately high and adverse impact on EJ communities currently served by these businesses in Robbinsdale, Crystal, and Brooklyn Park. Chapter 7 of the Final EIS discusses this in more detail. The specific businesses cited that likely have a predominantly minority and/or low-income clientele include: Northside Oriental Market; American Furniture Mart; Unified Staffing, Inc. (tenant of Schrader Building); Hart Custom Homes (owner and tenant of Schrader Building); and Brianna’s Hair Studio (tenant of Schrader Building). For impacts to the communities served by the displaced businesses, the Council shall provide notices to the affected EJ community with the business’ new location (if a suitable relocation was identified) with transit options to access the new business location, and/or other options to meet their needs.</p> <p>Section 4.2 of the Final EIS summarizes community facilities documented and analyzed as part of the proposed BLRT Extension project. This includes schools, churches, libraries, community centers, social service agencies and non-profits. No mitigation measures are warranted for long-term neighborhood and community impacts, because the effectiveness of mitigation measures identified for specific environmental categories (including but not limited to noise, vibration, visual quality and aesthetics, transit, roadways and traffic, parking, and pedestrian and bicyclist considerations) would prevent adverse impacts.</p>
133D	Hwang	Ange	Asian Media Access	134	Email	5 – Social and Economic Effects	No mention of minorities community-based agencies in North Minneapolis	Asian Media Access was identified in the Draft EIS as an EJ organization. The Final EIS also includes Asian Media Access as an EJ organization. The full list of organizations included in the Final EIS can be found in Chapter 7.
133E	Hwang	Ange	Asian Media Access	135	Email	6 – Social and Economic Effects	Recommend that BLRT Extension project planners contract directly with community groups for future engagement.	For the proposed BLRT Extension project, the Council has implemented a comprehensive public outreach program that has engaged nearby communities and underrepresented groups in the proposed BLRT Extension project design and engineering process. This includes appointing two voting members to the CMC that represent the Blue Line Coalition (a community-based group working to advance local and regional equity and community health along the Blue Line corridor). The Council has also established a BAC and CAC to seek public input and advise the CMC and the Council. The Council will continue to engage community groups directly and via local/ neighborhood-based media to inform on project progress.
133F	Hwang	Ange	Asian Media Access	133	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Because of the overlapping transitway corridors and planning areas, AMS is recommending coordinated planning across these transit projects by Metro Transit, Hennepin County, and the City of Minneapolis.	Planning for the proposed BLRT Extension project involved extensive outreach and coordination with the affected public, agencies, and key stakeholders. Key stakeholder outreach activities conducted during EIS Scoping and the development of the EIS are summarized in Section 9.2 of the Final EIS. Stakeholder advisory committees included staff from the Council, Hennepin County, Metro Transit, the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor municipalities, and several others.
133G	Hwang	Ange	Asian Media Access	133	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	Olson Memorial Highway/HWY 55 is currently not pedestrian friendly or safe. The Bottineau LRT project has the potential to provide the opportunity to reconstruct this corridor to be safe and welcoming for pedestrians and bikes with traffic calming strategies. Special attention should be given to redesigning HWY 55 with safe and livable crossing connections for pedestrians and bicycles. HWY 55 currently is a barrier within this environmental justice community. The Bottineau LRT project has the potential to exacerbate this barrier.	Chapter 3 – Transportation of the Final EIS addresses improvements to Olson Memorial Highway. Two stations would provide access to the communities along the highway: Penn Avenue Station and Van White Boulevard Station. While a six-lane roadway would be maintained, the lane widths would be reduced to 11 feet to accommodate pedestrian crossing length. The design speed and posted speed limit would be reduced to 35 mph (from 40 mph). Existing sidewalks would be replaced with 6-foot-wide sidewalks on the north and south sides of the highway. Pedestrian refuges would be added in the median of the highway. ADA-compliant pedestrian crossings of Olson Memorial Highway would be facilitated by proposed signalized intersections at Bryant Avenue North, Van White Boulevard, Humboldt Avenue, James Avenue, Morgan Avenue, midblock between Newton Avenue and Oliver Avenue, Penn Avenue, Russell Avenue, and Thomas Avenue. The proposed BLRT Extension project would provide space on the north side of Olson Memorial Highway for a 10-foot two-way cycle track

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Community Organizations

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								(to be constructed by others) between Thomas Avenue and Van White Memorial Boulevard. The proposed BLRT Extension project would construct a multi-use trail on the north side of the reconstructed westbound Olson Memorial Highway bridge, providing connections to the Luce Line Trail and to trails within TWRP.
133H	Hwang	Ange	Asian Media Access	133	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Throughout the Bottineau Corridor there are environmental justice small businesses. Every effort should be made to maximize the benefit and minimize the impacts of the project on these entrepreneurs.	Chapter 7 of the Final EIS includes additional discussion and analysis of the benefits of the proposed BLRT Extension project to the EJ communities, in addition to the evaluation of potential impacts. Ten business operations would be displaced as a part of the proposed BLRT Extension project. These businesses would be relocated in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and compensated by payment of fair market value for their property. Five of these business operations are considered EJ businesses, either serving EJ populations or are owned by minority or low income people. The Council would also provide information to the communities where businesses would be displaced about the businesses' new locations and/or other options to meet their needs. In addition, the Council has been engaged in an extensive outreach effort with various stakeholders along the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor, including local business operators that may be impacted by the proposed BLRT Extension project to receive insight into daily operations and develop strategies to minimize impacts. To mitigate impacts on businesses during construction, the Council will develop a Construction Mitigation Plan, a Construction Communication Plan, and a construction staging plan. These tools will help the Council notify businesses and patrons in advance about any access issues or closures. The construction staging plan will also help businesses and patrons affected by LRT construction understand when construction would occur in different areas of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Finally, a 24-hour construction hotline will be available for issue resolution and information about LRT construction.
133I	Hwang	Ange	Asian Media Access	133	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Land use planning and zoning reviews should be conducted with neighbors and business owners.	Local municipalities have land use controls available to them in the form of comprehensive plans guiding land use and city zoning codes guiding development. Overall, the proposed BLRT Extension project would be compatible with the local comprehensive plans, land use and other planning policies of the cities of Minneapolis, Golden Valley, Robbinsdale, Crystal, and Brooklyn Park. Although the city of Golden Valley's comprehensive plan does not specifically mention the proposed BLRT Extension project, LRT would be compatible with the transit goal and objective of the city's comprehensive plan. The Council does not have local land use planning jurisdiction, which is why the compatibility with local jurisdiction land use plans is an important component to the environmental impact analysis. The proposed BLRT Extension project would also be compatible with regional land use planning policies. The Council has been working with Hennepin County on the SAP efforts at each station, incorporating community input into the considerations of land uses, types of development, and other strategies to address neighborhood concerns and ensure that the investments promote growth and have benefits to the local communities. Section 4.1 of the Final EIS summarizes land use plan compatibility.
133J	Vang	Penny	Twin Cities Regional Center Collaborative	133	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Call for more balanced development approach that supports small businesses. Three strategies: one block at a time, equitable transit oriented placemaking, and cluster focus.	Economic effects are summarized in Section 4.6 of the Final EIS. Local land use is governed by local municipalities. Hennepin County has led a SAP effort with each community along the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor to create a vision for the area that reflects the community's goals and ensures that LRT infrastructure is effectively integrated with the surrounding community. See www.hennepin.us/residents/transportation/bottineau-community-works for more information about the SAP.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Community Organizations

CAPI

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
136A	Racho	Jennifer	CAPI USA	136	Email	3 – NEPA Process & Public Involvement	Most of our CAPI participants reside in Brooklyn Park, Brooklyn Center and North Minneapolis within the areas of the Bottineau Light Rail transit construction and transit line. They will be affected by all light rail developments and CAPI is working to ensure that their voices are heard throughout this entire process.	Chapter 9 of the Final EIS provides a summary of public involvement for the Final EIS, including a summary of open houses held during Final EIS preparation. The Council engages and will continue to engage the public in the preliminary engineering process and into construction. The Council 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. Chapter 7 of the Final EIS describes outreach efforts to EJ communities in Brooklyn Park and corridor-wide.
136B	Racho	Jennifer	CAPI USA	136	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Group that represents EJ communities and wants to create a dialogue with LRT affiliated entities to ensure that processes and policies are changed to authentically and equitably serve needs of public.	Section 9.2.1.4 of the Final EIS details the establishment of the CAC, which serves as a voice for the community and advises the CMC during the planning and implementation phases of the light rail line. The CAC comprises representatives from the Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee; Masjid An-Nur; MICAH; the Asian Economic Development Association; the cities of Brooklyn Park, Crystal, Golden Valley, Minneapolis, and Robbinsdale; and MPRB. The CAC has met on an approximately monthly basis to advise the Council on the development of the proposed BLRT Extension project. CAC meeting summaries and membership can be found on the website for the proposed BLRT Extension project, BlueLineExt.org . Additionally, there are two voting members on the BLRT CMC that represent the Blue Line Coalition (a community-based group working to advance local and regional equity and community health along the Blue Line corridor).
136C	Racho	Jennifer	CAPI USA	136	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering & Design	We prefer that all 4 station stops are implemented because we recognize that residents and participants live all along these 4 stations. However, if only 3 were possible, our surveyed CAPI participants prefer the Golden Valley station.	All four stations—the Penn Avenue, Van White Boulevard, Plymouth Avenue, and Golden Valley Road stations—are included in the proposed BLRT Extension project scope and cost estimate. The proposed BLRT Extension project would improve the transportation system by providing the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor with more travel choices and faster travel times between residential areas, major destinations, and employment centers. Chapter 3 of the Final EIS presents a summary of the stations within the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor.
136D	Racho	Jennifer	CAPI USA	136	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering & Design	For all the stations, there needs to be constant lighting, signs in Hmong and other languages, and an emergency call button to talk to multi-lingual transit staff, especially those who speak Hmong, 24 hours a day.	All LRT stations are equipped with lighting, security cameras, and emergency phones. Contact through the emergency phone system is directed to Metro Transit emergency response center or the local police department. Interpretive services are available for Metro Transit Police and local police department. The ticket vending machines on the station platforms have a Hmong, Spanish, and Somali language option. Metro Transit provides a telephone interpretation service called Language Line that allows phone representatives to provide trip plans and transit information in 170 languages, including Hmong, with the help of translators. Language Line is available at 612-373-3333.
136E	Racho	Jennifer	CAPI USA	136	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	Need ample parking spots for riders who prefer a park and ride option. Want a parking lot for the Van White station.	No park-and-ride facilities would be located in the City of Minneapolis for the proposed BLRT Extension project, the community closest to the Van White Boulevard Station. Chapter 3 of the Final EIS describes each station along the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. The city of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and the Council have been working on the SAP efforts at each station, incorporating community input into the considerations of land uses, types of development, and other strategies to address neighborhood concerns and ensure that the investments have benefits to the local communities. The Station Area Plan for the Van White Boulevard Station recommends mixed use residential and medium density residential for future land use.
136F	Racho	Jennifer	CAPI USA	136	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	All residents along the West Broadway portion of the line are minimally impacted and if their property is destroyed or impacted in any way, they are equitably financially compensated.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project from Candlewood to 93rd Avenue in Brooklyn Park. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the roadway project was completed in September 2015 and a Negative Declaration finding was issued in December. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives of the Final EIS. No residential property displacements are

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Community Organizations

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								anticipated as a result of implementing the proposed BLRT Extension project (see Section 4.3 of the Final EIS). Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects of the Final EIS describes the effects with both the LRT and roadway project together.
136G	Racho	Jennifer	CAPI USA	136	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Construction job quota for people of color, those with English as a second language, immigrants and refugees, and residents within the corridor.	The Council has an established DBE program and includes specific goals in project contracts to increase participation by minority and women owned businesses. The Office of Equal Opportunity has an EO consultant designated to the proposed BLRT Extension project to conduct outreach and monitor progress towards meeting those goals. The Council has set a 3-year DBE goal of 15.5 percent for federal fiscal years 2013–2016. In addition to the DBE goal, the construction contracts would have a workforce goal for both minority and women workers. An additional EO consultant would be assigned to support these efforts when it gets closer to construction.
136H	Racho	Jennifer	CAPI USA	136	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Clearer signs to find the train stations, louder intercom volume on train, longer train door opening time, and multilingual signage.	Station design, including signage and wayfinding, would be designed to be ADA-compliant. Station design would be addressed in the Engineering phase of project development. Community input would be sought on station design during this phase.

City of Lakes Community Land Trust

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
139A	Horwitz	Staci	City of Lakes Community Land Trust	139	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	DEIS lacks evaluation of longer-term impacts to low income neighborhoods as development occurs along the transit corridor. No mitigation for ensuring low income and minority populations are not displaced by being priced out of the market. There is no evaluation of social and economic impact if significant displacement occurs as a result of transit oriented development.	The Draft EIS and Final EIS acknowledge the potential for indirect, growth-inducing impacts of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Hennepin County is advancing Station Area Plans at each proposed BLRT station, and input from each community, including concerns for equity and affordability, is integrated into the planning process. Chapter 7 – Environmental Justice of the Final EIS evaluated the long-term indirect economic impacts to EJ communities. Properties within 0.5 mile of a transit station may experience some level of increase in property value, which would benefit property owners, but negatively impact renters. Of the block 45 block groups within 0.5 mile of a proposed station, 26 block groups (58 percent) have a majority owner-occupied housing units. Since a larger number of units are owner-occupied, more residents would likely perceive an overall benefit to property values with implementation of the proposed BLRT Extension project. All of the residents in these block groups, regardless of occupancy status, would receive the benefit of access to the Blue Line and the potential to reduce their transportation costs.
139B	Horwitz	Staci	City of Lakes Community Land Trust	139	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	DEIS should consider issues in comment ID 139A with respect to environmental justice populations.	See response to comment 139A.
139C	Horwitz	Staci	City of Lakes Community Land Trust	139	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	An analysis of the economic and neighborhood impact of zoning-related restrictions on land use would be helpful in understanding where policy changes could be beneficial and leveraged to maximize this transit investment. Higher density, mixed-used developments have been identified repeatedly as an element needed to support economic growth in North Minneapolis.	Local municipalities have land use controls available to them in the form of comprehensive plans guiding land use and city zoning codes guiding development. The Council has been working with Hennepin County on the SAP efforts at each station, incorporating community input into the considerations of land uses, types of development, and other strategies to address neighborhood concerns and ensure that the investments have benefits to the local communities. The Station Area Plans for North Minneapolis recommend higher density residential and mixed use developments to support transit oriented development.
139D	Horwitz	Staci	City of Lakes Community Land Trust	139	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	TH 55 already impacts the overall community character of North Minneapolis by creating an indirect separation of the Harrison Neighborhood from the rest of North Minneapolis. Implementation of the Bottineau LRT [in the BNSF Corridor] may create further segregation of this community with the elimination of the many “illegal” crossing points.	The unauthorized crossings into TWRP across the BNSF Railway (BNSF) tracks at-grade would be fenced off during construction and permanently fenced off once the proposed BLRT Extension project is in operation due to safety concerns related to LRT and freight train operations with unauthorized pedestrian access. However, grade-separated crossings of the BNSF corridor at Golden Valley Road, Theodore Wirth Parkway, Plymouth Avenue, and Olson Memorial Highway would be maintained

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Community Organizations

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								permanently and the proposed BLRT Extension project would improve these crossings by reconstructing the bridges with multi-use pedestrian/bicycle facilities. Temporary access impacts during construction will be mitigated by the development of a Construction Communications Plan, which will be used to coordinate with emergency service providers as well as the public. See Section 4.7 of the Final EIS for additional discussion on this topic.
139E	Horwitz	Staci	City of Lakes Community Land Trust	139	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	Need adequate crossings of TH55; how will the number of crossing areas separate from station stops be determined?	Chapter 3 – Transportation of the Final EIS addresses improvements to Olson Memorial Highway. Two stations would provide access to the communities along the highway: Penn Avenue Station and Van White Boulevard Station. While a six-lane roadway would be maintained, the lane widths would be reduced to 11 feet to accommodate pedestrian crossing length. The design speed and posted speed limit would be reduced to 35 mph. Existing sidewalks would be replaced with 6-foot-wide sidewalks on the north and south sides of the highway. Pedestrian refuges would be added in the median of the highway. ADA-compliant pedestrian crossings of Olson Memorial Highway would be facilitated by proposed signalized intersections at Bryant Avenue North, Van White Boulevard, Humboldt Avenue, James Avenue, Morgan Avenue, midblock between Newton Avenue and Oliver Avenue, Penn Avenue, Russell Avenue, and Thomas Avenue. The proposed BLRT Extension project would provide space on the north side of Olson Memorial Highway for a 10-foot two-way cycle track (to be constructed by others) between Thomas Avenue and Van White Memorial Boulevard. The proposed BLRT Extension project would construct a multi-use trail on the north side of the reconstructed westbound Olson Memorial Highway bridge.

Downtown Minneapolis Transportation Management Organization

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
142A	Davis	Lee	Downtown Minneapolis Transportation Management Organization	142	Email & US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Supports BLRT project. Project will be important for employment and development activity.	See Master Response 2 in Section G.4.1 of Appendix G of the Final EIS

Harrison Neighborhood Association

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
146A	Willis	Kennedy	Harrison Neighborhood Association	146	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	EJ needs must be fully considered.	Chapter 7 of the Final EIS summarizes the EJ analysis. The study area for the EJ analysis documented 18.70 percent of the population below the poverty level and 48.40 percent of the study area population as minority groups. The proposed BLRT Extension project would benefit both EJ and non-EJ communities with reliable and higher-capacity service for transit riders, improved pedestrian and bicycle connections and access, and no permanent residential property displacements. The full list of community benefits can be found in Section 7.5 of the Final EIS. The Council engaged members of the Blue Line Coalition during the Final EIS development phase to better understand their concerns based on this comment in the Draft EIS and also conducted public outreach to identify additional EJ populations in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. The Council will continue to work with the Blue Line Coalition and conduct direct outreach to EJ populations as design advances. The Council has been working with Hennepin County on the SAP efforts at each station, incorporating community input into the considerations of land uses, types of development, and other strategies to address neighborhood concerns and ensure that the investments have benefits to the local communities
146B	Willis	Kennedy	Harrison Neighborhood Association	146	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Believes that the EJ communities are bearing disproportionate weight of development burdens and requests more collaborative and comprehensive plans between different levels of government.	The potential for disproportionately high and adverse effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project to be borne by EJ communities was evaluated by FTA in Chapter 7 – Environmental Justice of the Final EIS. This evaluation also documents how EJ communities were engaged in the proposed BLRT Extension project process and provided the opportunity for input during planning phases. Planning for the proposed BLRT Extension project involved extensive outreach and coordination with the affected public, agencies, and key stakeholders. Key stakeholder outreach activities conducted during EIS Scoping and the development of the EIS are summarized in Section 9.2 of the Final EIS. Stakeholder advisory committees included staff from the Council, Hennepin County, Metro Transit, the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor municipalities, and several others.
146H	Willis	Kennedy	Harrison Neighborhood Association	146	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Pedestrian safety across Olson to LRT should be considered.	Chapter 3 – Transportation of the Final EIS addresses improvements to Olson Memorial Highway. Two stations would provide access to the communities along the highway: Penn Avenue Station and Van White Boulevard Station. While a six-lane roadway would be maintained, the lane widths would be reduced to 11 feet to accommodate pedestrian crossing length. The design speed and posted speed limit would be reduced to 35 mph. Existing sidewalks would be replaced with 6-foot-wide sidewalks on the north and south sides of the highway. Pedestrian refuges would be added in the median of the highway. ADA-compliant pedestrian crossings of Olson Memorial Highway would be facilitated by proposed signalized intersections at Bryant Avenue North, Van White Boulevard, Humboldt Avenue, James Avenue, Morgan Avenue, midblock between Newton Avenue and Oliver Avenue, Penn Avenue, Russell Avenue, and Thomas Avenue. The proposed BLRT Extension project would provide space on the north side of Olson Memorial Highway for a 10-foot two-way cycle track (to be constructed by others) between Thomas Avenue and Van White Memorial Boulevard. The proposed BLRT Extension project would construct a multi-use trail on the north side of the reconstructed westbound Olson Memorial Highway bridge.
146J	Willis	Kennedy	Harrison Neighborhood Association	146	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	There is a need for rapid connection between the Blue Line and the SWLRT along Penn Avenue.	The Southwest Green Line Extension and proposed BLRT Extension project Draft Feeder Bus Plan includes a proposed Route 26, which would connect stations on both lines. The proposed bus network would be refined with input from the public prior to the proposed BLRT Extension project opening day. Additionally, planning for the C Line, Bus Rapid Transit along Penn Avenue began in 2013. The proposed BLRT Extension project is anticipated to begin detailed design and engineering in 2016 and start construction in 2017 pending full project funding. The C Line would connect to the Southwest LRT at the Royalston Station.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Community Organizations

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
146C	Willis	Kennedy	Harrison Neighborhood Association	146	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering & Design	supportive of LRT	See Master Response 2 in Section G.4.1 of Appendix G of the Final EIS
146D	Willis	Kennedy	Harrison Neighborhood Association	146	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Supportive of LRT if there will be development along Olson Memorial Hwy.	Local land use is governed by local municipalities. Hennepin County has led a SAP effort with each community along the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor to create a vision for the area that reflects the community’s goals and ensures that LRT infrastructure is effectively integrated with the surrounding community. The Minneapolis Station Area Plan along Olson Memorial Highway recommends mixed use residential and medium density residential to support transit oriented development. See www.hennepin.us/residents/transportation/bottineau-community-works for more information about the SAP.
146E	Willis	Kennedy	Harrison Neighborhood Association	146	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Request action to mitigate harm created in efforts to site OMF facilities in surrounding communities.	The Final EIS describes the location of the 140,000-square-foot Operations and Maintenance Facility (OMF), which is proposed at the north end of the proposed BLRT Extension project in Brooklyn Park. This area today is largely undeveloped, but through SAP efforts, the city of Brooklyn Park and Hennepin County have developed a master plan for the area, integrating the OMF with mixed use commercial and office development, and greenspace. See Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for a more detailed description of the OMF. The OMF site requires acquisition of two undeveloped parcels owned by the city of Brooklyn Park, however no displacements would be required to construct the OMF. The OMF would be an adverse impact on the surrounding area. The OMF and related project elements, including landscaping and visual screening, would be designed in coordination with the city of Brooklyn Park and the Three Rivers Park District and in accordance with local zoning ordinances.
146F	Willis	Kennedy	Harrison Neighborhood Association	146	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	Concern that the Draft EIS does not consider other ongoing community and public works projects such as Penn Ave Community Works, the North Minneapolis Greenway project, the Penn Avenue BRT project and the Great Streets Initiative.	The Final EIS incorporates the ongoing planning of the Penn Avenue BRT project (C Line) and other transit projects. See Chapter 3 of the Final EIS for more information about how other planned transit projects were incorporated into the analysis for the Final EIS. Hennepin County has been doing extensive bike planning work focusing on connecting bikes and transit. The Council has used the 2040 Bicycle Transportation Plan (2015) as a guide for ongoing design of bike facilities. The plan is available at this website: www.hennepin.us/residents/transportation/biking . The city of Minneapolis is also a project partner in the proposed BLRT Extension project planning and has provided input on other ongoing projects so the Council can better coordinate with other planned projects.
146G	Willis	Kennedy	Harrison Neighborhood Association	146	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Omission of community resources that are important to EJ communities.	The Council has implemented a comprehensive public outreach program that has engaged nearby communities and underrepresented groups, including the Summit Academy OIC and Wayman AME Church. Coordination with these groups will continue throughout the course of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Project staff have met with leadership at these organizations to discuss future construction needs for the proposed BLRT Extension and Green Line LRT Extension projects. The Council engaged members of the Blue Line Coalition during the Final EIS development phase to better understand their concerns based on this comment in the Draft EIS and also conducted public outreach to identify additional EJ populations in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. This resulted in documenting additional organizations into the Final EIS. The proposed BLRT Extension project would displace five businesses that may serve the EJ community. Therefore, the proposed BLRT Extension project would have a disproportionately high and adverse impact on EJ communities currently served by these businesses in Robbinsdale, Crystal, and Brooklyn Park. Chapter 7 – Environmental Justice of the Final EIS discusses this in more detail. The specific businesses cited that likely have a predominantly minority and/or low-income clientele include: Northside Oriental Market; American Furniture Mart; Unified Staffing, Inc. (tenant of Schrader Building); Hart Custom Homes (owner and tenant of Schrader

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Community Organizations

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								Building); and Brianna’s Hair Studio (tenant of Schrader Building). For impacts to the communities served by the displaced businesses, the Council shall provide notices to the affected EJ community with the business’ new location (if a suitable relocation was identified) with transit options to access the new business location, and/or other options to meet their needs. Section 4.2 of the Final EIS summarizes community facilities documented and analyzed as part of the proposed BLRT Extension project. This includes schools, churches, libraries, community centers, social service agencies and non-profits. No mitigation measures are warranted for long-term neighborhood and community impacts, because the effectiveness of mitigation measures identified for specific environmental categories (including but not limited to noise, vibration, visual quality and aesthetics, transit, roadways and traffic, parking, and pedestrian and bicyclist considerations) would prevent adverse impacts.
146K	Willis	Kennedy	Harrison Neighborhood Association	146	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Station area development that facilitates health equity and wealth development of the community	A Health Impact Assessment was published by Hennepin County in 2013, prior to the Draft EIS publishing. The Council has been working with Hennepin County on the SAP efforts at each station, incorporating community input into the considerations of land uses, types of development, and other strategies to address neighborhood concerns and ensure that the investments have benefits to the local communities. The SAP effort and the ongoing design for the proposed BLRT Extension project have health equity and economic development goals.
146L	Willis	Kennedy	Harrison Neighborhood Association	146	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Equity commitments that Harrison has contributed to and that have been circulated in relation to the Green Line extension/SWLRT, especially where the commitment requests apply to the Blue Line planning and development	The Council recognizes the need to address equity in planning and development of new transit development and <i>Thrive 2040 MSP</i> outlines strategies to work toward a more equitable region. For the proposed BLRT Extension project, the Council has developed a comprehensive public engagement process that has proven to be effective at addressing community concerns. The proposed Blue Line Extension project has included the use of advisory committees, giving a voice to citizens, EJ organizations and neighborhood groups. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ CMC that includes a representatives from each City Council along the alignment, Hennepin County, BAC chair, CAC chair, and two community organization members. This group meets monthly and provides recommendations to the Council on project decisions. ■ CAC that includes neighborhood and community representatives (including Harrison) and discusses topics of concern or interest to the community such as safety, noise impacts, station location and design, and accessibility features. ■ BAC that includes business and chamber representatives and discusses topics of concern or interest to the business community such as access, construction impacts, station location and design. ■ Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee is a formal advisory committee of the Council that provides input and advice on concerns and interests to the ADA community including accessibility, station design, and pedestrian features. Members of this advisory committee serve on the CAC and BAC and have also participated in station design workshops to provide feedback on station features to ensure that they take into consideration use by those with limited vision, mobility or hearing. In addition to these formal advisory committees, the Council has conducted outreach and public engagement activities such as open houses, workshops and walking tours to seek public input on the design of the proposed BLRT Extension project. This approach to community engagement has proven effective on other Twin Cities transit projects, including the Blue Line (Hiawatha LRT) and Green Line (Central Corridor); therefore, a community compact was not necessary and was not created.

Heritage Park Neighborhood Association

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
148A	Cole	Terra	Heritage Park Neighborhood Association	148	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	<p>Important to ensure economic, racial and age cohesion of the Heritage Park/Sumner-Glenwood neighborhood. Bifurcation of the neighborhood separating the neighborhood into two districts: the “White and affluent” southside 55405 “good zip code” with its businesses, high income housing and lion’s share of neighborhood amenities and the “Colored” northside 55411 “bad zip code” with 90% rental, low income housing, no economic amenities and continued perception of being the “new projects. Due diligence must be served as to not leave current residents at a disadvantage or return to the days prior to the Holman Decree by creating a concentrated area of race and poverty.</p>	<p>Hennepin County is advancing Station Area Plans at each proposed BLRT station, which include housing considerations, based on the communities’ concerns for equity and affordability. The proposed BLRT Extension project would directly serve residents in the 55411 ZIP code with stations at Van White Boulevard, Penn Avenue, Plymouth Avenue, and Golden Valley Road. It would also serve the residents in the 55405 ZIP code neighborhood. The improvements proposed for Olson Memorial Highway would create a better pedestrian environment to improve community cohesion between the communities north and south of the highway. See Response 148B on specific design improvements on Olson Memorial Highway.</p> <p>Local land use is governed by local municipalities. Hennepin County has led a SAP effort with each community along the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor to create a vision for the area that reflects the community’s goals and ensures that LRT infrastructure is effectively integrated with the surrounding community. The Minneapolis Station Area Plan recommends mixed use residential and medium density residential to support transit oriented development. They also envision a mixed income neighborhood with new market-rate housing to stabilize the already existing affordable housing and catalyze new development in the neighborhood. See www.hennepin.us/residents/transportation/bottineau-community-works for more information about the SAP.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Council has established programs to encourage affordable housing planning and implementation that may offset potential indirect impacts to low-income persons. See Section 7.4.6 of the Final EIS for a discussion on indirect impacts and cumulative effects on EJ populations. The findings from the Fair Housing equity assessment (FHEA) identified a need to address equity in affordable housing and the policies to address this issue are included in the <i>Thrive MSP 2040</i>, Housing Policy Plan (www.metrocouncil.org/Housing/Planning/2040-Housing-Policy-Plan.aspx). The Council’s role is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Work with communities to create a mix of housing affordability, including subsidies to strategically locate market-rate housing in areas that lack such options as well as affordable housing in areas that lack affordability. ■ Use Livable Communities Act resources to both catalyze private investment in areas of concentrated poverty and attract affordable housing to higher-income areas. ■ Work with our partners and stakeholders to identify indicators to measure how projects, supported with Council resources, advance equity, including providing opportunities to residents of areas of concentrated poverty, lower-income households, and people with disabilities. ■ Identify and address institutional challenges and barriers, including a lack of funding, to affordable housing development in Suburban, Suburban Edge, and Emerging Suburban Edge locations. ■ Encourage private market interest in these targeted areas through transit investments, education, and marketing support to local communities. <p>To comply with the Metropolitan Land Planning Act and remain consistent with the Housing Policy Plan, the Council requires cities to demonstrate how affordable housing needs can be met in their local comprehensive plan updates. Cities must demonstrate how their comprehensive plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Addresses the future housing need for forecasted growth. ■ Acknowledges its allocation for future affordable housing need. ■ Guides sufficient land at minimum residential densities of 8 units/acre to support the city’s total allocation of affordable housing need.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Community Organizations

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
148B	Cole	Terra	Heritage Park Neighborhood Association	148	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	The need to provide safe, viable pathways for pedestrians, bikers and those who are visually and physically disabled by creating sustainable pathways to existing & future amenities, on the southside of Olson Highway.	Chapter 3 – Transportation of the Final EIS addresses improvements to Olson Memorial Highway. Two stations would provide access to the communities along the highway: Penn Avenue Station and Van White Boulevard Station. While a six-lane roadway would be maintained, the lane widths would be reduced to 11 feet to accommodate pedestrian crossing length. The design speed and posted speed limit would be reduced to 35 mph. Existing sidewalks would be replaced with 6-foot-wide sidewalks on the north and south sides of the highway. Pedestrian refuges would be added in the median of the highway. ADA-compliant pedestrian crossings of Olson Memorial Highway would be facilitated by proposed signalized intersections at Bryant Avenue North, Van White Boulevard, Humboldt Avenue, James Avenue, Morgan Avenue, midblock between Newton Avenue and Oliver Avenue, Penn Avenue, Russell Avenue, and Thomas Avenue. The proposed BLRT Extension project would provide space on the north side of Olson Memorial Highway for a 10-foot two-way cycle track (to be constructed by others) between Thomas Avenue and Van White Memorial Boulevard. The proposed BLRT Extension project would construct a multi-use trail on the north side of the reconstructed westbound Olson Memorial Highway bridge.
148C	Cole	Terra	Heritage Park Neighborhood Association	148	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	There is a lack of a significant plan to create economic development opportunities on both sides of station stops for residents who live on northside of Olson.	Economic effects are summarized in Section 4.6 of the Final EIS. Local land use is governed by local municipalities. Hennepin County has led a SAP effort with each community along the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor to create a vision for the area that reflects the community’s goals and ensures that LRT infrastructure is effectively integrated with the surrounding community. The Minneapolis Station Area Plan recommends mixed use residential and medium density residential to support transit oriented development. See www.hennepin.us/residents/transportation/bottineau-community-works for more information about the SAP.
148D	Cole	Terra	Heritage Park Neighborhood Association	148	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	The historical and continued isolation the neighborhood and its residents experience because area parks, trails and pedestrian pathways are not connected to downtown, the Kenwood/Walker Art Center and the proposed North Minneapolis Greenway.	See response to 148B.
148E	Cole	Terra	Heritage Park Neighborhood Association	148	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Gentrification; in that those with “money” will be white and those “without” and “on assistance” will be of color. With over 80% of current residents hailing from Somali, African American, Ethiopian, Asian, Hispanic, descent, it is imperative that a transit/stationary stop plan takes into consideration an even split in housing unit density on both sides of the stationary stop that provides pathways for ownership to current residents as well as new.	See response to 148A.

Masjid An-Nur

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
156A	Shabazz	Aasim	Masjid An-Nur	156	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	Bottineau LRT corridor is 52% people of color and 14% are transit dependent. Bottineau Corridor. connects 2 significant environmental justice communities to our regional transitway system – Brooklyn Park and North Minneapolis. It is Important that the transit investment, the corresponding land use and economic development has community benefits for the low income communities and communities of color in the corridor. Have formed the Blue Line Coalition to secure community benefits for environmental justice communities in the Bottineau Corridor.	The study area for the EJ analysis documented 18.70 percent of the population below the poverty level and 48.40 percent of the study area population as minority groups. The proposed BLRT Extension project would benefit both EJ and non-EJ communities with reliable and higher-capacity service for transit riders, improved pedestrian and bicycle connections and access, and no permanent residential property displacements. The full list of community benefits can be found in Section 7.5 of the Final EIS. The Council engaged members of the Blue Line Coalition during the Final EIS development phase to better understand their concerns based on this comment in the Draft EIS and also conducted public outreach to identify additional EJ populations in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. The Council will continue to work with the Blue Line Coalition and conduct direct outreach to EJ populations as design advances. The Council has been working with Hennepin County on the SAP efforts at each station, incorporating community input into the considerations of land uses, types of development, and other strategies to address neighborhood concerns and ensure that the investments have benefits to the local communities.
156B	Shabazz	Aasim	Masjid An-Nur	156	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	Recommends a corridor wide community compact similar to the Red Line Community Compact in Baltimore. The community compact process should model best practices in community engagement and be a partnership between Metro Transit, Hennepin County, the cities, and the environmental justice communities within the Bottineau LRT corridor.	The Council has developed a comprehensive public engagement process that has proven to be effective at addressing community concerns. The Blue Line Extension project has included the use of advisory committees, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ CMC that includes a representatives from each City Council along the alignment, Hennepin County, BAC chair, CAC chair, and two community organization members. This group meets monthly and provides recommendations to the Council on project decisions. ■ CAC that includes neighborhood and community representatives and discusses topics of concern or interest to the community such as safety, noise impacts, station location and design, and accessibility features. ■ BAC that includes business and chamber representatives and discusses topics of concern or interest to the business community such as access, construction impacts, station location and design. ■ Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee is a formal advisory committee of the Council that provides input and advice on concerns and interests to the ADA community including accessibility, station design, and pedestrian features. Members of this advisory committee serve on the CAC and BAC and have also participated in station design workshops to provide feedback on station features to ensure that they take into consideration use by those with limited vision, mobility or hearing. In addition to these formal advisory committees, the Council has conducted outreach and public engagement activities such as open houses, workshops and walking tours to seek public input on the design of the proposed BLRT Extension project. This approach to community engagement has proven effective on other Twin Cities transit projects, including the Blue Line (Hiawatha LRT) and Green Line (Central Corridor); therefore, a community compact was not necessary and was not created.
156C	Shabazz	Aasim	Masjid An-Nur	156	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	EJ community resources have not be adequately documented	The Council has implemented a comprehensive public outreach program that has engaged nearby communities and underrepresented groups, including the Summit Academy OIC and Wayman AME Church. Coordination with these groups will continue throughout the course of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Project staff have met with leadership at these organizations to discuss future construction needs for the proposed BLRT Extension project and Green Line LRT Extension projects. The Council engaged members of the Blue Line Coalition during the Final EIS development phase to better understand their concerns based on this comment in the Draft EIS and also conducted public outreach to identify additional EJ populations in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. This resulted in adding additional organizations into the Final EIS.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Community Organizations

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								The proposed BLRT Extension project would displace five businesses that may serve the EJ community. Therefore, the proposed BLRT Extension project would have a disproportionately high and adverse impact on EJ communities currently served by these businesses in Robbinsdale, Crystal, and Brooklyn Park. Chapter 7 – Environmental Justice of the Final EIS discusses this in more detail. The specific businesses cited that likely have a predominantly minority and/or low-income clientele include: Northside Oriental Market; American Furniture Mart; Unified Staffing, Inc. (tenant of Schrader Building); Hart Custom Homes (owner and tenant of Schrader Building); and Brianna’s Hair Studio (tenant of Schrader Building). For impacts to the communities served by the displaced businesses, the Council shall provide notices to the affected EJ community with the business’ new location (if a suitable relocation was identified) with transit options to access the new business location, and/or other options to meet their needs. Section 4.2 of the Final EIS summarizes community facilities documented and analyzed as part of the proposed BLRT Extension project. This includes schools, churches, libraries, community centers, social service agencies and non-profits. No mitigation measures are warranted for long-term neighborhood and community impacts, because the effectiveness of mitigation measures identified for specific environmental categories (including but not limited to noise, vibration, visual quality and aesthetics, transit, roadways and traffic, parking, and pedestrian and bicyclist considerations) would prevent adverse impacts.
156D	Shabazz	Aasim	Masjid An-Nur	156	Email	3 – NEPA Process & Public Involvement	<p>Recommends that the Blue Line Extension Community Advisory Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Be a community driven body with staff support. b) Be a resource and check point for community engagement by reviewing and approving a corridor project community engagement plans. c) Identify issues and assign problem solving teams that include community members and project staff. d) Elect a representative member on the transitway corridor policy advisory committee/management committee. e) Be formed early in the scoping phase of the transitway corridor planning process. f) Membership will be selected by communities they represent. g) Elect a chairperson who represents a grassroots community. h) Have the ability to set their own agenda, pass motions, and make recommendations to the corridor policy advisory committee/management committee. i) Will be combined with Business Advisory Committees ensuring coordinated issues and efforts. j) CE Steering committee will support project staff with connections to underrepresented groups i.e.: Faith communities; Cultural communities; Place based groups; Communities of color ; Small and Ethnic businesses; Community Engagement Steering Committee members; Disability community; New immigrant communities; Low-income communities; Students at high schools, community colleges k) Orientation will include a focus on environmental justice, equitable development, and cultural awareness. l) Construction Communication Committees set up at least one month in advance of construction, with representatives appointed by community groups. 	<p>Section 9.2.1.4 of the Final EIS details the establishment of the CAC, which serves as a voice for the community and advises the CMC during the planning and implementation phases of the light rail line. The CAC has met on an approximately monthly basis to advise the proposed BLRT Extension project team. CAC meeting summaries and membership can be found on the website for the proposed BLRT Extension project, www.BlueLineExt.org.</p> <p>The Council formed the CAC by asking each city to designate representatives as well as inviting community based organizations to appoint members. The CAC comprises representatives from the Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee; Masjid An-Nur; MICAH; the Asian Economic Development Association; the cities of Brooklyn Park, Crystal, Golden Valley, Minneapolis, and Robbinsdale; and MPRB.</p> <p>The first CAC meeting was held jointly with the BAC in April 2015. At that meeting, members were asked about their top concerns and topics that they were most interested in discussing. The Council staff also presented an overview of the outreach plan and types of activities. Another joint meeting with the BAC was held in October to review and recommend a revised project scope.</p> <p>In addition to the CAC, the Council added two grassroots representatives from the Blue Line Coalition as members of the CMC. The Blue Line Coalition is a community-based group working to advance local and regional equity and community health along the Blue Line corridor.</p> <p>The CAC and BAC would transition to smaller Construction Communication Committees for each city when it gets closer to construction.</p>
156E	Shabazz	Aasim	Masjid An-Nur	156	Email	3 – NEPA Process & Public	Recommends coordinated planning across Metro Transit, Hennepin County, and the City of MPLS.	Planning for the proposed BLRT Extension project involved extensive outreach and coordination with the affected public, agencies, and key stakeholders. Key stakeholder

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Community Organizations

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
						Involvement		outreach activities conducted during EIS Scoping and the development of the EIS are summarized in Section 9.2 of the Final EIS. Stakeholder advisory committees included staff from Council, Hennepin County, Metro Transit, the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor municipalities, and several others.
156F	Shabazz	Aasim	Masjid An-Nur	156	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Land use planning should promote growth along corridor.	Overall, the proposed BLRT Extension project would be compatible with the local comprehensive plans, land use and other planning policies of the cities of Minneapolis, Golden Valley, Robbinsdale, Crystal, and Brooklyn Park. Although the city of Golden Valley’s comprehensive plan does not specifically mention the proposed BLRT Extension project, LRT would be compatible with the transit goal and objective of the city’s comprehensive plan. The proposed BLRT Extension project would also be compatible with regional land use planning policies. Hennepin County, in partnership with the Bottineau Boulevard Partnership, also prepared the Bottineau Land Use Planning Framework (2012). While the Framework is unlike the aforementioned local comprehensive planning documents because the County does not have land use planning administrative authority, it clearly states the County and Partnership’s priority for increased development along the Bottineau Transitway. Section 4.1 of the Final EIS summarizes land use plan compatibility.
156G	Shabazz	Aasim	Masjid An-Nur	156	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	Special attention should be given to redesigning Hwy 55 with safe and livable crossing connections for pedestrians and cyclists; recommends bus shelter improvements.	Chapter 3 – Transportation of the Final EIS addresses improvements to Olson Memorial Highway. Two stations would provide access to the communities along the highway: Penn Avenue Station and Van White Boulevard Station. While a six-lane roadway would be maintained, the lane widths would be reduced to 11 feet to accommodate pedestrian crossing length. The design speed and posted speed limit would be reduced to 35 mph. Existing sidewalks would be replaced with 6-foot-wide sidewalks on the north and south sides of the highway. Pedestrian refuges would be added in the median of the highway. ADA-compliant pedestrian crossings of Olson Memorial Highway would be facilitated by proposed signalized intersections at Bryant Avenue North, Van White Boulevard, Humboldt Avenue, James Avenue, Morgan Avenue, midblock between Newton Avenue and Oliver Avenue, Penn Avenue, Russell Avenue, and Thomas Avenue. The proposed BLRT Extension project would provide space on the north side of Olson Memorial Highway for a 10-foot two-way cycle track (to be constructed by others) between Thomas Avenue and Van White Memorial Boulevard. The proposed BLRT Extension project would construct a multi-use trail on the north side of the reconstructed westbound Olson Memorial Highway bridge.
156H	Shabazz	Aasim	Masjid An-Nur	156	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	Recommends study on viability of new bus circulator in North Minneapolis and upgrades to bus shelters and transfer stations.	The Draft Feeder Bus Plan for the year 2040 includes a proposed Route 26 that would connect to Penn Avenue and Van White Boulevard stations, circulating through North Minneapolis. The proposed bus network would be refined with input from the public prior to BLRT opening day. Additionally, planning for the C Line, Bus Rapid Transit along Penn Avenue began in 2013. The C Line would connect residents of North Minneapolis, near Penn Avenue, to BLRT stations, METRO Green Line stations, Brooklyn Center, and to downtown Minneapolis. Metro Transit has been working with the community on Better Bus Stops through a Ladders of Opportunity Grant from FTA. The goal is to add up to 150 shelters and improve an additional 75 existing shelters as part of the agency’s work. For more information, visit this website: www.metrotransit.org/better-bus-stops .
156I	Shabazz	Aasim	Masjid An-Nur	156	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Throughout the Bottineau Corridor there are environmental justice small businesses. Every effort should be made to maximize the benefit and minimize the impacts of the project on these entrepreneurs.	Chapter 7 of the Final EIS includes additional discussion and analysis of the benefits of the proposed BLRT Extension project to the EJ communities, in addition to the evaluation of potential impacts. Ten business operations would be displaced as a part of the proposed BLRT Extension project. These businesses would be relocated in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and compensated by payment of fair market value for their property. Five of these business operations are considered EJ businesses, either serving EJ populations or are owned by minority or low income people. Therefore, the proposed BLRT Extension project would have a disproportionately high and adverse impact on EJ communities currently served by these businesses in Robbinsdale, Crystal, and Brooklyn Park. The specific businesses cited that likely have a predominantly minority and/or low-income clientele include:

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Community Organizations

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
								Northside Oriental Market; American Furniture Mart; Unified Staffing, Inc. (tenant of Schrader Building); Hart Custom Homes (owner and tenant of Schrader Building); and Brianna’s Hair Studio (tenant of Schrader Building). The Council would also provide information to the communities where businesses would be displaced about the businesses’ new locations and/or other options to meet their needs. In addition, the Council has been engaged in an extensive outreach effort with various stakeholders along the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor, including local business operators that may be impacted by the proposed BLRT Extension project to receive insight into daily operations and develop strategies to minimize impacts. To mitigate impacts on businesses during construction, the Council will develop a Construction Mitigation Plan, a Construction Communication Plan, and a construction staging plan. These tools will help the Council notify businesses and patrons in advance about any access issues or closures. The construction staging plan will also help businesses and patrons affected by LRT construction understand when construction would occur in different areas of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Finally, a 24-hour construction hotline will be available for issue resolution and information about LRT construction. Section 3.4 of the Final EIS summarizes construction-phase mitigation measures.
156J	Shabazz	Aasim	Masjid An-Nur	156	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Recommends strategy to prevent involuntary displacement and expanding affordable housing options.	Displacement is a significant impact, and the proposed BLRT Extension project has proactively avoided these impacts since the release of the Draft EIS. The evaluation of Alignments D1 and D2 considered several environmental and social issues and impact areas, and the selection of Alignment D1 for the proposed BLRT Extension project avoids impacts to the north Minneapolis neighborhood, including the large number of displacements. Moreover, since publication of the Draft EIS, modifications to the preliminary design have resulted in the avoidance of any residential property displacements with the proposed BLRT Extension project. The Council has been working with Hennepin County on the SAP efforts at each station, incorporating community input into the considerations of land uses, types of development, and other strategies to address neighborhood concerns and ensure that the investments promote growth and have benefits to the local communities. Section 4.1 of the Final EIS summarizes land use plan compatibility.
156K	Shabazz	Aasim	Masjid An-Nur	156	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Recommends creating employment and entrepreneurial opportunities.	The Council has an established DBE program and includes specific goals in project contracts to increase participation by minority and women owned businesses. The Office of Equal Opportunity has an EO consultant designated to the Blue Line Project to conduct outreach and monitor progress towards meeting those goals. The Council has set a 3-year DBE goal of 15.5 percent for federal fiscal years 2013–2016. In addition to the DBE goal, the construction contracts would have a workforce goal for both minority and women workers. An additional EO consultant would be assigned to support these efforts when it gets closer to construction. To assist in achieving the DBE and workforce goals, the Council’s EO and the Council’s outreach and communication staff would hold workshops and networking mixers and attend events to inform people of employment and contracting opportunities. Other communication strategies would be used including social media, the BlueLineExt.org website, newsletters, and articles.
156L	Shabazz	Aasim	Masjid An-Nur	156	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Brooklyn Park will have 5 stations on the Bottineau LRT line. The city of Brooklyn Park is 50% people of color. Through the Community Engagement team the Alliance is working with 6 environmental justice community groups in the Northwest suburbs. They will continue to be active partners in the development of the Bottineau Transitway project and corridor.	The Council will continue to work closely with the city of Brooklyn Park, the Blue Line Coalition, and EJ populations located in Brooklyn Park throughout the Engineering phase of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Station design, which would happen during the Engineering phase of the proposed BLRT Extension project, would incorporate pedestrian and bike amenities and would be ADA-compliant. The Council has been working with Hennepin County on the SAP efforts at each station, incorporating community input into the considerations of land uses, types of development, and other strategies to address neighborhood concerns and ensure that the investments have benefits to the local communities.

Summit Academy OIC

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
158A	Garnett	George	Summit Academy OIC	158	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Summitt Academy OIC was completely omitted in assessment of impacts	The Council has implemented a comprehensive public outreach program that has engaged nearby communities and underrepresented groups, including the Summit Academy OIC. Coordination with these groups, including the Summit Academy OIC will continue throughout the course of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Council staff have met with Summit Academy OIC leadership to discuss future construction needs for the proposed Blue Line LRT Extension and Green Line LRT Extension projects.
158B	Garnett	George	Summit Academy OIC	158	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Organization trains low income minority and female construction workers and hopes that there are aggressive employment quotas for this project.	The Council has an established DBE program and includes specific goals in project contracts to increase participation by minority and women owned businesses. The Office of Equal Opportunity has an EO consultant designated to the Blue Line Project to conduct outreach and monitor progress towards meeting those goals. The Council has set a 3-year DBE goal of 15.5 percent for federal fiscal years 2013–2016. In addition to the DBE goal, the construction contracts would have a workforce goal for both minority and women workers. An additional EO consultant would be assigned to support these efforts when it gets closer to construction. To assist in achieving the DBE and workforce goals, the Council’s EO and the Council outreach and communication staff would hold workshops and networking mixers and attend events to inform people of employment and contracting opportunities. Other communication strategies would be used including social media, the BlueLineExt.org website, newsletters, and articles.

West Broadway Business and Area Coalition (WBC)

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
162A	Heelan	Erin	West Broadway Business and Area Coalition (WBC)	162	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Concerned about how project will impact other commercial corridors and what steps need to be taken to mitigate or leverage funding to assure that all corridors continue to be a priority for our local governments not just the ones with rail.	Long-range transportation plans and the fiscally constrained investment plans that are derived from them are the primary mechanisms for making regional transit investments. This comment is outside the scope of the Final EIS.

Saint Margaret Mary Church

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
186A	Moudry	Fr. Paul	Saint Margaret Mary Church	186	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering & Design	Supports public transportation.	See Master Response 2 in Section G.4.1 of Appendix G of the Final EIS.
186B	Moudry	Fr. Paul	Saint Margaret Mary Church	186	US Mail	6 – Noise & Vibration Effects	Concerned about station being across the street from our church – noise.	No noise impacts were identified at Saint Margaret Mary Church. It is far enough away from the proposed alignment that noise from BLRT operations would not rise to a level requiring mitigation (see Section 5.6 of the Final EIS, which summarizes noise impacts at institutional land uses [Table 5.6-6]).
186C	Moudry	Fr. Paul	Saint Margaret Mary Church	186	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Concerned about station being across the street from our church – safety.	Section 4.7 of the Final EIS addresses safety and security. Safety for rail users, area residents, local pedestrians and bicyclists, project construction workers, operators and vehicle occupants is an important consideration for the proposed BLRT Extension project. The framework for ensuring the highest level of safety to these groups would be established through conformance with the proposed BLRT Extension project site safety and health plan, construction contingency plan, the Council’s Safety and Security Management Plan and the Metro Transit Security and Emergency Preparedness plan. Project operations in conformance with these plans would necessarily be closely and continuously coordinated with local area law enforcement, medical, fire, transportation and other organizations with related emergency responsibilities within the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Stations would include emergency equipment, public address systems, video cameras, emergency telephones, and closed-circuit television. The public address system, with both speakers and signs, would convey information to people with disabilities in compliance with ADA requirements. Lighting for proposed station areas and park-and-ride lots, as well as vehicular and pedestrian circulation areas, would be consistent with the Metro Light Rail Transit Design Criteria (Council, 2015). Emergency lighting would be provided in all public areas, including platforms, pedestrian facilities, vehicular traffic areas, bus loading zones, and park-and-ride lots.
186D	Moudry	Fr. Paul	Saint Margaret Mary Church	186	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	Concerned about parkland, to be treasured.	The Final EIS and the Amended Draft Section 4(f)/6(f) Evaluation (Chapter 8 of the Final EIS) address the effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on parklands as well as other Section 4(f) resources. This evaluation was accomplished in coordination with MPRB, the Three Rivers Park District, municipalities, and other governmental entities. These efforts included consideration of project sequencing (avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures) to minimize harm to Section 4(f)/6(f) resources. The proposed BLRT Extension project would result in the permanent incorporation of approximately 2.1 acres of property from TWRP. During construction, approximately 9.2 acres of temporary construction easements would be required within TWRP to grade land around the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor, to provide access during construction, and to provide floodplain and wetland mitigation. A short segment of an existing north-south trail that parallels the west side of the rail corridor (a portion of the trail is located on the private rail corridor right-of-way) would be realigned along with a shift of an approximately 400-foot stretch of Bassett Creek as part of the replacement of the Plymouth Avenue Bridge. Access to the park would remain open throughout construction. All areas of the TWRP property that would be affected by proposed BLRT Extension project’s construction activities would be restored to existing conditions or better and restoration plans would be developed and implemented in consultation with MPRB. Chapter 8 of the Final EIS provides additional information about the proposed BLRT Extension project’s impact to TWRP.
186E	Moudry	Fr. Paul	Saint Margaret Mary Church	186	US Mail	8 – Transportation System Effects	Ridership comes from outside of Golden Valley.	The Council used its regional travel demand forecasting model to develop the transit ridership forecasts for the proposed BLRT Extension project. Blue Line LRT Expansion Project ridership modeling is discussed in Section 3.1 of the Final EIS. The Golden Valley Road Station would have a total of 905 riders daily arriving via walking, transferring from another bus, or driving/passenger drop off.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – Community Organizations

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Response
186F	Moudry	Fr. Paul	Saint Margaret Mary Church	186	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering & Design	NIMBY is involved. Riders from suburbs and downtown are saying “not in your back yard meaning not North Minneapolis”.	The proposed BLRT Extension project would improve the transportation system by providing the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor with more travel choices and faster travel times between residential areas, major destinations, and employment centers. Residents of North Minneapolis would have access to four adjacent stations: Van White Boulevard, Penn Avenue, Plymouth Avenue, and Golden Valley Road.
186G	Moudry	Fr. Paul	Saint Margaret Mary Church	186	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Need to consider long range development.	Section 4.1 of the Final EIS describes the methodology used to assess compatibility with local comprehensive plans. Comprehensive plans address long-term growth. While there would be temporary impacts due to construction, the long-term benefit of the proposed BLRT Extension project would provide economic development opportunities, improved mobility, and access to more destinations.
186H	Moudry	Fr. Paul	Saint Margaret Mary Church	186	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Need to consider impact on property values.	Property values are affected by a variety of market conditions. Impacts of an LRT project on property values are difficult to assess conclusively. Continuing population growth and a strengthening of the local economy within the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor may contribute to redevelopment and increased property values. Studies have shown that LRT transit around the country has been an impetus for increased property values near station locations. Chapter 7 – Environmental Justice of the Final EIS addresses property values from an EJ perspective.
186I	Moudry	Fr. Paul	Saint Margaret Mary Church	186	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Need to consider neighborhood improvement.	Increased access brought by transit improvements may act as a catalyst for new investment in the area surrounding stations. Land development and property taxation policies are principally the responsibility of the cities of Minneapolis, Robbinsdale, Golden Valley, Crystal, and Brooklyn Park; but the Council has taken every effort to minimize adverse impacts of the proposed BLRT Extension project while maintaining the positive benefits this project would deliver.



Appendix G

Response to Draft EIS Comments

4 Index of Comments and Response to Comments – General Public Written Comments



This page intentionally left blank



General Public Written Comments and Responses Index

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Adair	Richard	19
Anderson	Brian	84A
Anderson	Brian	84B
Anderson	Brian	84C
Applebaun	Steve	132A
Balfour	Andrew	3A
Balfour	Andrew	3B
Bartell	Julie	134
Bellward	Paul	72A
Bellward	Stacy	90A
Berg	H. Nils	126A
Berg	H. Nils	126B
Berg	H. Nils	126C
Berg	H. Nils	126D
Berg	H. Nils	126E
Berg	H. Nils	127A
Berg	H. Nils	127B
Berg	H. Nils	127C
Berg	H. Nils	127D
Berg	Nils	171A
Berg	Nils	171B
Berg	Nils	171C
Berg	Nils	171D
Berg	Nils	171E
Berg	Nils	171F
Berg	Nils	171G
Binder	Billy	134A
Binder	Billy	134B
Binder	Billy	134C
Binder	Billy	134D
Binder	Billy	134E
Binder	Billy	134F
Binder	Billy	134G
Binder	Billy	134H
Binder	Lois	164A
Binder	Lois	164B



General Public Written Comments and Responses Index

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Binder	Lois	164C
Binder	Lois	164D
Bladine	Debbie	94A
Bladine	Debbie	94B
Bladine	Debbie	94C
Bladine	Debbie	94D
Bladine	Debbie	94E
Bladine	Debbie	94F
Bladine	Debbie	94G
Bonniwell	Constance	27A
Bonniwell	Constance	83A
Bonniwell	Constance	83B
Bonniwell	Constance	140A
Boyce	Kim	43A
Boyce	Kim	43B
Boyce	Kim	43C
Burakowski	Mike	85A
Burakowski	Mike	85B
Burakowski	Mike	85C
Burakowski	Mike	85D
Burakowski	Mike	85E
Burakowski	Mike	85F
Chesney	Steve	137A
Chesney	Steve	137B
Christle	Terry	138A
Clausen	Joanie	172A
Clausen	Joanie	172B
Clausen	Joanie	172C
Crawford	Freddy	163A
Crawford	Freddy	163B
Crawford	Freddy	163C
Crawford	Freddy	163D
Crawford	Freddy	163E
Crawford	Freddy	163F
Crawford	Freddy	163G
Crawford	Freddy	163H



General Public Written Comments and Responses Index

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Dalrymple	Pam	165A
Dalrymple	Pam	165B
Dalrymple	Pam	165C
Dalrymple	Pam	165D
Dalrymple	Gwyn	182A
Dalrymple	Gwyn	182B
Davis	Denis F.	63A
Davis	Denis F.	63B
Davis	Sharon	64A
Davis	Sharon	64B
Davis	Sharon	64C
Deikman	Cathy	141A
Deikman	Cathy	141B
Deikman	Cathy	141C
Dougherty	Rebecca	65A
Dougherty	Rebecca	65B
Dougherty	Rebecca	65C
Dougherty	Rebecca	65D
Dougherty	Rebecca	65E
Dube	Diane Marie	110A
Dube	Diane Marie	110B
Dube	Diane Marie	110C
Dube	Diane Marie	110D
Dube	Diane Marie	110E
Dube	Diane Marie	110F
Dube	Diane Marie	110G
Dube	Diane Marie	110H
Dube	Diane Marie	110I
Duggan	Mary Ann	87A
Fahey	Sean	173A
Fahey	Sean	173B
Fahey	Sean	173C
Fairbanks	Mary Ann	115A
Fischer	Dolores	103A
Fischer	Dolores	103B
Fischer	Dolores	103C



General Public Written Comments and Responses Index

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Flower	Jane	144
Flower	Paul	144A
Flower	Paul	144B
Flower	Paul	144C
Giles	Patricia	91A
Giles	Patricia	91B
Giles	Patricia	91C
Giles	Patricia	91D
Heelan	Erin	162
Heim	Erv	145A
Heim	Carmen	183A
Heim	Carmen	183B
Heim	Carmen	183C
Heim	Carmen	183D
Heim	Ervin	184A
Heim	Ervin	184B
Heim	Ervin	184C
Heim	Ervin	184D
Holm	Pamela	147A
Holm	Pamela	147B
Jeska	Joan	22A
Jeska	Joan	22B
Jeska	Joan	22C
Jeska	Joan	22D
Jeska	Joan	22E
Jeska	Joan	22F
Jeska	Joan	22G
Johnson	Wesley D	20A
Johnson	Wesley D	20B
Johnson	Wesley D	20C
Johnson	Edward	174A
Johnson	Edward	174B
Johnson	Edward	174C
Johnson	Edward	174D
Johnson	Edward	174E
Jonas	Brian	66A



General Public Written Comments and Responses Index

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Jonas	Brian	66B
Jonas	Brian	66C
Jonas	Brian	66D
Jonas	Brian	66E
Jonas	Brian	66F
Jordan	Pat	5A
Jordan	Pat	5B
Jordan	Pat	5C
Jordan	Pat	21A
Jordan	Pat	21B
Jordan	Pat	21C
Jordan	Pat	21D
Jordan	Pat	21E
Jordan	Pat	21F
Jordan	Pat	21G
Jordan	Pat	21H
Jordan	Pat	185A
Jordan	Pat	185B
Jordan	Pat	185C
Jordan	Pat	185D
Jordan	Pat	185E
Jordan	Pat	185F
Jordan	Pat	185G
Kester	Troy	101A
Lambert	Terry	88A
Lamker	Darlene	166A
Lamker	Darlene	166B
Lamker	Darlene	166C
Lamker	Darlene	166D
Lamker	Darlene	166E
Lamker	Darlene	166F
Lamker	Darlene	166G
Lamker	Darlene	166H
Lamker	Darlene	166I
Lamker	Darlene	166J
Lamker	Darlene	166K



General Public Written Comments and Responses Index

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Lamker	Dean	167A
Laundreaux	Rich	149A
Laundreaux	Rich	149B
Laundreaux	Rich	149C
Laundreaux	Rich	149D
Laundreaux	Rich	149E
Laundreaux	Rich	149F
Laundreaux	Rich	149G
Laundreaux	Rich	149H
Laundreaux	Rich	149I
Laundreaux	Rich	149J
Laundreaux	Rich	149K
Lawrence	Tyree	93A
Lawrence	Tyree	93B
Lawrence	Tyree	93C
Lawrence	Tyree	93D
Lawrence	Tyree	93E
Leach	Mary Ann	175A
Leach	Mary Ann	175B
Leach	Mary Ann	175C
Lehman	Karen	48A
Lehman	Karen	48B
Lehman	Karen	48C
Lehman	Karen	48D
Lehman	Karen	48E
Lehman	Karen	150A
Lehman	Karen	150B
Lehman	Karen	150C
Lehman	Karen	150D
Lehman	Karen	150E
Lehman	Karen	150F
Lerdal	Harriett	168A
Lerdal	Harriett	168B
Lerdal	Harriett	168C
Lerdal	Harriett	168D
Lerdal	Harriett	168E



General Public Written Comments and Responses Index

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Lerdal	Harriett	168F
Lerdal	Harriett	168G
Lerdal	Harriett	168H
Lewis	Shaun	47A
Lindeman	LeAnn	118A
Lindeman	LeAnn	118B
Lindeman	LeAnn	118C
Lindeman	LeAnn	118D
Lokken	Barbara	95A
Lokken	Barbara	95B
Lokken	Barbara	95C
Lokken	Barbara	95D
Lokken	Barbara	95F
Lundgren	Suzanne	168
Milstein	Bernie	74A
Milstein	Bernie	74B
Milstein	Bernie	74C
Milstein	Bernie	74D
Milstein	Bernie	74E
Milstein	Bernie	74F
Milstein	Bernie	74G
Milstein	Bernie	74H
Milstein	Bernie	74I
Milstein	Bernie	74J
Milstein	Bernie	74K
Moren	Mae	122A
Moren	Mae	122B
Moudry	Father Paul	176A
Moudry	Father Paul	176B
Moudry	Father Paul	176C
Moudry	Father Paul	176D
Moudry	Father Paul	176E
Moudry	Father Paul	176F
Mulla	Hassanali	112A
Mulla	Masuma	113A
Nerud	Amanda	116A



General Public Written Comments and Responses Index

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Nieman	Scott	129A
Nieman	Scott	129B
Nieman	Scott	129C
Nieman	Scott	129D
Nieman	Scott	129E
Nieman	Scott	129F
Nieman	Scott	129G
Nieman	Scott	129H
Nieman	Scott	129I
Nieman	Scott	129J
Nieman	Scott	129K
Nieman	Scott	129L
Nieman	Scott	129M
Nieman	Scott	129N
Nieman	Scott	129O
Nieman	Scott	129P
Olson	Leslie	67A
Olson	Leslie	67B
Olson	Leslie	67C
Olson	Leslie	67D
Olson	Leslie	67E
Olson	Leslie	67F
Olson	Leslie	67G
Olson	Leslie	67H
Olson	Leslie	67I
Olson	Leslie	67J
Olson	Leslie	67K
Olson	Leslie	67L
Olson	Leslie	67M
Olson	Leslie	67N
Olson	Leslie	67O
Olson	Leslie	67P
Olson	Randy	96A
Overby	Amy	23A
Overby	Amy	23B
Paulson	Linda	169A



General Public Written Comments and Responses Index

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Peschong	Jennifer	153A
Peschong	Jennifer	153B
Peschong	Jennifer	153C
Peschong	Jennifer	153D
Peschong	Jennifer	153E
Peters	Pamela	107A
Peters	Pamela	107B
Peters	Pamela	107C
Peters	Pamela	107D
Price	Robin	24A
Price	Robin	24B
Price	Robin	24C
Price	Robin	24D
Price	Robin	24E
Price	Robin	24F
Price	Robin	24G
Price	Robin	24H
Price	Robin	24I
Price	Robin	24J
Reiter	Chris	154A
Reiter	Chris	154B
Rochefford	Mike	123A
Rock	Amy	155A
Rock	Amy	155B
Rock	Amy	155C
Runke	Dale	5
Sannes	Norm	124A
Sanoski	Lori	97A
Schaper	Paul	4A
Schaper	Paul	4B
Schiestl	Lee	98A
Simmons	Susan	99A
Simmons	Susan	99B
Simmons	Susan	99C
Simmons	Susan	99D
Smith	Marietta	44A



General Public Written Comments and Responses Index

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Smith	Marietta	45A
Smith	Marietta	45B
Smith	Marietta	45C
Smith	Marietta	45D
Smith	Marietta	45E
Smith	Marietta	46A
Smith	Marietta	46B
Smith	Marietta	46C
Smith	Marietta	46D
Smith	Marietta	46E
Smith	Marietta	125A
Smith	Marietta	125B
Smith	Marietta	125C
Smith	Marietta	125D
Spence	Sharyn	68A
Spence	Sharyn	68B
Spence	Sharyn	68C
Spence	Sharyn	68D
Spencer	Marta	170A
Spencer	Marta	170B
Spencer	Marta	170C
Spencer	Marta	170D
Stein	Ben	157A
Stein	Ben	157B
Stein	Ben	157C
Stein	Ben	157D
Steinberg	Dan	25A
Steinberg	Dan	187A
Steinberg	Dan	187B
Steinberg	Dan	187C
Steinberg	Dan	187D
Steinberg	Dan	187E
Steinberg	Dan	187F
Steinberg	Dan	187G
Swanson	Randy	69A
Thorsen	Madge	117A



General Public Written Comments and Responses Index

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Thorsen	Madge	117AA
Thorsen	Madge	117AB
Thorsen	Madge	117AC
Thorsen	Madge	117AD
Thorsen	Madge	117AE
Thorsen	Madge	117AF
Thorsen	Madge	117AG
Thorsen	Madge	117AH
Thorsen	Madge	117AI
Thorsen	Madge	117AJ
Thorsen	Madge	117AK
Thorsen	Madge	117AL
Thorsen	Madge	117AM
Thorsen	Madge	117AN
Thorsen	Madge	117AO
Thorsen	Madge	117AP
Thorsen	Madge	117AQ
Thorsen	Madge	117AR
Thorsen	Madge	117AS
Thorsen	Madge	117AT
Thorsen	Madge	117AU
Thorsen	Madge	117AV
Thorsen	Madge	117AW
Thorsen	Madge	117AX
Thorsen	Madge	117AY
Thorsen	Madge	117AZ
Thorsen	Madge	117B
Thorsen	Madge	117BA
Thorsen	Madge	117BB
Thorsen	Madge	117BC
Thorsen	Madge	117BD
Thorsen	Madge	117BE
Thorsen	Madge	117BF
Thorsen	Madge	117BG
Thorsen	Madge	117BH
Thorsen	Madge	117BI



General Public Written Comments and Responses Index

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Thorsen	Madge	117BJ
Thorsen	Madge	117C
Thorsen	Madge	117D
Thorsen	Madge	117E
Thorsen	Madge	117F
Thorsen	Madge	117G
Thorsen	Madge	117H
Thorsen	Madge	117I
Thorsen	Madge	117J
Thorsen	Madge	117K
Thorsen	Madge	117L
Thorsen	Madge	117M
Thorsen	Madge	117N
Thorsen	Madge	117O
Thorsen	Madge	117P
Thorsen	Madge	117Q
Thorsen	Madge	117R
Thorsen	Madge	117S
Thorsen	Madge	117T
Thorsen	Madge	117U
Thorsen	Madge	117V
Thorsen	Madge	117W
Thorsen	Madge	117X
Thorsen	Madge	117Y
Thorsen	Madge	117Z
Thorsen	Madge	177A
Thorsen	Madge	177B
Thorsen	Brad	178A
Toftum	D.J.	100A
Toftum	D.J.	100B
Unknown	Randy	73A
Unknown		92A
Unknown		92B
Unknown		92C
Unknown		92D
Wall-Romana	Christophe	135A



General Public Written Comments and Responses Index

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Wall-Romana	Christophe	135B
Wall-Romana	Christophe	135C
Wall-Romana	Christophe	135D
Wall-Romana	Christophe	135E
Wall-Romana	Christophe	135F
Wall-Romana	Christophe	135G
Wall-Romana	Christophe	135H
Wall-Romana	Margaret	161A
Wall-Romana	Margaret	161B
Wall-Romana	Margaret	161C
Wall-Romana	Margaret	161D
Wall-Romana	Margaret	161E
Wall-Romana	Margaret	190A
Wall-Romana	Margaret	190B
Wall-Romana	Margaret	190C
Wall-Romana	Christophe	191A
Wall-Romana	Christophe	191B
Wall-Romana	Christophe	191C
Wall-Romana	Christophe	191D
Wall-Romana	Christophe	191E
Wall-Romana	Christophe	191F
Weiske	Jeanne	70A
Weiske	Jeanne	89A
Weiske	Jeanne	114A
Weiske	Jeanne	114B
Wildung	Cathy	26A
Wildung	Cathy	26B
Wildung	Cathy	26C
Wildung	Cathy	26D
Wildung	Cathy	26E
Wildung	Cathy	26F
Wilson	Mary	71A
Wilson	Jane	102A
Wilson	Jane	102B



This page intentionally left blank

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
3A	Balfour	Andrew	None provided	3	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	In favor of A-C-D2 alignment. Thinks connecting the Maple Grove transit center, downtown Robbinsdale, going through the neighborhoods (not the park) in North Minneapolis, and finally connecting to the interchange is the best placement.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
3B	Balfour	Andrew	None provided	3	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	D1 should not be considered. Ridership and convenience are what is important, not scenic (sparsely populated) views of a park.	The Alternatives Analysis (AA)/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) process examined numerous alignment options detailed in Chapter 2 of both documents. The proposed METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit (BLRT) Extension project includes an alignment that meets the purpose and need most efficiently and minimizes project impacts. The ridership forecasts are as follows: B-C-D1 – 27,000 boardings per day B-C-D2 – 26,000 boardings per day
4A	Schaper	Paul	None provided	4	Email	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	Light rail waste of time and money. One billion dollars can go a lot farther fixing and expanding roads that we have now. Examples on the west metro, 494 between county road 6 and the split is still only 2 lanes each way. Highway 394 from Plymouth to downtown is already outdated. That took 10 years to build. Heavy traffic at 10:00 pm. Interstate 94 from the split to Monticello is a mess. Basically the state wants to keep people from driving their own cars. This will not happen.	The purpose and need for the project has been the subject of many studies. The proposed BLRT Extension project includes an alignment that meets the purpose and need most efficiently and minimizes project impacts. The purpose of the proposed BLRT Extension project is to provide transit service which would satisfy the long-term regional mobility and accessibility needs for businesses and the traveling public. The proposed BLRT Extension project is needed to effectively address long-term regional transit mobility and local accessibility needs while providing efficient, travel-time competitive transit service that supports economic development goals and objectives of local, regional, and statewide plans. The current design of the proposed BLRT Extension project and how it affects other transportation facilities is discussed in Chapter 3 of the Final EIS. Meeting federal cost-effectiveness criteria would be an essential part of entering into the Engineering phase for this project. However, cost is not the only criteria. The Purpose and Need is discussed in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS and a financial analysis of the project is discussed in Chapter 10 of the Final EIS. The proposed BLRT Extension project would improve the transportation system by providing the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor with more travel choices and faster travel times between residential areas, major destinations, and employment centers.
4B	Schaper	Paul	None provided	4	Email	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	Anyone figure cost benefit?	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #4.
5	Runke	Dale	None provided	5	US Mail		Same comments as Pat Jordan, co-signed letter	
5A	Jordan	Pat	None provided	5	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	I care about wildlife in the park. All of that will change.	Section 5.8 of the Final EIS presents a summary of the assessment of wildlife habitat, impacts to wildlife habitat, and effects on threatened and endangered species. The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) concurred with the Council’s assessment that there would be no adverse effects on Blanding’s turtle populations with the implementation of DNR’s guidelines. A copy of the guidelines is included in Appendix F of the Final EIS. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) determined that the proposed BLRT Extension project may affect the Northern long-eared bat, but the potential for impacts was low, and incidental “takes” of the bat would not be prohibited. Locations of fencing will continue to be explored through the design process; decisions regarding fencing locations will likely be finalized between the 30 percent and 60 percent design stages. The Council acknowledges that fencing in areas of notable wildlife habitat may impede wildlife movement. Minimizing the use of fencing in these areas, or the provision of wildlife crossings (dry culverts or other passageways) are potential solutions.
5B	Jordan	Pat	None provided	5	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	The noise pollution is a big factor.	Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS. Noise impacts have been assessed at parks throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Active use parks are not considered noise sensitive receptors and are not included in the noise analysis. A park may be considered a noise sensitive land use depending upon the recreation activities within the park. Theodore Wirth Regional Park was assessed in the noise

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								analysis as a Category 1 land use. As reported in Table 5.6-6 of the Final EIS, neither Theodore Wirth Regional Park nor The Chalet would have moderate or severe noise impacts from the proposed BLRT Extension project. Theodore Wirth Regional Park – noise level with the proposed BLRT Extension project would be 44 dBA (A-weighted decibels) with a moderate noise impact criterion of 53 dBA and a severe noise impact criterion of 59 dBA. The Chalet – noise level with the proposed BLRT Extension project would be 31 dBA with a moderate noise impact criterion of 56 dBA and a severe noise impact criterion of 61 dBA.
5C	Jordan	Pat	None provided	5	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Having a station on G.V. Road will alter access to Minneapolis and the parkway. The station there is a poor decision.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #19.
19	Adair	Richard	Bryn Mawr Neighborhood	19	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I support the Locally Preferred Alternative. There will always be the “not in my back yard” concerns. Keep your eyes on the prize – a functioning integrated transit system that moves people around and knit us together, especially transit-dependent people in high poverty areas. We are building a future for generations to come.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
20A	Johnson	Wesley D	None provided	20	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	The ditch next to the tracks is the storm runoff and storm water storage for all of Kewanee Way. Their house has been flooded before and the now have a sump pump. Any changes to the storm drainage through the ditch to the swamp would effect the viability of housing on Kewanee Way if it affects the storm drainage. Currently it is something we have to watch and worry about with every major storm.	As part of the proposed BLRT Extension project, the existing BNSF Railway (BNSF) track would be shifted to the western 50 feet of the existing 100-foot rail corridor. This would result in impacts to the Bassett Creek floodplain. The total proposed floodplain fill within the Bassett Creek floodplain, is 16,800 cubic yards. The floodplain mitigation area between the main stem of Bassett Creek and the light rail transit (LRT) and BNSF rail corridor (partially in Theodore Wirth Regional Park and partially on private property; initially identified in the Draft EIS) has been further refined. The mitigation would include excavating adjacent ground below the 100-year floodplain elevation to provide compensatory floodplain storage for the fill placed in the floodplain.
20B	Johnson	Wesley D	None provided	20	Written	8 – Transportation System Effects	Many residents of Kewanee Way and the streets above use a pathway to access the tracks to the fire station to catch buses on Golden Valley Road and to vote. Cutting off this access more than inconvenient. Most people will not be able to walk around as it is 3 or 4 times longer and has steep hills. Cutting off access across the tracks would isolate this part of Golden Valley from the parks, fire station, and the rest of Golden Valley as regards to walking or bicycle usage.	The informal and unauthorized crossings across BNSF property from Kewanee Way near Sohacki Park and Sohacki Park: Mary Hills Nature Area would be eliminated as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Crossings at Golden Valley Road and Plymouth Avenue would be the primary points of access for pedestrians traveling from Kewanee Way.
20C	Johnson	Wesley D	None provided	20	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	There is heavy deer and animal traffic across the tracks. Blocking this will force them onto the roadways, probably golden valley road bridge.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #13.
21A	Jordan	Pat	None provided	21	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	LRT in Golden Valley does not serve the public who would be using it.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
21B	Jordan	Pat	None provided	21	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	The wildlife, environment, pollution, noise, air quality, traffic – all are going to see big changes. (responses are broken up to cover each element of comment).	Concerning wildlife: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #13.
21C	Jordan	Pat	None provided	21	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	The wildlife, environment, pollution, noise, air quality, traffic – all are going to see big changes. (responses are broken up to cover each element of comment).	Concerning environmental impacts: At the time of publication, the Draft EIS included a discussion of all known environmental issues and impacts.
21D	Jordan	Pat	None provided	21	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	The wildlife, environment, pollution, noise, air quality, traffic – all are going to see big changes. (responses are broken up to cover each element of comment).	Concerning pollution: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #12.
21E	Jordan	Pat	None provided	21	Written	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	The wildlife, environment, pollution, noise, air quality, traffic – all are going to see big changes. (responses are broken up to cover each	Concerning noise: Please see response to Comment 5B.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							element of comment).	
21F	Jordan	Pat	None provided	21	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	The wildlife, environment, pollution, noise, air quality, traffic – all are going to see big changes. (responses are broken up to cover each element of comment).	Concerning air quality: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #12.
21G	Jordan	Pat	None provided	21	Written	8 – Transportation System Effects	The wildlife, environment, pollution, noise, air quality, traffic – all are going to see big changes. (responses are broken up to cover each element of comment).	Concerning traffic: The traffic operations analysis indicates that the Golden Valley Road/Theodore Wirth Parkway intersection would operate at a level of service E in 2040 with either the No-Build Alternative or the proposed BLRT Extension project. See Table 3.3-3 in the Final EIS.
21H	Jordan	Pat	None provided	21	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	Do you realize the land by Golden Valley Road and where the tracks are located is a dump underneath the top layer? It's a flood zone there. The old Hwy 100 concrete, etc was dumped there.	<p>The Council is aware of the previous dumping that had occurred during the 1960s in Sochacki Park. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) has been conducted and a Phase II ESA will be done to further evaluate the presence of contamination along the entire proposed BLRT Extension project corridor and proposed areas of construction. Information gathered from the Phase I and II ESA will be incorporated into the proposed BLRT Extension project's Response Action Plan (RAP) (which includes a Construction Contingency Plan for unidentified contamination) to properly handle, treat, store, and dispose of solid wastes, hazardous materials, petroleum products, and other regulated materials that could not be avoided during construction. Coordination with the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, cities of Robbinsdale and Golden Valley, and the Three Rivers Park District will also be arranged.</p> <p>The Council reviewed Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year floodplains and FEMA floodways as part of the evaluation for the proposed BLRT Extension project. The floodplains and floodways were identified and evaluated based on current FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) and ancillary information. The data relied upon for floodplain analysis are based on the information in the Preliminary Floodplain Impacts and Mitigation Strategies Technical Memorandum (January 2016), or Floodplain Technical Memorandum. The Council conducted the analysis in coordination with US Army Corps of Engineers, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, and local watershed organizations (Bassett Creek Water Management Commission, Shingle Creek Watershed Management Commission, West Mississippi Water Management Commission, and Mississippi Watershed Management Organization) as described in the Floodplain Technical Memorandum.</p>
22A	Jeska	Joan	None provided	22	Written	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	Where is the money for this – won't pay for itself.	<p>A breakdown of funding sources is located in Table 10.1-2 of Chapter 10 – Financial Analysis of the Final EIS totaling \$1.496 billion. The Council assumes the following capital funding breakdown:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Capital Investment Grant (CIG) Program funding from FTA – 49 percent ■ State of Minnesota – 10 percent ■ County Transit Improvement Board – 31 percent ■ Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority – 10 percent <p>FTA must evaluate and rate proposed projects seeking funding from the CIG Program under a set of project justification and local financial commitment criteria specified in law. The criteria evaluate the merits of the project and the project sponsor's ability to build and operate it as well as the existing transit system. Also, please see MASTER RESPONSE #4.</p>
22B	Jeska	Joan	None provided	22	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	Theodore Wirth Park is the main feature of our quality of life and the intent was to protect it. BOT would destroy the principle law of that (try planting a tree on Hiawatha line – none).	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #14.
22C	Jeska	Joan	None provided	22	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Our lake system puts us on the map for quality of life – reroute Bottineau – use more buses.	The Draft EIS considered an Enhanced Bus/Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative to serve comparable travel markets (Route 731/732). While the Enhanced Bus/TSM Alternative provides additional transit service, it does not meet the proposed BLRT Extension project goals of enhancing access to regional activity centers, enhancing the effectiveness of transit services within the proposed BLRT

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								Extension project corridor, or promoting sustainable development patterns. In the Draft EIS travel time was estimated at approximately 48–50 minutes for the Enhanced Bus/TSM Alternative, whereas the proposed BLRT Extension project estimated approximately 33 minutes. Chapter 11 of the Draft EIS compares the various alternatives.
22D	Jeska	Joan	None provided	22	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Doesn't serve people who need public transportation. Minimum population along the T.W vs Bottineau.	The proposed BLRT Extension project would improve the transportation system by providing the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor with more travel choices and faster travel times between residential areas, major destinations, and employment centers. The Final EIS includes an evaluation of potential disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority and low-income populations along the proposed BLRT Extension project. The evaluation considers proximity of low-income populations and transit-dependent households to proposed stations as well as access to other enhanced transit options. Section 7.5 of the Final EIS discusses how the project would "prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations" and improve transit for those most dependent upon it as part of an integrated system.
22E	Jeska	Joan	None provided	22	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	If this was right for the people there would not be such strong opposition. Citizens are against. What is our voice?	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #6.
22F	Jeska	Joan	None provided	22	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	My home is adjacent to the tracks and has major structural issues. Any construction could cause my house to collapse.	Section 5.7 of the Final EIS summarizes vibration impacts. Vibration impacts to residential properties have been identified in Robbinsdale and Crystal, along with the proposed mitigation for those impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 36th Avenue North to 38th Avenue North: 700-foot-long ballast mat ■ 38th Avenue North to 40½ Avenue North: 300-foot-long ballast mat ■ 47th Avenue North to BNSF freight tracks: 300-foot-long ballast mat For these impacts, the proposed ballast mats will eliminate long-term vibration impacts at these locations. The most effective methods for reducing the impact from construction vibration are to limit the use of high-vibration activities, such as impact pile driving and vibratory rolling, and to include vibration limits in the construction specifications.
22G	Jeska	Joan	None provided	22	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Public transit is for people who need it.	Please see response to Comment 22D.
23A	Overby	Amy	None provided	23	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	How will safety be provided for commuters? Specifically, when individuals leave the visibility and relative safety of street level (Golden Valley Road, particularly), who will ensure safety and peace of mind at a station located under a bridge, near a woodland occasionally inhabited by transients?	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.
23B	Overby	Amy	None provided	23	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	In both of those locations (Golden Valley Road and Plymouth Ave), I am unwilling to walk alone or with my dog when it is dark, those areas do not feel safe, because of the isolation and the highly/deeply wooded locations. If the goal of a station at those locations is to increase business/commuter traffic and usage, the isolated, invisible nature of those locations will actually discourage commuter usage.	Chapter 3 – Transportation addresses ridership and connectivity of the Golden Valley Road and Plymouth Avenue stations by car, bus, and walk up. A park-and-ride would provide 100 parking spaces for users of the Golden Valley Road Station. Approximately 905 daily boardings would occur at the Golden Valley Road Station and 229 at the Plymouth Avenue Station. Also, please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.
24A	Price	Robin	Bassett Creek Neighborhood	24	Written	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	30 days has not been enough time to review the DEIS before this meeting.	The notification and comment period followed the legal requirements (minimum requirement is 45 days). The Draft EIS comment period was from April 11 to May 29, 2014 (48 days).
24B	Price	Robin	Bassett Creek Neighborhood	24	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	Continued concerns about health and integrity of Bassett Creek.	Bassett Creek is an iconic water resource. Good community work has already been implemented in the restoration of reaches of this important stream. Though Bassett Creek is currently listed on the 303(d) List of Impaired Waters, conditions within the Creek are improving. Per the federal Clean Water Act, an impaired water cannot be made worse by a proposed action. Thus, the Council is obligated to implement best

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								management practices that would be compliant with the Clean Water Act and that would likely exceed compliance and improve the water quality and habitat value of the creek.
24C	Price	Robin	Bassett Creek Neighborhood	24	Written	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Concern over lack of access to quiet space in this corner of Golden Valley	Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS. Noise impacts have been assessed at parks throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. As reported in Table 5.6-5 of the Final EIS the following noise level with the proposed BLRT Extension project would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Plymouth Avenue North to 16th Avenue North – 9 moderate noise impacts and no severe noise impacts ■ 16th Avenue North to Golden Valley Road – 1 moderate noise impact and no severe noise impacts ■ Golden Valley Road to 26th Avenue North – 9 moderate noise impacts and 14 severe noise impacts For the first two locations, after the implementation of interior testing to determine the appropriate mitigation measure, no residual noise impacts are anticipated. For the third location with mitigation in the form of a noise barrier, 1 moderate and 1 severe noise impacts would remain.
24D	Price	Robin	Bassett Creek Neighborhood	24	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I want to see the rail go down Highway 55 or Broadway.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
24E	Price	Robin	Bassett Creek Neighborhood	24	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	If there needs to be a light rail stop, it should serve downtown Golden Valley and encourage business growth.	Please see MASTER RESPONSES #1 and #19.
24F	Price	Robin	Bassett Creek Neighborhood	24	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Many Golden Valley residents are opposed to this route.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
24G	Price	Robin	Bassett Creek Neighborhood	24	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	This is not MY preferred route.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
24H	Price	Robin	Bassett Creek Neighborhood	24	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	Please keep Theodore Wirth Park pristine and on the historical register.	Effects to historic properties within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) were analyzed and documented in the Final EIS. All attempts would be made to avoid or minimize adverse effects to historical or cultural resources, including to Theodore Wirth Regional Park, as the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act process moves forward. See Chapter 4 (Section 4.4) of the Final EIS for additional information regarding the Theodore Wirth Segment of the Grand Rounds Historic District. FTA has determined that the project undertaking would have an adverse effect on this historic resource; however, it remains eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Mitigation measures can be found in the Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement in Appendix H of the Final EIS including designing to <i>The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (SOI's Standards; 36 CFR Part 68)</i> , developing a Construction Protection Plan to avoid and minimize adverse construction effects, preparing a preservation plan and a treatment plan in accordance with <i>SOI's Standards</i> , and incorporating interpretation of the Theodore Wirth Segment into the design of the proposed BLRT Extension project in the Grand Rounds Historic District.
24I	Price	Robin	Bassett Creek Neighborhood	24	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	Currently Bassett Creek floods near the homes on Bassett Creek Drive – it could get worse with 100 feet of development around the rail.	Development associated with or resulting from the proposed BLRT Extension project is guided by local ordinances and watershed rules that dictate the amount of runoff that would be permitted from proposed developments and infrastructure. These rules are in place to help mitigate potential flooding effects on Bassett Creek and other waterbodies. As part of the proposed BLRT Extension project, the existing BNSF track would be

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								shifted to the western 50 feet of the existing 100-foot rail corridor. This would result in impacts to the Bassett Creek floodplain. The total proposed floodplain fill within the Bassett Creek floodplain, is 16,800 cubic yards. The floodplain mitigation area between the main stem of Bassett Creek and the LRT and BNSF rail corridor (partially in Theodore Wirth Regional Park and partially on private property; initially identified in the Draft EIS) has been further refined. The mitigation would include excavating adjacent ground below the 100-year floodplain elevation to provide compensatory floodplain storage for the fill placed in the floodplain.
24J	Price	Robin	Bassett Creek Neighborhood	24	Written	8 – Transportation System Effects	Parking or drop off spots will be dangerous on Golden Valley Road	Chapter 3 – Transportation of the Final EIS discusses the Golden Valley Road Station. A 100-space park-and-ride and pedestrian and bicycle improvements would be included at the Golden Valley Road Station. The station would include bus drop off locations on Golden Valley Road and a crosswalk for riders to access westbound buses on Golden Valley Road from the station. At the intersection at Theodore Wirth Parkway and Golden Valley Road a traffic signal is included in the proposed BLRT Extension project.
25A	Steinberg	Dan	None provided	25	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Would like to see tunnel study from Golden Valley Rd to Abbot Dr. underground then zigzag the rail through Robbinsdale. All I am asking for is a study before track is laid down.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #20.
26A	Wildung	Cathy	None provided	26	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	Impacts on floodplains, wetlands, water sources for drinking and wells – private and public. (answers broken into three parts to answer each topic).	Concerning floodplains: The Council reviewed FEMA 100-year floodplains and FEMA floodways as part of the evaluation for the proposed BLRT Extension project. The floodplains and floodways were identified and evaluated based on current FEMA FIRM and ancillary information. The data in this section are based on the information in the Preliminary Floodplain Impacts and Mitigation Strategies Technical Memorandum (January 2016), or Floodplain Technical Memorandum. The Council conducted the analysis in coordination with the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), DNR, and local watershed organizations (Bassett Creek Water Management Commission, Shingle Creek Watershed Management Commission, West Mississippi Water Management Commission, and Mississippi Watershed Management Organization) as described in the Floodplain Technical Memorandum.
26B	Wildung	Cathy	None provided	26	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	Impacts on floodplains, wetlands, water sources for drinking and wells – private and public. (answers broken into three parts to answer each topic).	Concerning wetlands: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #16.
26C	Wildung	Cathy	None provided	26	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	Impacts on floodplains, wetlands, water sources for drinking and wells – private and public. (answer broken into three parts to answer each topic).	Concerning water sources: The Final EIS addresses drinking water in Section 5.1 dealing with utilities. Private and public wells within the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor are identified and the potential effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project are described. The construction and maintenance phases of the project would also incorporate appropriate measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts to drinking water from public and private wells.
26D	Wildung	Cathy	None provided	26	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	The possibility of uncovering hazardous materials – 790 recorded sites in B-C-D1 Preferred Alternative area.	Chapter 5 (Section 5.5) of the Final EIS discusses the potential for encountering contamination. A Phase I ESA has been conducted, and a Phase II ESA is being conducted to further evaluate the presence of contamination along the entire proposed BLRT Extension project corridor and proposed areas of construction. Information gathered from the Phase I and II ESA will be incorporated into the proposed BLRT Extension project's RAP (which includes a Construction Contingency Plan for unidentified contamination) to properly handle, treat, store, and dispose of solid wastes, hazardous materials, petroleum products, and other regulated materials that could not be avoided during construction. Coordination with the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, cities of Robbinsdale and Golden Valley, and the Three Rivers Park District will also be arranged.
26E	Wildung	Cathy	None provided	26	Written	6 – Noise and	Noise – both during construction phase in which noise decibel levels will exceed recommended levels for residential use – and the rail	An assessment of the impacts of construction noise was included in the Draft EIS and has been included in more detail in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
						Vibration Effects	noise, which, between 80-100 decibels equates to a concrete mixer, jack hammer and a rock drill. This is from the report on Page 5-39.	Construction noise levels are subject to local noise ordinances and noise rules administered by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA; Minnesota Rules, Chapter 7030). The primary means of mitigating noise from construction activities is to require the contractor to prepare a detailed Noise Control Plan. A noise control engineer or acoustician will work with the contractor to prepare a Noise Control Plan in conjunction with the contractor's specific equipment and methods of construction. Also, please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
26F	Wildung	Cathy	None provided	26	Written	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	The constant operating hours and service frequencies of the light rail, especially during early morning and late evening hours. Bells, horns, rail noise, will impact everyone nearby.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
27A	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	27	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I walked a ring around our woods from 27th Avenue North and the BN rail line to Golden Valley Road, then down the east side of the BN line to Highway 55, a 100+ acre expanse of wild life habitat your Draft EIS makes no reference about. I knocked only on the doors of properties abutting the BN line or abutting the wooded parkland that abuts the BN line (many of those owners have maintained private wild life habitat bordering park woods for decades) with some owners living directly across the street from park or BN wild life habitat. The owners on the front lines. Here are 96 of the 102 addresses I have collected so far. 4 of them are not on the front lines but I wasn't telling anyone that they couldn't sign a petition for no LRT in their woods. My biggest problem is people not answering doors. I have listened to many property owners and I can say with assurance that the true local preference is NO BUILD. A petition was attached as well. (This is the same correspondence as #27 sent to a different person)	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
43A	Boyce	Kim	None provided	43	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I am very supportive of the proposed transitway. Providing easier access to public transit for residents and visitors to the northwestern suburbs, as well as North Minneapolis, could prove to be a substation asset to this region.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
43B	Boyce	Kim	None provided	43	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	As I did a quick review of the reasoning and rationale outlined in the Executive Summary of the EIS, I have a much better understanding of why the D1 option was selected over the D2 option. The potential displacement of so many residents in the D2 option does create a significant negative impact on that portion of the community.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
43C	Boyce	Kim	None provided	43	Written	8 – Transportation System Effects	Having adequate traffic control and drop-off spaces at proposed stations at Golden Valley and Theodore Wirth Park are important considerations. Not everyone will be able to easily walk to these locations.	Chapter 3 – Transportation of the Final EIS discusses the Golden Valley Road Station. A 100-space park-and-ride and pedestrian and bicycle improvements would be included at the Golden Valley Road Station. The station would include bus drop off locations on Golden Valley Road and a crosswalk for riders to access westbound buses on Golden Valley Road from the station. At the intersection at Theodore Wirth Parkway and Golden Valley Road a traffic signal is included in the proposed BLRT Extension project.
44A	Smith	Marietta	Resident	44	Written	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	We need more time to review this voluminous report. I still need to review chapters 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 11. How do we get additional review time?	Please see response to Comment 24A.
45A	Smith	Marietta	Resident	45	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	I don't believe that the conclusions of the DEIS implying that the D1 Plymouth Station location is the best alternative were made taking into consideration the permanent detriment impact it will have on this urban ecological area. The natural urban wetland and wildlife habitat refuge provided by the area proposed for the Plymouth Station is unique. There is no way to mitigate the damage it will impose by any mitigation means. I'm told	Section 5.8 of the Final EIS summarizes impacts to wildlife habitat and endangered species. Theodore Wirth Regional Park has notable terrestrial and aquatic habitat that would be impacted by the proposed BLRT Extension project. Because of the urban setting of the proposed BLRT Extension project, the wildlife that inhabits these areas are generalist species adapted to urban conditions. These species are generally more tolerant of human presence and activities, including traffic (pedestrian, rail, and vehicle) and have demonstrated by their presence that they adapt readily to the human environment. Unavoidable impacts to aquatic habitat would be mitigated by

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							that the mitigation does not need to be -- and likely won't be -- in the damaged areas. One reason many of us purchased our homes in this area is because we loved the rural feel and aspect of that strip of land from Plymouth northward.	a combination of on-site wetland mitigation and purchasing suitable wetland credits from an established wetland mitigation bank. Unavoidable impacts to notable terrestrial habitat would be mitigated by restoring vegetation in and around Theodore Wirth Regional Park and other notable habitats to be determined during design efforts. Where effective and feasible, suitable wildlife crossings would be accommodated within proposed culverts to allow wildlife species to cross from one side of the LRT/freight rail tracks to the other.
45B	Smith	Marietta	Resident	45	Written	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Because those of us who live in Xerxes Avenue North -- just across from the proposed LRT station -- live on the Minneapolis side of the street we were not included in the initial findings -- which, coincidentally, originally did not envision a station in the Theodore Wirth BNSF corridor. It was completely short-sided and unfair to ignore our input and impact it would have on our area. The proposed project is virtually in our FRONT YARDS and BACK YARDS! As I understand it, the station is proposed to be constructed to the north of the Plymouth Avenue bridge. That area is just a narrow strip of land that can barely accommodate two additional sets of tracks, not even considering LRT Station. The existing BNSF railroad tracks have been a part of the landscape and were built decades before the current residential development of this area.	Please see MASTER RESPONSES #6, #14 and #19.
45C	Smith	Marietta	Resident	45	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	The damage that will be done by the heavy equipment and heavy construction cannot be repaired enough to restore the current ecological environment of that narrow strip of land. Forcing it to accommodate the proposed station by filling in the wetlands and marsh areas doesn't appear to be a good solution.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #14 and #16.
45D	Smith	Marietta	Resident	45	Written	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	The reality of the years of noise, dirt, dust, additional traffic, loss of neighborhood safety -- just to mention a few detrimental environmental impacts -- in a decades old residential and urban ecological area is just devastating.	Concerning noise: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17. Interior testing to determine the appropriate mitigation measure of impacted homes from Oak Park Avenue North to Golden Valley Road is the proposed mitigation measure. See Table 5.6-7 in the Final EIS for a summary of proposed mitigation measures by location. Concerning dirt and dust: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #12. Concerning additional traffic: The traffic operations analysis indicates that the Golden Valley Road/Theodore Wirth Parkway intersection would operate at a level of service E in 2040 with either the No-Build Alternative or the proposed BLRT Extension project. See Table 3.3-3 in the Final EIS. Concerning loss of neighborhood safety: No mitigation measures are warranted for long-term impacts to safety and security because there would be no adverse impacts to safety and security. Safety and security oversight for the proposed BLRT Extension project would be achieved through implementation of the proposed BLRT Extension project's Safety and Security Management Plan and the Metro Light Rail Transit Design Criteria. Concerning detrimental environmental impacts: Please see responses to Comments 45A, 45B, and 45C.
45E	Smith	Marietta	Resident	45	Written	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Also, the 45-day comment period for such a comprehensive report and its referenced reports and studies is unconscionable.	Please see response to Comment 24A.
46A	Smith	Marietta	Resident	46	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Despite the DEIS indicating the D1 (the LPA) is the best alternative of the routes being considered, I disagree. The negative impacts outweigh the benefits to this part of North Minneapolis -- which is further from Penn Avenue area surroundings that would most benefit from this project.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
46B	Smith	Marietta	Resident	46	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I understand Penn Avenue was dropped due to the number of houses that would need to be razed.	The Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) recommended Alignment D1 over Alignment D2 because Alignment D1 would result in significantly less property and

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								neighborhood impacts, improved travel time, greater cost-effectiveness, and less disruption of roadway traffic operations. Discussion focused on the adverse impacts of Alignment D2 and that Alignment D1 better meets the project goals. The costs (impacts) of Alignment D2 for the people on Penn Avenue would outweigh the potential benefits.
46C	Smith	Marietta	Resident	46	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	However, there should be a better alternative -- what about Olson Highway. Granted the Plymouth Avenue is closer to the Chalet but this alternative is more costly	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
46D	Smith	Marietta	Resident	46	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	(I'm sure there will be soil "surprises" once construction begins but that will be a bit late to make any substantive changes) and disruptive.	Chapter 5 (Section 5.4) of the Final EIS discusses poor or substandard soils. Detailed geotechnical analysis, including boring tests, has been conducted and the findings from those analyses are reflected in the Final EIS and project design. Chapter 5 (Section 5.5) of the Final EIS discusses hazardous and contaminated materials, which indicates a medium risk of contamination around the Plymouth Avenue Station.
46E	Smith	Marietta	Resident	46	Written	8 – Transportation System Effects	There are already transportation routes that culminate at Olson Highway and could easily tie into a station there.	Chapter 3 of the Final EIS discusses existing and future bus routes that would connect with stations. The existing route 7 would connect with the Plymouth Avenue Station.
47A	Lewis	Shaun	Urban League	47	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	The community need both Golden Valley Road Station and Plymouth Station.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #19.
48A	Lehman	Karen	None provided	48	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	<p>Thank for the opportunity to share my comments on May 7 with all of you. My property is at... I have since submitted written comments to the Bottineau Transitway team at the Metropolitan Council. I have some additional thoughts I would like to share with all of you, given your interest in protecting Golden Valley's interests without standing in opposition to larger regional interests.</p> <p>It is clear that Golden Valley is in an adaptation and mitigation situation all around. As a stand-alone community, we would be better served by better bus transit than by light rail. However, it appears that the D1 option is the only truly viable option for the outlying communities. So we must adapt as best we can.</p> <p>I am in favor of only one station in Golden Valley, preferably at Golden Valley Road, largely to decrease environmental disruption. I say that, even though I am likely to suffer the negative noise, parking, and decreased security consequences on Zephyr Place. If I am not mistaken, the impacts on wetlands will be greater at the Plymouth stop. Let's not do that. However, if the priority is Plymouth, then I think we should not develop Golden Valley Road. We only truly need one stop in Golden Valley, if we are thinking about people getting out of our community to places they want to go.</p>	Concerning the Golden Valley Road Station: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #19.
48B	Lehman	Karen	None provided	48	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	I now understand that no matter what, the line will be fenced, and that it will only be lit at the stations: one bad thing for the natural areas, and one good thing. Fencing will cut the wildlife corridor connecting Theodore Wirth Park and the east side of the line for the four-legged animals. Fortunately, birds will not be as affected. And the majority of the area will be unlit, which is great. I support that.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #13. Locations of fencing will continue to be explored through the design process; decisions regarding fencing locations will likely be finalized between the 30 percent and 60 percent design stages.
48C	Lehman	Karen	None provided	48	Written	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	So I am now focused on how to reduce the impact on those of us living on York and Zephyr Place whose homes hang out over the rail line, particularly for noise and visual pollution. Given that the line will be fenced regardless, I request that you advocate for a sound barrier below York and Zephyr Place, adequate to address the fact that sound travels up. The engineering study would need to address this unique aspect of above-grade housing. The barrier may require more height,	Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit's noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Impacts were identified in the Draft EIS in this area. An additional noise measurement was conducted in this area for the Final EIS and the results of the assessment and mitigation recommendations are included in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							or different placement (for example, on the informal path that currently exists on the east side of the line). It would be a plus that it might also provide a sight barrier so that we would continue to see trees and a neutral static wall, rather than seeing trains whizzing by every 10 minutes. This would allow this area to maintain some of its unique character and reduce impacts that might encourage me, and perhaps others, to sell our homes.	Interior testing to determine the appropriate mitigation measure is recommended for the location of 16th Avenue North to Golden Valley Road in Golden Valley, near Zephyr Place and York resulting in no residual noise impacts. See Table 5.6-7 in the Final EIS for a summary of proposed mitigation measures by location. Also, please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
48D	Lehman	Karen	None provided	48	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	For security reasons, I also request that you not develop a path along the east side of the line. I have already had one attempted break-in from someone using the informal path, and making it easier for people to have this “back door” out of the neighborhood with no eyes on the street would be detrimental to the community. People might think that a lighted path is safe. If no one is looking, it doesn’t matter, and then we just deal with light pollution in a currently blessedly dark place. Wirth Park has good paths. Making sure that there are good sidewalks on Golden Valley Road should be adequate.	No new trails would be developed along the east side of the BNSF right-of-way as a part of the proposed BLRT Extension project. There would be improvements to existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Chapter 3 of the Final EIS provides additional detail on bicycle and pedestrian facilities as a part of the proposed BLRT Extension project.
48E	Lehman	Karen	None provided	48	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	As I said to Commissioner Higgins and Council Member Clausen after the meeting, what you heard at the meeting was not resistance to change, but expression of loss. Golden Valley will be a different place once the line goes through, and people know that. Many will choose to leave to seek a place that has the qualities that Golden Valley currently possesses, and new people will come in who are more interested in getting to work easily. For those leaving, Golden Valley will be a worse place, and for those arriving, it will look better. My goal is not to leave, to protect as much of Golden Valley’s current natural character as possible. If I can tolerate the change in the environment, I will stay. At this point, tolerable is all I’m aiming for.	The Council has worked with the public and stakeholders to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to the environment since the publication of the Draft EIS. Impacts to floodplains were reduced from the Draft EIS (18,700 cubic yards) to the Final EIS (17,000 cubic yards). Impacts to wetlands increased slightly from 10.2 acres in the Draft EIS to 13.21 acres in the Final EIS. Permanent impacts to park resources were reduced to 2.11 acres. The visual character of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor as a whole would not be substantially changed. Noise effects from the proposed BLRT Extension project would result in no severe or moderate impacts with mitigation. Vibration impacts for residential land uses would be eliminated with mitigation. For additional information, please review Chapter 12 of the Final EIS.
63A	Davis	Denis F.	None provided	63	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	No lite rail whatsoever, no where. Dissolve the met council. Opposes all LRT.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
63B	Davis	Denis F.	None provided	63	Written	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	Not cost effective, do any rail systems operate in the red? 90 million per mile for LRT, 10 million to add a lane of road.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #4.
64A	Davis	Sharon	None provided	64	Written	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Get rid of Met Council. People should vote on this.	Please see response to Comment 24A. Chapter 9 of the Final EIS provides a summary of public involvement for the Final EIS, including a summary of open houses held during Final EIS preparation. The Council has hosted numerous events for public input in the City of Robbinsdale. Open houses, public hearings, and city council work sessions have all been organized to provide information about the proposed BLRT Extension project and to solicit feedback from community members. The Council also attends community events and presents to local organizations.
64B	Davis	Sharon	None provided	64	Written	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	Project is a waste of money.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #4.
64C	Davis	Sharon	None provided	64	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	People do not want this. Stop now. Opposes project.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
65A	Dougherty	Rebecca	None provided	65	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I support the light rail coming to Brooklyn Park 100%	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
65B	Dougherty	Rebecca	None provided	65	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	If any of the issues of access or loss of property [along West Broadway Avenue in Brooklyn Park] can be addressed that would be great. I know they all can’t be satisfied, but any is better than none.	Moving from an undivided configuration that allows full access into and out of every driveway along the West Broadway Avenue (County State-Aid Highway 103) corridor to a divided configuration is expected to increase traffic capacity, improve traffic operations, and lower the rate of incidents (crashes). Multiple studies have documented the capacity, mobility, and safety improvements that can be achieved

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								with this type of roadway design. By directing traffic to designated median openings, the proposed West Broadway Avenue corridor design would allow businesses and other private driveways full access to one direction of travel, with right-in/right-out access. Also, please see MASTER RESPONSE #21.
65C	Dougherty	Rebecca	None provided	65	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Thank you for the work on this project. We do need light rail to Brooklyn Park.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
65D	Dougherty	Rebecca	None provided	65	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Living near the LR not on the LR is a valid comment but people need to consider the extra expense of a tunnel or elevated train.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #20.
65E	Dougherty	Rebecca	None provided	65	Written	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Informing the public more on access to college and businesses and how that is positive is so important.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #6.
66A	Jonas	Brian	None provided	66	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I am against the proposed LRT route along West Broadway to Brooklyn Park.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
66B	Jonas	Brian	None provided	66	Written	8 – Transportation System Effects	I live nearby and am greatly concerned about traffic disruptions going both in and out of my property. Turning restrictions along West Broadway would prevent him from being able to turn left onto Maplebrook Parkway to enter Maplebrook Estates and would prevent him from turning left exiting Maplebrook Parkway to go north on West Broadway.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects. Moving from an undivided configuration that allows full access into and out of every driveway along the West Broadway Avenue corridor to a divided configuration is expected to increase traffic capacity, improve traffic operations, and lower the rate of incidents (crashes). Multiple studies have documented the capacity, mobility, and safety improvements that can be achieved with this type of roadway design. By directing traffic to designated median openings, the proposed West Broadway Avenue corridor design would allow businesses and other private driveways full access to one direction of travel, with right-in/right-out access. The proposed BLRT Extension project includes a variety of roadway modifications that would avoid new congested intersections, and, with one exception, the proposed BLRT Extension project would not worsen conditions at intersections that would be congested with the No-Build Alternative in 2040. Additional information can be found in Section 3.3 of the Final EIS.
66C	Jonas	Brian	None provided	66	Written	8 – Transportation System Effects	I also work in Brooklyn Park and the construction would impact route to work, possibly sending him miles out of the way.	To mitigate impacts during construction, the Council will develop a Construction Mitigation Plan, a Construction Communication Plan, and a construction staging plan. These tools will help the Council notify people in advance about any access issues or closures. The construction staging plan would also help businesses and patrons affected by LRT construction understand when construction would occur in different areas of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Finally, a 24-hour construction hotline will be available for issue resolution and information about LRT construction. Section 3.4 of the Final EIS (Pedestrians and Bicyclists) summarizes construction-phase mitigation measures. During construction, the Council will require the contractor to comply with appropriate state and local requirements concerning the closing of roadways. The mitigation measures required by the city for roadway access and traffic control also apply.
66D	Jonas	Brian	None provided	66	Written	8 – Transportation System Effects	Turning restrictions along West Broadway would affect my access to Brooklyn Park businesses causing me to take my business to other cities.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects. Moving from an undivided configuration that allows full access into and out of every driveway along the West Broadway Avenue corridor to a divided configuration is expected to increase traffic capacity, improve traffic operations, and lower the rate of incidents (crashes). Multiple studies have documented the capacity, mobility, and

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								safety improvements that can be achieved with this type of roadway design. By directing traffic to designated median openings, the proposed West Broadway Avenue corridor design would allow businesses and other private driveways full access to one direction of travel, with right-in/right-out access. The proposed BLRT Extension project includes a variety of roadway modifications that would avoid new congested intersections, and, with one exception, the proposed BLRT Extension project would not worsen conditions at intersections that would be congested with the No-Build Alternative in 2040. Additional information can be found in Section 3.3 of the Final EIS.
66E	Jonas	Brian	None provided	66	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I am also concerned about loss of homes due to LRT and West Broadway construction.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #21.
66F	Jonas	Brian	None provided	66	Written	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	I am concerned about increased noise from the LRT, the roadway and the LRT station proposed at 85th Ave which I live by. Please reconsider the current plan and send it to Maple Grove instead of disrupting home owners.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17 and #1. Five moderate noise impacts have been identified between Shingle Creek and 85th Avenue North in Brooklyn Park. The moderate impacts at these locations do not meet the decibel threshold to warrant mitigation as defined by the Metro Transit noise mitigation approach.
67A	Olson	Leslie	None provided	67	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Declining house values – up to \$20,000 depreciation per Realtor meeting.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #7.
67B	Olson	Leslie	None provided	67	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Difficulty in selling townhouse during each phase (being in limbo as final decision is being made by county and city/road expansion project construction/LRT construction). Need to disclose county plans for road/LRT. Maplebrook sellers are all looking for the exact same buyer.	Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would not displace any residential properties. All property would be acquired in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended and Minnesota Statute (Minn. Stat.) 117. The Council is required to pay fair market value for property. Damages are determined by the appraiser on a parcel by parcel basis and would be included in the appraisal with the offer amount. Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue widening project. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects.
67C	Olson	Leslie	None provided	67	Written	8 – Transportation System Effects	Double lane Road (possible 45-50 mph). More traffic (trucks/semis going to warehouses, rush hour, emergency vehicles), significant increase in noise levels, 45-50 mph roads turn into 55-60 mph with speed of traffic.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #21.
67D	Olson	Leslie	None provided	67	Written	8 – Transportation System Effects	Need wide biking/walking paths. There will be more foot traffic and less privacy.	Sidewalks are proposed on the east side of West Broadway Avenue from 74th Avenue to the 93rd Avenue park-and-ride station. Review of the LRT station locations with respect to pedestrians and bicyclists can be found in Chapter 3 (Section 3.4) of the Final EIS. Also, new or improved sidewalk crossing would be provided in the final design of West Broadway Avenue. See Hennepin County's Environmental Assessment Worksheet on the widening of West Broadway Avenue.
67E	Olson	Leslie	None provided	67	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	Loss of berm/three evergreens to accommodate paths/roadway meaning less privacy and less appealing (look directly at traffic), increase noise due to loss of barrier, no barrier to stop cars that swerved off road in accidents (direct access to townhouse unit).	Please see response to Comment 66B.
67F	Olson	Leslie	None provided	67	Written	5 – Environmental Effects	Loss of mature trees/bushes/grassy area in association (loss of nature) – more cement/pavement.	Much of the forested area in the project is severely degraded from infestation of European buckthorn. Dense growth of European buckthorn limits regeneration of desirable tree species and with time eliminates any native herbaceous cover. Some of the areas disturbed from construction that lie outside of the trackage would be revegetated with a diverse complement of tree and herbaceous species.
67G	Olson	Leslie	None provided	67	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Closer proximity to utility poles and power lines will be visually unappealing for townhomes.	Section 5.1 of the Final EIS summarizes utilities. In Brooklyn Park, the Xcel transmission towers north of Trunk Highway (TH) 610 would be relocated to the center of the proposed West Broadway Avenue Boulevard, east of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. The horizontal and vertical locations of overhead electric and communication lines would be adjusted to provide adequate vertical

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								and horizontal clearance for LRT vehicles and the overhead catenary system. The majority of views in the Brooklyn Park landscape unit would have moderate impacts as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project. To the extent feasible, project facilities have been sited to avoid locations in proximity to residences, parks, or other sensitive visual receptors. Where avoidance is not feasible, or where greater visual or privacy effects are anticipated to result from the introduction of new physical features of the proposed BLRT Extension project, such as where the elevation of the LRT alignment would be higher than adjacent residences, efforts would be made to screen or soften the view using landscaping or walls where adequate space permits. Landscape treatments would be selected for consistency with applicable local policies, consideration for agency maintenance budgets and staffing, and compatibility with the character of the parks and surrounding neighborhoods.
67H	Olson	Leslie	None provided	67	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Higher association dues likely to occur as a result of loss of acquired townhouses. Lose neighborhood feel to the community and lose townhouses in association/whole look to association (less appealing).	Association dues are affected by a variety of market conditions. Impacts of an LRT project on association dues are difficult to assess conclusively.
67I	Olson	Leslie	None provided	67	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Likely to be higher crime rate due to more foot traffic/road traffic.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.
67J	Olson	Leslie	None provided	67	Written	8 – Transportation System Effects	Restricted access to W. Broadway (lose ability to turn north from N. Maplebrook Circle), limits ease of access to Hwy 610/169.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue widening project. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects. Moving from an undivided configuration that allows full access into and out of every driveway along the West Broadway Avenue corridor to a divided configuration is expected to increase traffic capacity, improve traffic operations, and lower the rate of incidents (crashes). Multiple studies have documented the capacity, mobility, and safety improvements that can be achieved with this type of roadway design. By directing traffic to designated median openings, the proposed West Broadway Avenue corridor design would allow businesses and other private driveways full access to one direction of travel, with right-in/right-out access.
67K	Olson	Leslie	None provided	67	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Addition of county library increases car/foot traffic/noise.	The proposed BLRT Extension project is not associated with the addition of a new county library; however, the analyses conducted for roadway traffic and station ridership take into account the planned development in the area.
67L	Olson	Leslie	None provided	67	Written	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Construction phase – widening of West Broadway (long duration construction). Concerned about vibration.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue widening project. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects.
67M	Olson	Leslie	None provided	67	Written	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Concerned about noise from LRT which includes station announcements, bell, train.	Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified and mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit’s noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS. Table 5.6-7 summarizes the residential noise mitigation measures. There are no severe residential noise impacts anticipated in Brooklyn Park. Therefore, no mitigation measures for this area are proposed.
67N	Olson	Leslie	None provided	67	Written	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Concerned about vibration from LRT.	Vibration impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures have been recommended. Vibration is discussed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.7) of the Final EIS. No vibration impacts have been identified in Brooklyn Park.
67O	Olson	Leslie	None provided	67	Written	8 – Transportation	Concerned about frequency of trains.	The Final EIS assumes that trains would operate at 10-minute frequencies for weekday operations. Travel times and operating assumptions for the proposed BLRT

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
						System Effects		Extension project are discussed in Section 2.6.2.3 of the Final EIS.
67P	Olson	Leslie	None provided	67	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	If I was a new buyer, would I have ever considered a unit with these conditions/negative variables? ABSOLUTELY NOT.	Comment Noted. Please see response to Comment 67L.
68A	Spence	Sharyn	None provided	68	Written	8 – Transportation System Effects	How many transit trains are expected to run along West Broadway and what will the time intervals be?	The Final EIS assumes that trains would operate at 10-minute frequencies for weekday operations. Travel times and operating assumptions for the proposed BLRT Extension Project are discussed in Section 2.5.2.3 of the Final EIS.
68B	Spence	Sharyn	None provided	68	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	How many families will lose their homes due to the widening of West Broadway?	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #21.
68C	Spence	Sharyn	None provided	68	Written	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	How much traffic noise can be expected from the proposed project?	The West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project would result in significantly lower speeds on the roadway (see the Environmental Assessment Worksheet [EAW] for the Hennepin County West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project, September 2015). Since highway noise is very dependent on traffic speed (higher speeds mean more noise) there would be lower noise levels after the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project is implemented than there are today. Noise impacts for the Proposed BLRT Extension project were prepared consistent with FTA's 2006 Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment methodology (see Section 5.6 of the Final EIS). This methodology is based on existing ambient noise data and the calculated effect of introducing a transit project. Since the proposed BLRT noise assessment was based on existing conditions, which include higher-speed present day traffic on West Broadway Avenue, the cumulative effects of implementing both projects (with future lower speeds on West Broadway Avenue) is predicted to be slightly lower noise than would result from the Proposed BLRT Extension project by itself. The cumulative effects identified would be primarily due to the presence of a crossover near the North Hennepin Community College.
68D	Spence	Sharyn	None provided	68	Written	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	What caused the West Broadway improvement project to increase from 107 feet to 178 feet.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects.
69A	Swanson	Randy	None provided	69	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I own the property that is being impacted at 73rd and Hwy 81. I object and am frustrated by this project taking control over my property for the past two years and for the next several years. I cannot sell or expand or improve this property since it will eventually be taken. This also applies to all homeowners along the corridor. We are frozen in place until this project runs its inevitable mind numbing pace to eventual construction. The confiscation during this period doesn't cost the government entities a dime but will cause us who are affected potential extreme hardships. I had a benefited buyer for my property in November 2014 who was serious enough to bring his architect for plan approval and was told no by the city of BP because it would be eventually acquired for LRT. I am at retirement age and would like to sell – what are my options? None according to Hennepin County until the project reaches property acquisition status in 2-3 years from today.	Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. Two businesses at Bottineau Boulevard (County Road 81) and 73rd Avenue would be displaced as part of the proposed BLRT Extension project: American Furniture Mart at 7308 Lakeland Avenue North, Brooklyn Park and Modern Dental Studio at 7300 Lakeland Avenue North, Brooklyn Park. All property would be acquired in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended and Minn. Stat. 117. The Council is required to pay fair market value for property.
70A	Weiske	Jeanne	None provided	70	Written	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	The so called "environmental impact statement" totally ignored the impact of the noise and vibration of the LRT on the residents along the proposed corridor. I, and many others, are extremely sensitive to infrasound vibrations. Especially deep bass, or, the rumble of wheels on tracks. This is not, in any way, an enhancement to our area. That vibration is easily carried by the bedrock or sub soil. We are NOT stupid. We do not want to live in an urban area, that's why we are here, not in the cities. This is another case of political confusion. A little honesty, clarity would go a lot farther.	Noise and vibration impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit's noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Noise and vibration are discussed in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS. The impact assessment methodology is discussed in the Noise and Vibration Technical Report, which provides detailed information about what inputs were considered as sources of noise and vibration for the project. These inputs include, but are not limited to, light rail train speeds, operating hours, LRT bells, LRT horns, crossing bells, type of track, crossovers, and elevated structures. Please see also MASTER RESPONSES #17

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								and #18.
71A	Wilson	Mary	None provided	71	Written	4 – Social and Economic Effects	We are concerned about our property value, safety, noise is our main issue. Not wise for us??	Concerning property value: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #7. Concerning safety: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8. Concerning noise: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
72A	Bellward	Paul	None provided	72	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I would like to share my excitement at the idea of light rail coming to Brooklyn Park and being part of the Bottineau Transitway. I am originally from Britain where public transport is far more widespread and would love to see the same sort of access to an affordable far reaching transit system here. I see light rail as a big way to keep the Twin Cities moving forward and being part of the solution to of mass transit problem for many years to come. The thought of being able to walk out of my door to a nearby station and being able to ride to downtown Minneapolis, MOA, airport St Paul or other cities is fantastic. This is a much needed addition to Brooklyn Park. I would hate to think of our city losing out and not being connected to the rest of the Twin cities in this way. I do own a property relatively close to the planned rail line, I am sure that I will be able to hear the bells as the train pulls into the closest station but this small disadvantage is far outweighed by the benefits. Please bring light rail to Brooklyn Park!	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
73A		Randy	None provided	73	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I support these projects being proposed for my neighborhood. As a resident of the west Broadway area, I believe this will enhance our property values and make my neighborhood a more livable place.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
74A	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	74	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	We of Hearthbrook Neighborhood Association, Hidden Lakes Neighborhood Association, Bassett Creek Neighborhood Association, Sweeney Lake Neighborhood Association, are absolutely opposed to this project station at Golden Valley Road, next to the Fire Station, west of St. Margaret Mary Church, South of Theodore worth Parkway and Golden Valley Rd., Golden Valley.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
74B	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	74	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	Golden Valley Road station will cause irreparable harm to the natural environment.	The Golden Valley Road Station is included in the proposed BLRT Extension scope and budget. The station’s impacts were evaluated, addressed, resolved, and mitigated in the Final EIS. (See Chapter 5 of the Final EIS.) Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #19.
74C	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	74	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	The station should be rerouted to the tracks and central area of Downtown Golden Valley near the City Hall. It would serve the greater population and greater good of Golden Valley by being there.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
74D	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	74	US Mail	8 – Transportation System Effects	Being at the station on Golden Valley road would create excess noise, traffic, pollution, crime and noise along that road, neighborhoods and corridor. (see also comments 74D through 74G for comment responses)	Concerning traffic: The traffic operations analysis indicates that the Golden Valley Road/Theodore Wirth Parkway intersection would operate at a level of service E in 2040 with either the No-Build Alternative or the proposed BLRT Extension project. See Table 3.3-3 in the Final EIS.
74E	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	74	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Being at the station on Golden Valley road would create excess noise, traffic, pollution, crime and noise along that road, neighborhoods and corridor. (see comments 74D through 74G for comment responses)	Concerning noise: Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit’s noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS. The park-and-ride at Golden Valley Road was included in the noise analysis in the Final EIS. Interior to determine the appropriate mitigation measure testing is proposed at the location from 16th Avenue to Golden Valley Road. A noise barrier is proposed at the location from Golden Valley Road to 26th Avenue North. See Table 5.6-7 in the Final EIS for additional information about proposed mitigation measures for residential properties.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
74F	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	74	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	Being at the station on Golden Valley road would create excess noise, traffic, pollution, crime and noise along that road, neighborhoods and corridor. (see comments 74D through 74G for comment responses)	Concerning pollution: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #11.
74G	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	74	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Being at the station on Golden Valley road would create excess noise, traffic, pollution, crime and noise along that road, neighborhoods and corridor. (see comments 74D through 74G for comment responses)	Concerning crime: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.
74H	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	74	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Putting the station and transportation along Golden Valley Rd and Wirth Parkway will detrimentally affect the property values in our neighborhoods, because of noise, pollution, dirt, excess traffic, crime, over amount of traffic on light rail.	Concerning property values: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #7.
74I	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	74	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Our properties are sacrosanct, they are our refuge, as are great amount of environmental refuges in the area. And, this light rail that you are trying to roll over our neighborhoods is going to be harmful to our health and mental and physical well being.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #9.
74J	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	74	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	You have not provided us with actual noise decibel study, a projected dirt and air quality study.	Concerning noise: Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit's noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Impacts were identified in the Draft EIS in this area. An additional noise measurement was conducted in this area for the Final EIS and the results of the assessment and mitigation recommendations are included in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS. Existing noise levels at the location of 16th Avenue North to Golden Valley Road in Golden Valley, near Kewanee Way are 54 dBA. Noise levels with the proposed BLRT Extension project would be 64 dBA. Interior testing to determine the appropriate mitigation measure is the recommended mitigation for the location of 16th Avenue North to Golden Valley Road in Golden Valley, near Kewanee Way. With mitigation no residual residential noise impacts are anticipated from the proposed BLRT Extension project. See Table 5.6-7 in the Final EIS for a summary of proposed mitigation measures by location. Concerning dirt and dust: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #12. Concerning air quality: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #11.
74K	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	74	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	You have written flawed and amateurish Health projection affects. So we plead with you to reroute this light rail project to downtown Golden Valley and certainly cease and desist the current plan which will greatly harm our neighborhoods.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #9.
83A	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	83	Written	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	I went to the Golden Valley public hearing and was cut off at 3 minutes, so I returned to the Crystal meeting, gave some comments to the transcribers so I wasn't cut off again, but I was, and what were the remarks I could not make to the public at a public meeting?	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #6.
83B	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	83	Written	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Met Council and Hennepin County come up with over 15 pounds of scoping, Draft EIS and health reports and we are given three minutes to respond. Many of us attending these meetings want to hear what our fellow citizens have to say about your project, but half the people in Golden Valley and Crystal were cut off. So while you limit how much you have to listen to us, you also limit our opportunity to hear our fellow citizens. You go through the cost and effort of holding these public meetings and the actual public hearing lasts in Golden Valley 40 minutes and Crystal's 20 minutes. I have never been to one that's gone over 47 minutes. Since some people have already experienced being cut off they don't speak and file written comments. These are people who have waded through much of your reports and	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #6.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							we don't get to hear from them at all. There's a great response about BRT that's getting filed via computer. We have no reason to trust Met Council and Hennepin County with our 100+ acre expanse of woods down the BN Line. Bot No!	
84A	Anderson	Brian	None provided	84	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	A large concern I have is for the southern half of the Willard Hay neighborhood. We are already cut off from Theodore Wirth Park, this project has the ability to make connecting even harder. We currently have two ways to get there, cross the six lanes of traffic at Highway 55 to a sidewalk on the Southside or go up to the Plymouth Avenue bridge, but no close or easy access to the trail under the bridge due to the golf course and archery range.	The following pedestrian enhancements in the vicinity of Olson Memorial Highway (TH 55) and Thomas Avenue include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Provision of a protected pedestrian crossing at a new signalized intersection at Olson Memorial Highway and Thomas Avenue ■ Provision of a protected pedestrian crossing at a new signalized intersection at Olson Memorial Highway and Thomas Avenue ■ Accommodation for a cycle track on the north side of the roadway. The cycle track cross-section would consist of a 10-foot boulevard, 10-foot-wide bicycle path, two-foot buffer area, and a six-foot sidewalk ■ Provision of a multi-use trail on the north side of the reconstructed westbound Olson Memorial Highway bridge.
84B	Anderson	Brian	None provided	84	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	I hope the trail connections from the area of Thomas North to Washburn North are being looked at. Along the Northside of Hwy 55 sidewalk/trail connection over the rail road tracks to connect to the walking/bike trails on the west side of the rail road trench would be very appreciated. Also, a flyover walking/bike trail bridge at 8th or Oak Park at Washburn would also help connect the neighborhood to a park that is hard to get to.	Please see response to Comment 84A.
84C	Anderson	Brian	None provided	84	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	A city issue, I know, but we are also missing sidewalks in my neighborhood. With light rail, I expect walking to become more common and sidewalks will be needed instead of people walking down the middle of the street. Areas of concern are: 900 block of Washburn, 8th street between Washburn and Upton and Oak Park between Xerxes and Vincent. Upton to Thomas Service Road just north of Highway 55.	Please see response to Comment 84A.
85A	Burakowski	Mike	None provided	85	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	My son and I live on Kewanee Way so this project has been a regular topic of discussion with neighbors and friends. We have attended previous meetings at the Wirth chalet and Golden Valley city hall and have read just about every document, email and update that has been provided. When interacting with our council members prior to third, strategically scheduled Golden Valley vote, the message was clear that they were voting to add Golden Valley's support to the EIS. They were also clear that if the project was not in the best interest of the city of Golden Valley, the council members would withdraw their support and suggest an alternative route. The majority of Golden Valley residents in attendance were not in favor of this preferred route, but I believed the word of our representatives and watched the long awaited EIS report. Having reviewed the document, I am not convinced that the alternative route is best for Golden Valley and all prospective users. I am also not at all convinced that Golden Valley or any other represented body will object to this route and demand an alternate. Subsequent emails about station planning also tells me that this is moving forward and that this email is futile.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
85B	Burakowski	Mike	None provided	85	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	This route appears to be "preferred" due to the least amount of impact on private property and associated costs. While a route down Bottineau Blvd/Broadway would result in more displacement, it would broaden transportation options, provide easier access to North Minneapolis businesses and North Memorial Hospital and support	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							growth like that seen along Hiawatha and Green lines.	
85C	Burakowski	Mike	None provided	85	Email	1 – Purpose and Need	I object to the data that suggests more riders and development as a result of the “preferred” route. The BNSF corridor takes the Bottineau line through well-established areas of Robbinsdale, woodlands and wetlands in Golden Valley and the Theodore Wirth Park. I’m at a loss to explain how those areas would support housing and business growth and increased ridership when compared to a route through North Minneapolis.	The Council used its regional travel demand forecasting model to develop the transit ridership forecasts for the proposed BLRT Extension project. BLRT Extension project ridership modeling is discussed in Section 3.1 of the Final EIS. Approximately 27,000 daily riders are forecast for 2040. Section 4.6 of the Final EIS discusses economic effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project. The evaluation of Alignments D1 and D2 considered several environmental and social issues and impact areas. While each alternative has a number of benefits and impacts to the surrounding area and residents, the social and environmental justice impacts associated with the displacement of many homes and disruption of community cohesion with Alignment D2 would be disproportionately adverse. With Alignment D1, the north Minneapolis community would not have proposed BLRT Extension project stations on Penn Avenue; however, Metro Transit has been advancing the planning and design of an enhanced transit service for the Penn Avenue corridor. A network of arterial bus rapid transit (BRT) lines is planned for the Minneapolis–St. Paul area, including the C Line along Penn Avenue. BRT is an enhanced transit service providing 25–30 percent faster trips and an improved experience for transit riders. This new BRT line would provide enhanced transit for this community, as well as opportunities for economic development, without the significantly adverse impacts associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project.
85D	Burakowski	Mike	None provided	85	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I have to admit that I am one of the “trespassers” who regularly crosses the BNSF tracks in front of my house to get to Mary Hills and Sochaki parks. I haven’t dwelled on the illegality of our actions, focusing on the ease of access that we have enjoyed for 10+ years from the Kewanee Way. With that being said, our neighborhood has also been the caretakers of the surrounding property that appears to be a “no man’s land” for Excel Energy, BNSF, and the City of Golden Valley. Neighbors cut the grass while Excel dispatches the Asplundh tree service periodically to haphazardly provide “preventive” service to the area, ignoring trees and brush in problem areas and laying bare other areas that appear to pose no threat to overhead power lines. Buckthorn and fallen trees area a problem that neither BNSF and Golden Valley will claim. Our care of these areas doesn’t trump our “trespassing” over the tracks, but you need to be aware of commitment to these soon-to-be-off-limits areas for our neighborhood.	The informal and unauthorized crossings across BNSF property from Kewanee Way near Sochacki Park and Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Nature Area would be eliminated as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Crossings at Golden Valley Road and Plymouth Avenue would be the primary points of access for pedestrians traveling from Kewanee Way. With freight and LRT operating in the same corridor the proposed BLRT Extension project would include corridor protection treatments for safety precautions. Corridor protection treatments include a ditch, a retained fill option where the LRT tracks would be at a higher grade than freight rail tracks, or a wall. Section 3.2 of the Final EIS provides additional detail about freight rail conditions and safety requirements.
85E	Burakowski	Mike	None provided	85	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	I had a totally different understanding of the EIS and patiently waited for someone to knock on my door to interview me to determine how this project would impact us; I even emailed the Bottineau team to inquire about the lack of contact with our neighborhood. The data provided in the report is simply scientific – noise and vibration levels recorded at the top of our street. The impact to our street and others along the line cannot simply be measured in decibels and important details are missing: the deer in my backyard this morning, sleeping with the windows open and hearing only crickets and our 4:45 cardinal wake up, the visual impact of three lines of tracks and overhead wires in place of trees and shrubs. I do not negate the impact of a rail line down the middle of Penn Ave N to the city residents, but the quality of life on Kewanee Way enjoyed since the mid-60’s will change forever. Yet the reports suggests “minimal impact” to me and my neighbors, a gap in reporting that is made worse by the assertion that only five houses at the top of Kewanee Way would be sufficiently affected by noise and vibration to warrant mitigation efforts. Really? Sit with me in my office in St. Paul along the	Concerning public involvement: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #6. Also the Council has hosted numerous events for public input in the City of Golden Valley. Open houses, public hearings, and city council work sessions have all been organized to provide information about the proposed BLRT Extension project and to solicit feedback from community members. The Council also attends community events and presents to local organizations. Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit’s noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Impacts were identified in the Draft EIS in this area. An additional noise measurement was conducted in this area for the Final EIS and the results of the assessment and mitigation recommendations are included in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS. Existing noise levels at the location of Golden Valley Road to 26th Avenue North in Golden Valley, near Kewanee Way are 50 dBA. Noise levels with the proposed BLRT Extension project would be 65 dBA. A noise barrier is the recommended mitigation for the location of Golden Valley Road to 26th Avenue North in Golden Valley, near Kewanee Way. With mitigation one moderate and one severe residual residential

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							Green Line – listen to the trains (about 10 times the distance from my front window at home), listen to the bells and whistles, feel the vibration and then tell me that we won't be impacted by trains 100 feet from my front door.	noise impacts are anticipated from the proposed BLRT Extension project in this area. See Table 5.6-7 in the Final EIS for a summary of proposed mitigation measures by location.
85F	Burakowski	Mike	None provided	85	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	<p>Speaking solely as a Golden Valley resident, this line does not benefit our city. If the Golden Valley station is chosen in your already-planned-meetings, I see few GV residents having easy access to the line. There will be no parking, so connector bus lines will bring riders to the station. I will have to traverse the woods at the end of the street for access in order to avoid a 1.5 miles walk down Byrd and Zenith. I'm not sure if the Theodore Wirth station would technically be in Minneapolis or Golden Valley, but that option decreases the likelihood of Golden Valley residents using the line. The Bottineau Blvd/Broadway option would not benefit Golden Valley resident access, but I can't help but think that ridership would increase in a more populated area.</p> <p>I am a proponent of light rail and will use the line where ever it ends up, but I don't feel that the preferred route is the best overall plan for the region and strongly encourage that Golden Valley and Met Council move the Bottineau line to the Bottineau/Broadway corridor.</p>	A 100-space park-and-ride would be located at the Golden Valley Road Station as part of the proposed BLRT Extension project. This would provide parking for Golden Valley residents accessing the station.
87A	Duggan	Mary Ann	None provided	87	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I feel that the Light Rail is a good thing but I do not feel that coming up Broadway Avenue is the way to go with it. There will be so many homes and people impacted if this decision is made. The noise and confusion of it all will hurt all of us in the area. Please consider an alternative way to go with the rail. I bought my home in Maplebrook 19 years ago and love it here. If the light rail comes down Broadway Ave., it will change everything to something that does not benefit anyone in the area. I'm 69 years old and my plan is to stay here for a lot of years yet. I want my retirement to be an enjoyable one not one with noise and confusion.	<p>Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit's noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. No moderate or severe noise impacts are anticipated along West Broadway Avenue between 85th Avenue North and 89th Avenue North.</p> <p>Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would not displace any residential properties. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117.</p> <p>Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #21.</p>
88A	Lambert	Terry	None provided	88	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Where is the study for the 85th to 93rd on West Broadway? Impact on loss of homes – many immigrant families. Noise, loss of home property values. North Minneapolis will not allow it – why is Brooklyn Park considering this? Where is the environmental impact statement for West Broadway expansion project? Very low I know – kill the West Broadway Expansion project – bad deal for all residents on or near west Broadway.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects. Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #21.
89A	Weiske	Jeanne	None provided	89	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	This is an integrated community of retirees, middle class working families, and immigrants looking for the "American Dream". I worked 46 years, bought the home I want to retire in. Now that I'm retired, the wheels of government are rolling across our homes and you offer what? market values? that's about half of the present value and half of what those of us still with a mortgage are paying. I've seen this way too often in a city council, rolls over an established community, drives out the settled residents, all for the "greater good". Whose "greater good"? Yours? The future? WE pay your salaries. We the tax payers, the ones you wish to drive out. For a change, listen to the people.	Since publication of the Draft EIS, modifications to the preliminary design have resulted in the avoidance of several anticipated property acquisitions and resulting displacements with the proposed BLRT Extension project. No residential property displacements are anticipated as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117. Section 7.5.1 of the Final EIS provides a detailed analysis of the potentially disproportionately high and adverse impacts of the proposed BLRT Extension project in regards to displacements of environmental justice communities. Avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures were taken to reduce impacts to minority and low-income populations. The proposed BLRT Extension project has the potential to indirectly spur development in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor particularly around stations. This creates the

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								potential for changes in property values as described above, which can be perceived as either an impact (generally for renters) or a benefit (generally for owners). These potential "pricing-out" impacts (that is, increased rents and decreased affordability for existing residents) can be offset by the decrease in transportation costs. The Health Impact Assessment suggests that cities, communities and developers work together to keep housing options affordable in station areas to ensure that neighborhoods near the transit stations continue to be affordable for low-income households (Myslajek, 2013). Additionally, Hennepin County is proactively considering strategies to minimize impacts on housing values with their station area planning effort, which seeks input from the public, including environmental justice (EJ) populations, to create a framework for any potential development that aligns with the community's goals and preferences. Furthermore, the Metropolitan Council (Council) has established programs to encourage affordable housing planning and implementation that may offset potential indirect impacts to low-income persons. Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #6.
90A	Bellward	Stacy	None provided	90	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Love light rail, love that it is coming to our neighborhood!! The faster it gets here the better!	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
91A	Giles	Patricia	None provided	91	US Mail	8 – Transportation System Effects	West Broadway has been an easy way of catching the buses and connecting with other bus lines and being able to walk to any of the businesses along 85th to Brooklyn Blvd.	The proposed BLRT Extension project is consistent with and supports the Purpose and Need outlined in Chapter 1 of in the Final EIS. The proposed BLRT Extension project would improve the transportation system by providing more travel choices and faster travel times between residential areas, major destinations, and employment centers.
91B	Giles	Patricia	None provided	91	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	Why would you want to take away the beauty and the peaceful tranquility from these locations, where people are out taking walks, walking their dogs, meeting and greeting one another along the way.	Chapter 4 (Section 4.5) of the Final EIS describes the process for determining visual impacts to natural areas. The visual impacts of the proposed BLRT Extension project were determined by evaluating the changes to existing visual resources that would occur as a result of project implementation, and assessing the anticipated viewer response to those changes. Visual impact assessment was based on direct field observation from multiple vantage points, including from neighboring properties and roadways; evaluation of existing visual character; and review of proposed BLRT Extension project plans and features. Visual impact assessment was also based on photographic documentation of existing conditions for several key views of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Adverse effects to visual quality would occur in some areas, such as areas where recreational and residential uses are located along or in the vicinity of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. At locations where adverse visual effects are anticipated, project elements added to the rail corridor may be visually screened or softened using landscaping where adequate space permits, and the loss of existing vegetation on side slopes for grading or access purposes would be replaced to the extent feasible. Several local plans address aesthetic and visual resources in the proposed BLRT Extension project area, and applicable policies include the establishment of design and landscape guidelines.
91C	Giles	Patricia	None provided	91	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Have you really stop and pictured it, where the sound and the noise will take place?	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
91D	Giles	Patricia	None provided	91	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Have you really considered how this effects peoples homes and their privacy or how things will be for driving, how they get to places that didn't take them as long, now they will get in longer time. If effects everything.	No mitigation measures are warranted for long-term impacts to roads and traffic because the identified avoidance measures would prevent any adverse impacts as a result of roadway modifications. As shown in Table 3.3-2 of the Final EIS, the proposed BLRT Extension project includes a variety of roadway modifications that would avoid new congested intersections, and, with one exception, the proposed BLRT Extension project would not worsen conditions at intersections that would be congested with the No-Build Alternative in 2040. Since publication of the Draft EIS, modifications to the preliminary design have resulted in the avoidance of several anticipated property acquisitions and resulting displacements with the proposed

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								BLRT Extension project. No residential property displacements are anticipated as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117.
92A	Unknown		None provided	92	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Though I have attended numerous planning and public input meetings, which have shown an overwhelming lack of public support for the “preferred” and proposed, formerly known as D1 route, it is frustrating to observe that these efforts and voices are largely ignored.	Comments from public meetings are recorded and posted on the proposed BLRT Extension project website (BlueLineExt.org) within 1 week of the meeting taking place. Comments are also brought forward by project staff for consideration at meetings regarding relevant issues. Chapter 9 of the Final EIS provides a summary of public involvement for the Final EIS, including a summary of open houses held during Final EIS preparation. Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #6.
92B	Unknown		None provided	92	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	The EIS, Environmental Impact Study, while enormously expensive, is disappointing in that while it provides pages of data and mitigation proposals, it misses the point entirely.	The Draft EIS discusses numerous alternatives that were analyzed as a part of the environmental review process. Key issues or changes to the locally preferred alternative (LPA) occurring since publication of the AA were identified and analyzed in the Draft EIS and are summarized Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. The process included a public comment period which provided the public a forum to raise concerns with respect to environmental issues.
92C	Unknown		None provided	92	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	Yesterday, I took a walk in the Mary Hill and Sochacki parks near my home. I stopped and closed my eyes and listened. By sound alone, I could identify chickadees, cardinals, a red winged black bird, baby hawks, sparrows, frogs, ducks, and geese and the lovely sound of moving water. Lest I get labeled just another tree hugger, I would point out that the city planning greats of yesteryear, like Francis Gross, Charles M. Loring, Eloise Butler, and Theodore Wirth, showed great foresight in preserving these wetlands and green spaces and some form of park access to every neighborhood throughout the city. They understood well, just as anyone who has travelled to NYC, and stepped into Central Park, the value of a quiet green space open to the public for refreshment and respite from the frenetic pace and noise of the city. It is a shame that after all these years, and the will to preserve these valuable places for the well being and health of all, that we would at this juncture make such a huge mistake as to ruin the aesthetic of not one, but three beautiful parks every seven minutes. These parks are Theodore Wirth, Mary Hill and Walter Sochacki Parks. Once you ruin the peaceful, tranquil aesthetic of these parks, there is no turning back. This would be a travesty: especially in regard to Theodore Wirth Park, a treasure to the Twin Cities of inestimable value.	Please see MASTER RESPONSES #14 and #15.
92D	Unknown		None provided	92	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	If the LRT is for commuters, it should be accessible to the commuters, promote not only jobs during construction, but also neighborhood revitalization and long term business opportunities. All three of the other previously proposed routes achieve these goals to a far greater degree than the so called “preferred route”. Preferred by who? BNSF? Perhaps it can be instructive to look at the recent LRT projects. What was the reasoning of running Green Line down University Avenue? And how has this enhanced the revitalization of business along that route? Why is the Southwest route so heavily opposed and mired in legal battles?	The proposed BLRT Extension project is expected to have positive effects on the commercial and residential areas along the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. It is anticipated that the proposed BLRT Extension project would contribute economic benefits by encouraging and supporting higher-density residential and commercial land uses around transit stations, including those in environmental justice neighborhoods consistent with local planning efforts. Increased mobility to both residents and business patrons within the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor is expected to support existing businesses and allow for their future growth. Hennepin County is leading the Station Area Planning effort, which seeks input from the public, including EJ populations, to create a framework for any potential development that aligns with the community’s goals and preferences. Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #1.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
93A	Lawrence	Tyree	None provided	93	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	<p>The City of Brooklyn Park has a mission statement “...a Thriving Community, Inspire Pride, Where Opportunities Exist for ALL.” Our community and City Council stood by this statement and went on to declare that no projects would be considered unless they were in direct alignment with our mission, vision, and purpose. In order to remain consistent with building a thriving community, this project has to invest its resources where opportunities exist for us ALL. These opportunities MUST be transparent, authentic, and very tangible. Here are some suggestions: (see next four comment/answers (93B-93E) for the three suggestions and comment responses).</p> <p>These are some initial suggestions to get things moving in the right direction. These suggestions will drastically improve the quality of life in our community and counteract the negatives associated with LRT projects in general. I will be happy to personally get involved and lend any type of direction as needed from the perspective of a community stakeholder. Thank you for considering my comments and suggestions.</p>	<p>Local and regional policies were reviewed to determine their compatibility with the proposed BLRT Extension project. The Brooklyn Park 2030 Comprehensive Plan was reviewed to evaluate the land use compatibility of the proposed BLRT Extension project with the City of Brooklyn Park. See Chapter 4 (Section 4.1.4) of the Final EIS. Additionally, the multi-step process to formally recommend and select the locally preferred alternative (LPA) for the proposed BLRT Extension project began following technical analysis and Scoping decisions. At the June 26, 2012, meeting of the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority (HCRRA), following public hearings and recommendation, and passage of resolutions of support from the cities of Minneapolis, Robbinsdale, Crystal, and Brooklyn Park, HCRRA selected Alternative B-C-D1 as the LPA. See Chapter 2 (Section 2.5) of the Final EIS.</p>
93B	Lawrence	Tyree	None provided	93	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	<p>1. Invest in the economic development initiated by the community for the community.</p> <p>A business hub that will cultivate aspiring entrepreneurs who desire to start a business. Fund the land and development space where people come together and feel a sense of pride, where currently, there is a void as the majority flock to other cities to satisfy the lack. Invest in support of small businesses by identifying the struggles of their current environment fueling an opportunity for REAL success vs standardized programs that only large companies qualify for.</p>	<p>The Hennepin County Community Works department has engaged the corridor cities and their communities in a station area planning effort. This effort includes a series of goals, two of which are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Maximize and strategically align public and private investments in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor to support transit oriented development through catalytic investments in life-cycle housing, commercial development, and public infrastructure. ■ Promote economic opportunity by improving access to jobs and supporting business recruitment and expansion along the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. <p>See www.hennepin.us/residents/transportation/bottineau-community-works for more information.</p>
93C	Lawrence	Tyree	None provided	93	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	<p>2. Invest in LOCAL talent, goods, and services that will provide sustenance and capacity growth organically vs. OUTSOURCING and/or MAINSTREAMING to the “highly favored” benefactors.</p>	<p>The Council has an established Disadvantaged Businesses Enterprises (DBE) program and includes specific goals in project contracts to increase participation by minority and women owned businesses. The Office of Equal Opportunity has an equal opportunity (EO) consultant designated to the proposed BLRT Extension project to conduct outreach and monitor progress towards meeting those goals.</p> <p>In addition to the DBE goal, the construction contracts would have a workforce goal for both minority and women workers. An additional EO consultant would be assigned to support these efforts when it gets closer to construction.</p> <p>To assist in achieving the DBE and workforce goals, the Council’s EO and Project Office outreach and communication staff would hold workshops and networking mixers and attend events to inform people of employment and contracting opportunities. Other communication strategies would be used including social media, the BlueLineExt.org website, newsletters and articles.</p>
93D	Lawrence	Tyree	None provided	93	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	<p>3. Invest in our YOUTH projects. Contribute to the development of a pool or slash pad, so our families can bond with their children. Focus on youth related transit issues to they remain connected to opportunities, program, jobs, and internships.</p>	<p>Youth projects have not been identified as mitigation for effects from the proposed BLRT Extension project. Youth have been engaged at fairs and other outreach activities, such as North Hennepin Community College and Zanewood Recreation Center in Brooklyn Park. Continued outreach and coordination during engineering and construction would target youth and adults and organizations such as schools, churches, and non-profits.</p>
93E	Lawrence	Tyree	None provided	93	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	<p>4. Invest in grass-roots efforts and genuine engagement of community members... Upgrade communications so people feel connected to the projects vs rejection on both sides. Support our leaders as an extension to the hard to reach demographics.</p>	<p>Chapter 9 of the Final EIS provides a summary of public involvement for the Final EIS, including a summary of open houses held during Final EIS preparation. The Council has hosted numerous events for public input in the City of Robbinsdale. Open houses, public hearings, and city council work sessions have all been organized to provide information about the proposed BLRT Extension project and to solicit</p>

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								feedback from community members. The Council also attends community events and presents to local organizations.
94A	Bladine	Debbie	None provided	94	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I am opposed to the Bottineau Line it its current form.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
94B	Bladine	Debbie	None provided	94	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Noise issues.	Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit’s noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS.
94C	Bladine	Debbie	None provided	94	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Loss of private homes	Chapter 4 (Section 4.3) of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would not displace any residential properties. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117.
94D	Bladine	Debbie	None provided	94	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Crime concerns	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.
94E	Bladine	Debbie	None provided	94	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Alternate routes were not given sufficient consideration.	The Draft EIS discusses numerous alternatives that were analyzed as a part of the environmental review process. Key issues or changes to the LPA occurring since publication of the AA were identified and analyzed in the Draft EIS and are summarized Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. The process included a public comment period which provided the public a forum to raise concerns with respect to environmental issues. Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #1.
94F	Bladine	Debbie	None provided	94	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Want to see ridership surveys done.	The Draft and Final EIS process examined ridership potential for numerous alignment options detailed in Chapter 3 of both documents. The Draft EIS disclosed similar ridership forecasts among the build alternatives ranging from 26,000 to 27,600 daily boardings. See Table 3.1-5 in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS for more information on ridership between alternatives considered. The proposed BLRT Extension project in the Final EIS includes an alignment that meets the purpose and need most efficiently and minimizes project impacts. The proposed BLRT Extension project anticipates approximately 27,000 daily boardings. See Chapter 3 (Section 3.1) of the Final EIS for more information on ridership.
94G	Bladine	Debbie	None provided	94	US Mail	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Believes route chosen to appease Target – they have not been a good community steward.	Although the proposed BLRT Extension project terminates in Brooklyn Park in the vicinity of the Target campus, the purpose and need for the project does not include subsidizing Target. The proposed BLRT Extension project meets the intended purpose and need for the project, to effectively address long-term regional transit mobility and local accessibility needs while providing efficient, travel-time competitive transit service that supports economic development goals and objectives of local, regional, and statewide plans. Chapter 1 of the Final EIS also describes the purpose and need for the project.
95A	Lokken	Barbara	None provided	95	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I am a very concerned resident of Brooklyn Park over the plan for light rail to go down West Broadway. Why would you even put it so close to houses and disrupt entire neighborhoods when you could run down 81 and cut over towards the school and target? This is not in the best interest of home owners nor the quality of life for those whose homes will be very close.	The Council seeks to develop the proposed BLRT Extension project while avoiding disruptions to neighborhoods as much as possible. The Council strives to avoid and minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas. However, for those impacts that are unavoidable, the Council has developed mitigation measures that comply with appropriate local, state, and federal regulations. Where displacements cannot be avoided, mitigation measures required by the Federal Uniform Relocation Act, as well as any other state (Minn. Stat. 117) and local policies would be followed. Chapter 4 of the Final EIS summarizes the community and social analysis, which includes Community Facilities/Community Character and Cohesion (4.2), and Acquisitions and Displacements (4.3). Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #1.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
95B	Lokken	Barbara	None provided	95	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I'm also concerned about crime, the kinds of people that will have easy access to our neighborhoods, the noise, impact, property value loss, and the disregard for the opinions and voice of the people. (see comments 95D through 95G for responses to access, noise, property loss and public opinion).	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.
95C	Lokken	Barbara	None provided	95	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	I'm also concerned about crime, the kinds of people that will have easy access to our neighborhoods, the noise, impact, property value loss, and the disregard for the opinions and voice of the people. (see comments 95D through 95G for responses to access, noise, property loss and public opinion).	Concerning noise: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
95D	Lokken	Barbara	None provided	95	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I'm also concerned about crime, the kinds of people that will have easy access to our neighborhoods, the noise, impact, property value loss, and the disregard for the opinions and voice of the people. (see comments 95D through 95G for responses to access, noise, property loss and public opinion).	Concerning property values: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #7.
95E	Lokken	Barbara	None provided	95	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I'm also concerned about crime, the kinds of people that will have easy access to our neighborhoods, the noise, impact, property value loss, and the disregard for the opinions and voice of the people. (see comments 95D through 95G for responses to access, noise, property loss and public opinion).	Concerning public input: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #6. Also the Council has hosted numerous events for public input in the City of Brooklyn Park. Open houses, public hearings, and city council work sessions have all been organized to provide information about the proposed BLRT Extension project and to solicit feedback from community members. The Council also attends community events and presents to local organizations.
95F	Lokken	Barbara	None provided	95	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	It appears this decision is based solely on business interests. Unless the path is resolved, I will be putting my home up for sale. Brooklyn Park already has terrible reputation for crime. As people put their homes up for sale and homes depreciate, it will continue to flood people into the area that can afford low cost housing. For the life of me, I cannot understand why you would sacrifice the rights of an entire community. Let the people vote. Reconsider this plan. Take a step back and reconsider. If this were your home on the line, you would never, ever approve this plan.	The purpose of the proposed BLRT Extension project is to provide transit service which would satisfy the long-term regional mobility and accessibility needs for businesses and the traveling public. The proposed BLRT Extension project has the potential to indirectly spur development in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor particularly around stations. This creates the potential for changes in property values as described above, which can be perceived as either an impact (generally for renters) or a benefit (generally for owners). These potential "pricing-out" impacts (that is, increased rents and decreased affordability for existing residents) can be offset by the decrease in transportation costs. The Health Impact Assessment suggests that cities, communities and developers work together to keep housing options affordable in station areas to ensure that neighborhoods near the transit stations continue to be affordable for low-income households (Myslajek, 2013). Additionally, Hennepin County is proactively considering strategies to minimize impacts on housing values with their Station Area Planning effort, which seeks input from the public, including EJ populations, to create a framework for any potential development that aligns with the community's goals and preferences. Furthermore, the Council has established programs to encourage affordable housing planning and implementation that may offset potential indirect impacts to low-income persons. Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #7 and #8.
96A	Olson	Randy	None provided	96	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I need to be able to vote on this issue. I didn't get to vote on the twins or Vikings stadiums for which I will never enter either one, but I'm paying for both of them. I won't be using the LRT line as well. Furthermore it sounds like I just might be losing my home due to the misplacement of the line going down the middle of West Broadway in Brooklyn Park. This is not the place for this line, it's too congested as it is. I believe in the LRT for the future, but not here. Running down 81, no homes need to be torn down. Please don't ramrod this thing at us.	Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. The proposed BLRT Extension project is not anticipated to displace any residential properties. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117. Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects. Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #1.
97A	Sanoski	Lori	None provided	97	US Mail	1 – Purpose and	Where do I start this conversation? When will the government at all	Concerning widening of West Broadway: Hennepin County is developing the West

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
						Need	<p>levels start to do the right thing for people? When will the government stop wasting tax payer money and time? When will the government be accountable for their actions? When will the government actually work for the people of this country rather than big corporations? When will the government use common sense? When will the government stop lying to the people? When will the government stop taking bribes from rich people? When will the government do what is right for the majority of the people?</p> <p>Because status quo is to do what everyone else does rather than stepping up and doing the right thing it can be hard to do and is scary too. For those of us who lived here all our lives and had grandparents and great grandparents and great grandparents that also lived here we are the least listened too and least benefited from this government. When our government starts to do the right thing(s), make ethical and moral choices America again will be a great place to live. We are settling for behaviors and actions less than stellar of our government. With that being said, stop the widening of West Broadway as it is a neighborhood that should not be disturbed nor do we need a train disrupting our quiet safe neighborhood with noise, congestion, accidents, crime, vandalism, tax increases, and association dues increases. At the town hall meeting people shared so many reasons including that this train should go down Co Rd. 81 where there is already a track, and the city government flip flops its rules to fit the needs of the government or big corporations. Let's be honest here, if the board members who want this road widening and train going through owned and lived where I do, they would be fighting tooth and nail to stop this entire process from being approved. I would be willing to trade ownership of my home for the ownership of any board member that wants this road and train process to pass and see how they like it.</p>	<p>Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects. Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #21.</p> <p>Concerning safety, crime, and vandalism: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.</p> <p>Concerning noise: Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit's noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. No moderate or severe noise impacts are anticipated along West Broadway Avenue between 85th Avenue North and 89th Avenue North. Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #17.</p> <p>Concerning congestion and accidents: Moving from an undivided configuration that allows full access into and out of every driveway along the West Broadway Avenue corridor to a divided configuration is expected to increase traffic capacity, improve traffic operations, and lower the rate of incidents (crashes). Multiple studies have documented the capacity, mobility, and safety improvements that can be achieved with this type of roadway design. By directing traffic to designated median openings, the proposed West Broadway Avenue corridor design would allow businesses and other private driveways full access to one direction of travel, with right-in/right-out access.</p> <p>Concerning tax increases and association dues increases: Association dues and tax increases are affected by a variety of market conditions. Impacts of an LRT project on association dues and taxes are difficult to assess conclusively.</p>
98A	Schiestl	Lee	None provided	98	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	<p>Location 30 feet from the track – no to Bottineau Transitway because of noise, property values, flood plain destruction, neighbor congestion. Would require buy out at reasonable terms.</p>	<p>Concerning noise: Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit's noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. No moderate or severe noise impacts are anticipated along West Broadway Avenue between 85th Avenue North and 89th Avenue North. Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #17.</p> <p>Concerning property values: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #7.</p> <p>Concerning floodplain destruction: no floodplain destruction is anticipated in this section of the proposed BLRT Extension project.</p> <p>Concerning congestion: Moving from an undivided configuration that allows full access into and out of every driveway along the West Broadway Avenue corridor to a divided configuration is expected to increase traffic capacity, improve traffic operations, and lower the rate of incidents (crashes). Multiple studies have documented the capacity, mobility, and safety improvements that can be achieved with this type of roadway design. By directing traffic to designated median openings, the proposed West Broadway Avenue corridor design would allow businesses and other private driveways full access to one direction of travel, with right-in/right-out access.</p> <p>Concerning "buy out at reasonable terms": Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would not displace any residential properties. All property would be acquired in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Minn. Stat. 117. The Council would pay fair market value for the property.</p>

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
99A	Simmons	Susan	None provided	99	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	No one wants to take the long way around to 610.	Appropriate access to West Broadway Avenue will be maintained, and the reconstructed roadway will adequately handle projected traffic flows. West Broadway Avenue will remain a viable route to access TH 610.
99B	Simmons	Susan	None provided	99	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Doesn't need to hear the bells and announcements all day long.	Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit's noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS. Quiet Zones would be implemented at Federal Railroad Administration shared at-grade crossings. A Quiet Zone is an FRA-approved section of a freight rail line where freight trains do not sound horns. Public roadway crossings of a Quiet Zone must have certain safety measures in place, which include gates, warning devices, and in some cases other supplemental safety measures, such as concrete medians. The implementation of a Quiet Zone reduces residential land use impacts to 176 moderate noise impacts and 120 severe noise impacts. Additional mitigation measures such as noise barriers, wayside devices, and interior testing to determine the appropriate mitigation measure to further reduce the residential land use noise impacts to 5 moderate noise impacts and 2 severe noise impacts. See Table 5.6-7 in the Final EIS for a summary of proposed mitigation measures by location.
99C	Simmons	Susan	None provided	99	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Safety of kids in the area.	Please see MASTER RESPONSES #8.
99D	Simmons	Susan	None provided	99	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Emergency crews getting in and out of complex.	Chapter 4 (Section 4.7) of the Final EIS addresses safety and security. In locations where there would be at-grade light rail crossings of roadways, the potential exists for increases in emergency response time as a result of delay to emergency vehicles while LRVs are in the crossing. During the peak weekday hour, up to 12 light rail trains (six in each direction) would pass through these at-grade crossings, causing approximately 50 seconds of delay per light rail train crossing. These delays could increase fire, emergency medical services, and police response times on routes using the crossings. To help avoid or minimize delays, the Council would coordinate with emergency services providers by providing them with the light rail operating schedule and identification of alternative crossing routes. Additional coordination would occur through the Fire Life Safety and Security Committee (FLSSC), as described in the proposed BLRT Extension project's <i>Safety and Security Management Plan (SSMP)</i> (Council, 2014).
100A	Toftum	D.J.	None provided	100	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	My take on this new rail line is that the proposed line is just not needed. I am in full support of the light rail expanding into the north metro and Brooklyn Park in general. Running along County Rd 81 (Bottineau) makes perfect sense to me. Plenty of room, existing rail tracks and even a new parking ramp at 63rd avenue makes this the ideal spot for it.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
100B	Toftum	D.J.	None provided	100	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	The proposed line to me would destroy a neighborhood by widening West Broadway, and construction/congestion nightmares, and be a general eye sore and increase noise pollution for the whole area. Living in Brooklyn Park for over 17 years, I want a good, solid public transportation for the entire community. This plan seems to ignore public interest while serving only corporate (Target) best interest. Please do not allow this plan to continue.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects. Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit's noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. No moderate or severe noise impacts are anticipated along West Broadway Avenue between 85th Avenue North and 89th Avenue North. See Table 5.6-7 in the Final EIS for a summary of proposed mitigation measures by location.
101A	Kester	Troy	None provided	101	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Routing LRT through the trees in Golden Valley, effectively bypassing North Minneapolis will perpetuate systematic obstacles to investment	The evaluation of Alignments D1 (part of the proposed BLRT Extension project) and D2 (located along Penn Avenue in north Minneapolis) considered several

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							in our community. Investment in housing and infrastructure will follow the LRT line. This form of institutional racism that should not be perpetuated in 2014.	environmental and social issues and impact areas. While each alternative has a number of benefits and impacts the surrounding area and residents, the social and environmental justice impacts associated with the displacement of many homes and disruption of community cohesion with Alignment D2 would be disproportionately adverse. With Alignment D1, the north Minneapolis community would not have the proposed BLRT Extension project stations on Penn Avenue; however, Metro Transit has been advancing the planning and design of an enhanced transit service for the Penn Avenue corridor to serve the transit-dependent populations. A network of arterial BRT lines is planned for the Minneapolis–St. Paul area, including the C Line along Penn Avenue. BRT is an enhanced transit service providing 25–30 percent faster trips and an improved experience for transit riders. This new BRT line would provide enhanced transit for this community, as well as opportunities for economic development, without the significantly adverse impacts associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project. The Council acknowledges your concern about public input into the planning process for the proposed BLRT Extension Project. Also please see MASTER RESPONSES #6.
102A	Wilson	Jane	None provided	102	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	As a 37-year resident of Brooklyn Park and as a dean at North Hennepin Community College, I am in full support of the Bottineau light rail line. I'm excited by the prospect of using it as my transportation option to the airport, the train depot, events in downtown Minneapolis or St. Paul, or even to go to Robbinsdale.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
102B	Wilson	Jane	None provided	102	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Our students will benefit greatly from the transit line; it has the potential to make North Hennepin a premier destination for Metro area students, a potential that brings revenue and growth not just to the college, but to the greater Brooklyn Park community.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
103A	Fischer	Dolores	None provided	103	US Mail	8 – Transportation System Effects	Do not like proposed Bottineau Transitway project because it would not allow left turns on to Broadway.	Moving from an undivided configuration that allows full access into and out of every driveway along the West Broadway Avenue corridor to a divided configuration is expected to increase traffic capacity, improve traffic operations, and lower the rate of incidents (crashes). Multiple studies have documented the capacity, mobility, and safety improvements that can be achieved with this type of roadway design. By directing traffic to designated median openings, the proposed West Broadway Avenue corridor design would allow businesses and other private driveways full access to one direction of travel, with right-in/right-out access.
103B	Fischer	Dolores	None provided	103	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	It would also cause considerable land and building loss.	Chapter 4 (Section 4.3) of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would not displace any residential properties. A total of 46.66 acres of permanent acquisition is anticipated for the proposed BLRT Extension project. Ten commercial displacements are anticipated. Loss of private property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117.
103C	Fischer	Dolores	None provided	103	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	If other options are available, pursue that alternative.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
107A	Peters	Pamela	None provided	107	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I am in favor of improving transportation for our state, city and most important Harrison neighborhood. I have seen mass transit lessen for people that use it in our neighborhood.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
107B	Peters	Pamela	None provided	107	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	The Wirth Coop definitely needs a stop in Girard and Van White.	The Van White Boulevard Station is sited immediately east of Van White Boulevard, one block north of the terminus of Girard Terrace, aligned in the middle of Olson Memorial Highway. Access to the Van White Boulevard Station is from Van White Boulevard or Bryant Avenue. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS details the proposed BLRT Extension project including the location of all stations.
107C	Peters	Pamela	None provided	107	US Mail	4 – Social and	The Wirth Coop needs a spot on the advisory board.	The Council worked with each city along the community, including the city of

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
						Economic Effects		Minneapolis, to identify business representatives for the proposed BLRT Extension project Business Advisory Committee.
107D	Peters	Pamela	None provided	107	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I am also concerned about continuing to have affordable housing in my neighborhood.	Hennepin County is advancing Station Area Plans at each proposed BLRT Extension project stations, which include housing considerations, based on the communities' concerns for equity and affordability. Chapter 7 – Environmental Justice of the Final EIS discusses indirect economic, which includes effects on property values, and Station Area Planning. The Council has an active affordable housing program to help cities maintain a viable proportion of affordable housing in Metro Area cities.
110A	Dube	Diane Marie	None provided	110	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	These comments are made to address the impact of construction on small businesses located in Robbinsdale and near the construction zone. Of particular concern are the business nodes in the Robbinsdale (42nd Avenue) station area, the Bass Lake Road station area, and the Brooklyn Boulevard Station Area. These comments relate to the following section of the DEIS: Section 4.6.4.2, Table 4.6-5, Section 4.6.5,	Chapter 7 of the Final EIS includes additional discussion and analysis of the benefits of the proposed BLRT Extension project to the environmental justice communities, in addition to the evaluation of potential impacts. Ten business operations would be displaced as a part of the proposed BLRT Extension project. These businesses would be relocated in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117, and compensated by payment of fair market value for their property. Five of these business operations are considered EJ businesses, either serving EJ populations or are owned by minority or low income people. The Council would also provide information to the communities where businesses would be displaced about the businesses' new locations and/or other options to meet their needs. In addition, the Council has been engaged in an extensive outreach effort with various stakeholders along the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor, including local business operators that may be impacted by the project to receive insight into daily operations and develop strategies to minimize impacts. To mitigate impacts on businesses during construction, the Council would develop a Construction Mitigation Plan, a Construction Communication Plan, and a construction staging plan. These tools would help the Council notify businesses and patrons in advance about any access issues or closures. The construction staging plan would also help businesses and patrons affected by LRT construction understand when construction would occur in different areas of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Finally, a 24-hour construction hotline would be available for issue resolution and information about LRT construction. Section 3.4 of the Final EIS (Pedestrians and Bicyclists) summarizes construction-phase mitigation measures.
110B	Dube	Diane Marie	None provided	110	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	The Minnesota Department of Transportation has identified seven impacts to be examined in determine the impact of construction on businesses: pedestrian access, traffic and vehicle access, temporary loss of parking, utility shut off, noise and vibrations, increase dirt and dust, and visual impacts (Minn DOT, Report on Mitigation of Transportation Construction Impacts, prepared for the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, prepared by CH2MHill (February 2009)	Chapter 7 of the Final EIS includes additional discussion and analysis of the benefits of the proposed BLRT Extension project to the environmental justice communities, in addition to the evaluation of potential impacts. Ten business operations would be displaced as a part of the project. These businesses will be relocated in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117, and compensated by payment of fair market value for their property. Five of these business operations are considered EJ businesses, either serving EJ populations or are owned by minority or low income people. The Council will also provide information to the communities where businesses would be displaced about the businesses' new locations and/or other options to meet their needs. In addition, the Council has been engaged in an extensive outreach effort with various stakeholders along the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor, including local business operators that may be impacted by the project to receive insight into daily operations and develop strategies to minimize impacts. To mitigate impacts on businesses during construction, the Council will develop a Construction Mitigation Plan, a Construction Communication Plan, and a construction staging plan. These tools would help the Council notify businesses and patrons in advance about any access issues or closures. The construction staging plan would also help businesses and patrons affected by LRT construction understand when construction would occur in different areas of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Finally, a 24-hour construction hotline will be available for issue resolution and information about LRT construction. Section 3.4 of the Final EIS (Pedestrians and Bicyclists) summarizes construction-phase mitigation measures. The Council will be key in notifying businesses and residents of

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								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.
110C	Dube	Diane Marie	None provided	110	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Variations of intensity of these impacts – particularly noise, vibrations, dirt, dust and visual impacts – may occur due to such things as multiple types of machinery; pile driving and pavement breaking; jackhammers and hoe rams; heavy tracked equipment such as bulldozers and backhoes; increased emissions due to construction operations or traffic back-ups; and smells from sewer grates or gas leaks. Temporary fencing, equipment placement and materials storage may obstruct views, leading customers to erroneously assume a business is not open. Debris and rubble may be unsightly, pose access problems or cause injuries to customers and employees. Traffic and pedestrian access may be disrupted or even prohibited during the construction phase. The temporary removal of pedestrian lighting, sidewalks, parking and roadbeds, restrictions to turning patterns, closure of cross streets and unregulated intersections will impact accessibility.	<p>Project construction would result in temporary partial or full closures of existing streets as well as material and equipment deliveries, worker arrivals and departures, and hauling of excavation and borrow materials.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for short-term (construction) impacts to roads and traffic will be implemented by the Council prior to and during construction through the Construction Mitigation Plan, which includes a Construction Communication Plan and a construction staging plan. The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), Hennepin County, and all municipalities affected by construction activities related to the proposed BLRT Extension project will be required to comply with applicable state and local regulations related to the closing of roads and the effects of construction activities.</p> <p>Contractors will be required to comply with all guidelines established in the <i>Minnesota Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices</i> (2015). Construction staging and mitigation documents will be reviewed by appropriate jurisdictions, and required permits would be secured by construction contractors. Traffic-control plans will be developed by the contractor based on information identified in the construction documents and the Construction Mitigation Plan. Traffic-control plans will be reviewed by appropriate jurisdictions and the Council before construction activities begin. For the proposed BLRT Extension project, the Council anticipates that temporary closures or detours would affect existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Construction traffic and debris such as excess dirt and gravel can also pose obstacles or issues for pedestrians and bicyclists. Maintaining safe access for non-motorized users as a result of detours, closures, and other inconveniences during the construction phase will be included by the Council in phasing plans. For visual effects during construction the Council will adhere to local jurisdiction construction requirements (if applicable) regarding construction-related visual disruption. In order to minimize visual disruption, construction activities will include the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Use construction methods that minimize the need to remove vegetation to accommodate construction activities ■ When possible, preserve existing vegetation, particularly along the edge of construction areas, to help screen views ■ Restore areas disturbed during construction <p>After construction is completed, regrade and revegetate areas disturbed by construction and staging to pre-project conditions, with an allowance to address survival of revegetation, to the extent feasible. Locate construction staging areas in places where their visibility would be minimal and, to the extent required, provide temporary visual screening to limit views into them from nearby residential areas, trails, streets, or other places from which they would be seen by visually sensitive viewers. Where construction lighting is required, the construction contractor will, to the extent practical, shield such lighting and direct it downward in such a manner that the light source visibility from offsite views would be limited as much as possible and would not fall outside the boundaries of the proposed BLRT Extension project site.</p>
110D	Dube	Diane Marie	None provided	110	US Mail	8 – Transportation System Effects	Disruptions – particularly traffic congestion – will impact not only the business next to the areas under construction, but also the businesses that rely on pedestrian and vehicular traffic that comes from the opposite side of the construction zone.	<p>Project construction would result in temporary partial or full closures of existing streets as well as material and equipment deliveries, worker arrivals and departures, and hauling of excavation and borrow materials.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for short-term (construction) impacts to roads and traffic will be implemented by the Council prior to and during construction through the</p>

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								<p>Construction Mitigation Plan, which includes a Construction Communication Plan and a construction staging plan. MnDOT, Hennepin County, and all municipalities affected by construction activities related to the proposed BLRT Extension project will require compliance with applicable state and local regulations related to the closing of roads and the effects of construction activities.</p> <p>Contractors will be required to comply with all guidelines established in the <i>Minnesota Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (2015)</i>. Construction staging and mitigation documents will be reviewed by appropriate jurisdictions, and required permits would be secured by construction contractors. Traffic-control plans will be developed by the contractor based on information identified in the construction documents and the Construction Mitigation Plan. Traffic-control plans would be reviewed by appropriate jurisdictions and the Council before construction activities begin. For the proposed BLRT Extension project, the Council anticipates that temporary closures or detours would affect existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Construction traffic and debris such as excess dirt and gravel can also pose obstacles or issues for pedestrians and bicyclists. Maintaining safe access for non-motorized users as a result of detours, closures, and other inconveniences during the construction phase will be included by the Council in phasing plans.</p>
110E	Dube	Diane Marie	None provided	110	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	The duration of the construction project, construction sequencing, hours of construction and even trash removal will all have an impact on the operation of a business.	See response to 110A.
110F	Dube	Diane Marie	None provided	110	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Utilities – hot and cold running water, fiber optic communications, and sewer, electricity, natural gas, telephone services – are the lifeline of any business.	Utility conflicts are identified in the Final EIS in Chapter 5 (Section 5.1). No long-term impacts to utilities are anticipated, since the relocation and reconstruction of utilities that would be conducted as part of the proposed BLRT Extension project would maintain current service levels. Short-term construction impacts may occur, but the Council would require the utility contractor to notify businesses and residents prior to any disruption of service.
110G	Dube	Diane Marie	None provided	110	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	In order to minimize the loss of business revenue expected to be experienced by small businesses, the mitigation measures must address each of the seven impacts identified by MnDOT and these specific impacts. Attention to the details of mitigation measures to address these impacts is critical to the survival of small businesses. It isn't enough to maintain traffic corridors and access points; congestion must be minimized or potential customers will find other businesses to patronize. Business signage must be erected before construction begins and must provide information to both vehicular traffic and pedestrians. What constitutes "advance communication" of construction activities depends on the type of business. Businesses should be consulted long before construction begins as to the mechanism for communication (e.g. telephone, flyers, email. etc.) and the notice period desired.	<p>Project construction would result in temporary partial or full closures of existing streets as well as material and equipment deliveries, worker arrivals and departures, and hauling of excavation and borrow materials.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for short-term (construction) impacts to roads and traffic will be implemented by the Council prior to and during construction through the Construction Mitigation Plan, which includes a Construction Communication Plan and a construction staging plan. MnDOT, Hennepin County, and all municipalities affected by construction activities related to the proposed BLRT Extension project will be required to comply with applicable state and local regulations related to the closing of roads and the effects of construction activities.</p> <p>Contractors will be required to comply with all guidelines established in the <i>Minnesota Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (2015)</i>. Construction staging and mitigation documents will be reviewed by appropriate jurisdictions, and required permits would be secured by construction contractors. Traffic-control plans will be developed by the contractor based on information identified in the construction documents and the Construction Mitigation Plan. Traffic-control plans will be reviewed by appropriate jurisdictions and the Council before construction activities begin. For the proposed BLRT Extension project, the Council anticipates that temporary closures or detours would affect existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Construction traffic and debris such as excess dirt and gravel can also pose obstacles or issues for pedestrians and bicyclists. Maintaining safe access for non-motorized users as a result of detours, closures, and other inconveniences during the construction phase would be included by the Council in phasing plans.</p>
110H	Dube	Diane Marie	None provided	110	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	In addition, mitigation measures should also address not only the intentional and planned interruption of utilities but also the unintentional and unplanned disruptive service.	Utility location excavations and pre-construction surveys will be performed in general accordance with the MnDOT policy of Subsurface Utility Engineering. These procedures would help minimize the number of unintended disruptions in utility

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								service. If utilities are discovered during construction that are not identified in the contract documents, the appropriate utility companies and agencies will be contacted to identify the line(s) and will be consulted on appropriate actions. Additional information may be found in the construction-phase impacts section 5.1 Utilities of the Final EIS.
110I	Dube	Diane Marie	None provided	110	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	The actions of the contractor and subcontractors can minimize impacts to businesses by limiting the magnitude of construction. Therefore, the construction contract should contain terms such as regulating days and hours of construction, mandating access requirements, requiring clean-up measures, prohibiting portable toilets within a specified zone around grocery stores and eating establishments, setting communication requirements and other measures to mitigate these impacts.	To mitigate impacts on businesses during construction, the Council will develop a Construction Mitigation Plan, a Construction Communication Plan, and a construction staging plan. These tools would help the Council notify businesses and patrons in advance about any access issues or closures. The construction staging plan would also help businesses and patrons affected by LRT construction understand when construction would occur in different areas of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Finally, a 24-hour construction hotline will be available for issue resolution and information about LRT construction.
112A	Mulla	Hassanali	None provided	112	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Please save our homes and our neighborhood.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects. Section 4.3 of the Final EIS discusses displacements anticipated with the proposed BLRT Extension project. No residential property displacements are anticipated as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project.
113A	Mulla	Masuma	None provided	113	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Please save our homes and our neighborhood.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives. Reference to West Broadway Avenue tech memos in Chapter 2 and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects. Section 4.3 of the Final EIS discusses displacements anticipated with the proposed BLRT Extension project. No residential property displacements are anticipated as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project.
114A	Weiske	Jeanne	None provided	114	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	The EIS does not consider the impact of the noise and announcements.	Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit’s noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Noise impacts have been assessed for both the LRT and the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. The combined effects of both projects are included in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS. Noise effects for the LRT project only are summarized in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS. There are nine moderate noise impacts anticipated from the proposed BLRT Extension project. These impacts do not require mitigation.
114B	Weiske	Jeanne	None provided	114	US Mail	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Residents are being ignored.	The Council acknowledges your concern about public input into the planning process for the proposed BLRT Extension project. Also, please see MASTER RESPONSES #6.
115A	Fairbanks	Mary Ann	None provided	115	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I moved to Brooklyn Park in 1970 when it was about nothing but potato and corn fields. I watched it deteriorate to a point to where people were embarrassed to say they were from Brooklyn Park. It is starting to make a comeback. I moved into Maplewood Estates townhomes in 1973. Pretty much like the city, it was a wonderful place to live, great neighborhood. Again, like the city, it went through some not so good times when the housing market took a huge downfall. Some homes are under water. From about 2008, our property values for tax purposes dropped each year – dropping by about 50%. Finally, the 2014 value for taxes payable in 2015 showed a slight increase. Light rail going through a residential area is going to drop the value of our homes again. Many homes will be lost, retired homeowners with mortgages paid off will be forced to move and	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #21. Since publication of the Draft EIS, modifications to the preliminary design have resulted in the avoidance of several anticipated property acquisitions and resulting displacements with the proposed BLRT Extension project. No residential property displacements would occur as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117. Section 7.5.1 of the Final EIS provides a detailed analysis of the potentially disproportionately high and adverse impacts of the proposed BLRT Extension project in regards to displacements of environmental justice communities. Avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures were taken to reduce impacts to minority and low-income populations. The proposed BLRT Extension project has the potential to

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							enter into another mortgage, children will be forced to relocate and change schools. That homes that are not totally lost will be harmed dramatically – from the noise, the vibration, the loss of neighborhood. Even MPR and the Star Tribune have negative comments about light rail. After going through some rough times, Maplebrook Estates has remained a great neighborhood. With hard work by homeowners and the association, the area always looks clean and nice. It is a quiet neighborhood. Walk through the area. It is a neighborhood full of proud homeowners where a retired couple or a family can take a walk at night. Now we have people who know nothing about Brooklyn Park, nothing about Maplebrook Estates, and live nowhere close making decision to run light rail through the residential area and force people out of their homes. The original draft EIS did not have the light rail running down West Broadway. Hennepin County do not seem to be at all interested. If your retired parents lived in Maplebrook Estates, would you approve light rail in their living room? I really don't see any reason that light rail is needed in Brooklyn Park, but if it is to come, an alternate route should be chosen where people are not forced out of their homes. Putting a train down the middle of a residential road and disrupting families is wrong. It's dangerous, it's noisy, it's disruptive. All one has to do is drive down Hiawatha in South Minneapolis to see how the train takes over the road and makes life difficult for those in cars, on bikes or pedestrians. PLEASE choose an alternate route – not West Broadway.	indirectly spur development in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor particularly around stations. This creates the potential for changes in property values, which can be perceived as either an impact (generally for renters) or a benefit (generally for owners). These potential "pricing-out" impacts (that is, increased rents and decreased affordability for existing residents) can be offset by the decrease in transportation costs. The Health Impact Assessment suggests that cities, communities and developers work together to keep housing options affordable in station areas to ensure that neighborhoods near the transit stations continue to be affordable for low-income households (Myslajek, 2013). Additionally, Hennepin County is proactively considering strategies to minimize impacts on housing values with their station area planning effort, which seeks input from the public, including EJ populations, to create a framework for any potential development that aligns with the community's goals and preferences. Furthermore, the Council has established programs to encourage affordable housing planning and implementation that may offset potential indirect impacts to low-income persons.
116A	Nerud	Amanda	None provided	116	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I became a resident of the Maplebrook Estates association a little under a year ago. Having just recently become aware of the intended expansion of West Broadway, with the intent to include the possible addition of the Metro Light Rail at a later time, some more informed parties indicated that the existing Bottineau Transitway Impact Study only lists minimal impact to the Maplebrook Estates community. In the city's most recent estimate, there would be as many as 38 impacted homes. 7 buildings are a 4-corners design with half the homes affected (so the city would have to acquire all 4 corners/homes), and one building is consisting of 6 townhomes. So in the broad view, it may appear that only 8 buildings are impacted, but it becomes a much larger impact when the multi-family aspect of the building is taken into account. It was indicated at the most recent public meeting that your Impact Statement indicated a smaller list of homes to be acquired than what the city is indicating, and therefore this route was more highly preferred than others. And this is only considering the impacted homes in the Maplebrook Estates community; south there are additional homes (some twin homes) and other businesses (including a church) that are foreseen to be acquired to make room for the road's expansion to accommodate the 'green space' for the possible future expansion for the LRT. I would strongly urge your team to reevaluate your study information and ensure your impact study takes into account the appropriate amount of affected homes and families when deciding which route the LRT will ultimately follow. I appreciate your time and diligence that went into these projects already and want to make sure my opinion is posted on this matter.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #21. Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117.
117A	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	The DEIS is inadequate. The following discussion of inadequacies concentrates on alignment D-1 as it crosses Golden Valley and parts of Robbinsdale. This commentator is opposed to D-1.	The Draft EIS was prepared and published in accordance with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Minnesota Environmental Policy Act requirements.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
117AA	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	The DEIS does not adequately address impacts to wildlife in and along the parks. Wildlife inhabiting the parks is not accurately inventoried or catalogued. Wildlife movement, behavior, corridors and habitat are not thoroughly analyzed.	Section 5.8.3 of the Final EIS details the protected flora and fauna that potentially could be present in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Also, please see MASTER RESPONSE #13.
117AB	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	The report is self-contradictory. On the one hand, it states that “deer will be able to cross where they do today” and on the other hand, it says that the track will be fenced where humans cross. Since humans cross at every point along the railroad ROW, the report apparently means to suggest the entire line between 36th Avenue and Golden Valley road will be fenced; deer and other animals would have no access to their typical crossings, feeding or resting grounds if that is the case. Which is it?	Strategically placed fencing would be necessary to minimize collisions between the train and pedestrians and animals. Wildlife crossings are mentioned in the Final EIS under Unavoidable Impacts and Mitigation for wildlife environments (Chapter 5 [Section 5.8.5.5]): “Where effective and feasible, suitable wildlife crossings would be accommodated within proposed culverts to allow wildlife species to cross from one side of the LRT/freight rail tracks to the other.”
117AC	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	If the entire track is fenced, humans could not cross either, as they do regularly today. It is no answer to say humans are crossing illegally. First, they have done that since the invention of tracks, here and everywhere in the world (it was shocking that the Scoping Document reported officials were “first learning” of trespass on the tracks! Really?!). Second, closing crossings to humans is infeasible because in these communities, accustomed as people are to free travel between parts of town, people are going to figure out a way to cross even if fences are erected to keep deer out. Safety and connectivity demands that if the alignment were to be built, alternative human crossings (like tunnels?) between east and west would be required.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.
117AD	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	The DEIS fails to analyze thoroughly hazardous waste dangers that could arise from disturbing the parks. Although waste sites are mentioned, they are not detailed and more importantly the question of concrete is inadequately addressed. (Chapter 5). These two parks were once a site of construction debris, including WPA-era concrete from Highway 100. Nature has reclaimed the areas and transformed them into beautiful park land, but conducting construction activities with heavy equipment and running heavy trains on a new corridor relocated to the west and rebuilt on the east may disturb the soil and uncover asbestos-containing concrete, both during construction and every day thereafter. Oral history indicates that decades ago, a locomotive derailed along the tracks and sank into the bog near and around Grimes Pond (Source: members, Robbinsdale Historical Society). Reportedly, it has never been recovered. Whether the history is true or urban legend is unknown, but the DEIS should address it in the event there may be any environmental impact (hazardous conditions or instability).	The Council is aware of the previous dumping that had occurred during the 1960s in Sochacki Park/Mary Hills Nature Center/Rice Lake Park. A Phase I ESA has been conducted to further evaluate the presence of contamination along the entire proposed BLRT Extension project corridor and proposed areas of construction. A Phase II ESA is currently being conducted to obtain more specific data on contamination. Information gathered from the Phase I and II ESA would be incorporated into the proposed BLRT Extension project’s RAP (which includes a Construction Contingency Plan for unidentified contamination) to properly handle, treat, store, and dispose of solid wastes, hazardous materials, petroleum products, and other regulated materials that could not be avoided during construction. Coordination with the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, cities of Robbinsdale and Golden Valley, and the Three Rivers Park District would also be arranged.
117AE	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Other Parks: South Halifax, Rice Lake, Triangle, Lee, Wirth Impacts on other parks are inadequately addressed (Chapter 4). Similar inadequacies plague the purported treatment of other D-1 parks. Lee and Triangle are said to be basically impacted because they have metal fences between the children and the extremely close tracks. (Triangle park users will “experience the effects of increased noise” (Chapter 4), but apparently, it doesn’t matter since nothing else is said about it.)	Please see response to Comment 5B.
117AF	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	Visual impacts on other parks – South Halifax, Rice Lake, Triangle, Lee, Wirth – are inadequately addressed.	Please see response to Comment 91B.
117AG	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Safety impacts on other parks – South Halifax, Rice Lake, Triangle, Lee, Wirth – are inadequately addressed.	Chapter 4 (Section 4.7) of the Final EIS addresses safety and security. In locations where there would be at-grade light rail crossings of roadways, the potential exists

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								for increases in emergency response time as a result of delay to emergency vehicles while LRVs are in the crossing. During the peak weekday hour, up to 12 light rail trains (six in each direction) would pass through these at-grade crossings, causing approximately 50 seconds of delay per light rail train crossing. These delays could increase fire, emergency medical services, and police response times on routes using the crossings. To help avoid or minimize delays, the Council would coordinate with emergency services providers by providing them with the light rail operating schedule and identification of alternative crossing routes. Additional coordination would occur through the FLSSC, as described in the proposed BLRT Extension project's SSMP (Council, 2014). Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #8
117AH	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	No analysis of impacts based on new uses at Lee has been done.	The Council assumes "Lee" is referring to Lee Park. Chapter 8 – Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation of the Final EIS addresses the project impact to all parklands in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Lee Park would not be impacted.
117AI	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	The Section 4(f) analysis is legally inadequate and does not afford a sufficient basis for decision. The DEIS offers a confusing discussion that purports to find a temporary occupancy of Mary Hills and Sochacki during construction, but implies that the temporary occupancy is not a "use" under law because all five required conditions that make temporary occupancy not a use would be met. But in its conclusion, the DEIS recites the five conditions inaccurately. In its list of the five conditions, the DEIS recites that there would be no "permanent adverse physical impact" on the parks. Chapter 8, p. 8-42. But this is a truncated statement; the regulations actually describe this condition as: "no interference with the protected activities, features, or attributes of the property on a temporary or permanent basis." (emphasis added). That is not the same as "adverse physical impact" alone. So did the DEIS silently analyze "interference with activities, features and attributes" and conclude there was none, even on a temporary basis, and so the temporary occupancy is not a use? Or does it conclude that there is at least temporary interference with the activities, features and attributes of the property and so the temporary occupancy is a use? The DEIS is less than clear in this regard.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #15.
117AJ	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	Whatever it meant to say about temporary occupancy, the DEIS omits constructive use assessment of these two parks altogether. Constructive use occurs when the "project's proximity results in impacts so severe that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify the property for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired. Substantial impairment occurs only if the protected activities, features, or attributes of the resource are substantially diminished." As courts have said, a project which respects a park's territorial integrity may still, by means of noise, air pollution and general unsightliness, "dissipate its aesthetic value, crush its wildlife, defoliate its vegetation and "take it" in every practical sense." DC Federation of Civil Association v. Volpe, 459 F. 2d 1231, cert. denied. March 27 1972. The DEIS does not report on any study of the parks' activities, features or attributes or the whether the impacts of noisome transit disturbances amount to constructive use. It does not discuss the fact that noise which interferes with quiet uses is by definition a constructive use. 23 CFR 774.15 (e)(iv). No objective empirical evidence is presented that could support conclusions or decisions about 4(f) constructive use. This in turn means that the rest	The Final EIS finds that there are no ecological, noise, visual, vibration or other aesthetic interferences that would substantially impair the activities, features or attributes of Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit or Sochacki Park: Sochacki Management Unit. Therefore, the proposed BLRT Extension project would not result in a constructive use, as defined under 23 CFR Part 771.135 on these park properties. Also please see MASTER RESPONSE #15.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							of the 4(f) analyses, such as fairly evaluating feasible and prudent alternatives, cannot reasonably be done.	
117AK	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	The DEIS acknowledges a change in setting and a diminution of both parks (Mary Hills and Sochacki) and then concludes the proposed project would not “change the community character.” Trains will split the parks in half; transit operations will reduce walkability. Connectivity between Robbinsdale, Golden Valley and Wirth Park will be impeded and connectedness among these three communities impaired. The DEIS inadequately addresses these points. A change in community character could hardly seem more obvious than in and adjacent to these parks. Sochacki in particular is a rare resource for Robbinsdale. It represents one-third of all of the cities’ park acreage. Residents and visitors view it as an enchantment and place of wonder, see above. Mary Hills is likewise unusual and treasured. Introducing LRT levels of noise, vibration and all the rest seems so clearly likely to destroy these resources.	Sochacki Park: Sochacki Management Unit and Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Nature Area would be restored and enhanced following the completion of construction and continued coordination with the Sochacki Park Joint Powers Agreement partners (the Three Rivers Park District, the city of Golden Valley, and the city of Robbinsdale). Additional supporting data and explanation have been added to the Final EIS and Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation. One mitigation measure is for the proposed BLRT Extension project to construct a paved trail that would connect Theodore Wirth Parkway trail to Sochacki Park. At the Golden Valley Road Station, both the Theodore Wirth Parkway bridge and the Golden Valley Road bridge would be reconstructed, including the existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities. A trailhead would be constructed at the eastern corner of the proposed Golden Valley Road Station park-and-ride. This trailhead would provide access to the existing Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board trail system and access to the proposed Bassett Creek Regional Trail that would be constructed by the Three Rivers Park District along Golden Valley Road. The proximity of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and the addition of new trail connections with the proposed BLRT Extension project could require improving the intersection to enhance the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists. The Council would coordinate such improvements with the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, the city of Golden Valley, and Hennepin County, along with other stakeholders. See Section 3.4 of the Final EIS for more discussion about planned bicycle and pedestrian accommodations at the proposed Golden Valley Road Station area.
117AL	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	The DEIS does not adequately answer the question: how is permanent change in noise, vibration, visual aesthetics, wildlife, and uses of parks, in effect their destruction as natural preserves, not a severe impact on community character?	No mitigation measures are warranted for long-term neighborhood and community impacts, because the effectiveness of mitigation measures that have been identified and would be implemented for specific environmental categories (including but not limited to noise, vibration, visual quality and aesthetics, transit, roadways and traffic, parking, and pedestrian and bicyclist considerations) would prevent adverse impacts. Specific mitigation for the long-term impacts such as property acquisitions and displacements, visual quality, and noise are discussed in other sections of this Final EIS. Also, please see MASTER RESPONSE #9.
117AM	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	Knowing how much the “preferred route” and all alternatives will cost rests on accurately reporting what the government will have to spend on acquiring land for the Project. Yet, reports on those costs have not been made public. Upon inquiry, this commentator was told that copies of or further information about these reports, calculations and methodologies, are not available to the public. Thus: 1) the review of tax-assessed values and the identification of “each of the impacted properties” are unavailable to the public; 2) the “appraisal” said to have been conducted in 2012 is unavailable to the public; 3) whatever these figures may be, they must be at least two years out of date; 4) the analyses apparently do not include constructive takings. The data should immediately be made publicly available.	Table 10.1-1 in Chapter 10 – Financial Analysis of the Final EIS outlines a breakdown of cost for the different elements of the proposed BLRT Extension project totaling \$1.496 billion. The right-of-way cost estimate was developed by a licensed appraiser using: (1) a preliminary appraisal of the BNSF rail corridor done by the Council in 2015; (2) a parcel by parcel assessment of proposed damages; and (3) an analysis of the current real estate market. Right-of-way cost estimates and appraisals developed by government entities on individual properties are confidential before an offer is made, per Minn. Stat. 13.44, subd. 3.
117AN	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Under the Minnesota Constitution and case law since <i>Alevizos v. Metropolitan Airports Commission</i> , private property cannot be constructively taken for public use without payment of just compensation. While not every inconvenience, annoyance or loss of peace and quiet caused by noise and other serious nuisance gives rise to inverse condemnation claims, where a property is deprived of its practical enjoyment and a definite and measurable loss in market value occurs which the property-owning public in general does not	Please see response to Comment 94C.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							suffer, compensation must be paid.	
117AO	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Along D-1, park property is being converted into a highly traveled rail corridor. Residences in turn will experience a change from rural silence, views, seclusion, serenity and clear air to the blight of LRT noise, vibration, visual effects and pollution (light, noise, air). The impact on this small segment is more profound (Bassett Creek Drive, Bonnie Lane, Dresden Lane, June, Kyle, Halifax, Kewanee Way, Xerxes and others) than anywhere else in the Project. Hundreds of parcels along the parks would be disproportionately damaged for the benefit of other citizens elsewhere. These owners are the most likely to bring and win inverse condemnation lawsuits if compensation is not paid for the diminution of their property values. The true cost of this alignment must therefore take into account these expenses, which could amount to millions in damages and legal fees. Failure to account for constructive takings understates the ROW and other build costs of D-1 in particular.	Concerning visual: Please see response to Comment 91B. Concerning noise: Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS. Noise impacts have been assessed at parks throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. As reported in Table 5.6-5 of the Final EIS, the following noise level with the proposed BLRT Extension project would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Plymouth Avenue North to 16th Avenue North – 9 moderate noise impact and no severe noise impacts ■ 16th Avenue North to Golden Valley Road – 1 moderate noise impact and no severe noise impacts ■ Golden Valley Road to 26th Avenue North – 9 moderate noise impacts and 14 severe noise impacts For the first two locations with mitigation in the form of interior testing to determine the appropriate mitigation measure, no residual noise impacts are anticipated. For the third location with mitigation in the form of a noise barrier, 1 moderate and 1 severe noise impacts would remain. Concerning vibration: Vibration impacts to residential properties have been identified in the cities of Robbinsdale and Crystal but not in the City of Golden Valley. The Final EIS finds that there are no ecological, noise, visual, vibration or other aesthetic interferences that would substantially impair the activities, features or attributes of Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit or Sochacki Park: Sochacki Management Unit. Therefore, the proposed BLRT Extension project would not result in a constructive use, as defined under 23 CFR Part 771.135 on these park properties.
117AP	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	The DEIS therefore artificially promotes D-1 over other potentially cheaper choices. Alignment D-1 may in fact prove more expensive than any other alternatives if all the data were analyzed. Analysis before and not after the “30%” engineering step should be done.	Many elements go into deciding the LPA including cost, social elements and environmental impacts, among others. Table 10.1-1 in Chapter 10 – Financial Analysis of the Final EIS outlines a breakdown of cost for the different project elements totaling \$1.496 billion. Cost reviews would continue throughout the design process to further refine the cost.
117AQ	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	The DEIS relies on generalized studies of LRT effects on community property values but does not come to grips with individual diminution of property value. Both sound walls and power lines can negatively impact property values.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #7.
117AR	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	No noise measurements were made at numerous clusters of houses along the parks and tracks, presumably (it is not clear) because they were more than 350 feet away. No moderate or severe impacts were identified on the west side of D-1, even though homes are currently at rural ambient noise levels.	Noise measurements were conducted in both the Draft EIS and Final EIS at noise sensitive locations within the appropriate screening distances for potential impacts from the project. Typically, impacts are limited to within 100 to 150 feet of the tracks. Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS.
117AS	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	The report concludes that D-2 should be rejected as an alternative to D-1 primarily because D-2 would experience more takes and partial takes of property. But it does no projections or estimates of constructive takes of high value parkway property and other residences adjacent to the proposed expanded tracks and so understates the effects and costs of D-1.	Please see response to Comment 94C.
117AT	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Without that thorough analysis of constructive takes, alignment D-2 and other alternatives cannot be accurately compared to D-1 and a “preference” can only be based on speculation. D-1 may in fact be the most expensive and least prudent and feasible of all alternative choices, but the DEIS does not enable the public or decision-makers to accurately conduct that analysis.	Please see response to Comment 94C and Comment 117AM.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
117AU	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	No economic impact analysis of park loss has been done. Economic impact analysis of park loss must be done to make fair financial assessments possible. Research confirms that park amenities, especially passive use amenities, increase property values, often throughout the whole community. See e.g., Crompton, The Impact of Parks and Open Space on Property Values, http://www.cprs.org/membersonly/winter07_propertyvalues.htm . Loss of such park amenities correspondingly decrease property values, especially proximate properties. In urban locations, LRT may not have significant negative economic impacts and may in fact improve the economics for places like North Minneapolis. But ruining Sochacki and Mary Hills may decrease property values substantially in those cities substantially, especially of homes in close proximity but also for property blocks away. This damage may not amount to constitutional takings, but may sufficiently reduce home values such that the tax bases of both Robbinsdale and Golden Valley would suffer to the tunes of millions in assessed valuations.	A review of park properties that would be impacted by the proposed BLRT Extension project is discussed in the Final EIS and Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation. Two parks have a <i>de minimis</i> use. Five parks have a temporary occupancy finding.
117AV	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	Anticipated ridership appears to be overstated and overly optimistic based on the data presented. Didn't the Hiawatha line lose riders in 2013; why are Bottineau projections so robust?	The Council used its regional travel demand forecasting model to develop the transit ridership forecasts for the proposed BLRT Extension project. Ridership modeling is discussed in Chapter 3 (Section 3.1) of the Final EIS. Approximately 27,000 daily riders are forecasted for 2040.
117AW	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	RBT is cheaper, less impactful, and more consistent with realistic ridership expectations, isn't it?	The Council is developing bus rapid transit routes within its service area; however, light rail was selected as the preferred technology for the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #1.
117AX	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	What does the City of Golden Valley get for its citizens in return for giving up its parks?	Sochacki Park: Sochacki Management Unit and Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit would be restored and enhanced following the completion of construction and continued coordination with the Sochacki Park Joint Powers Agreement partners (the Three Rivers Park District, the city of Golden Valley, and the city of Robbinsdale). Additional supporting data and explanation have been added to the Final EIS and Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation (Chapter 8). The park will remain open to recreational use during construction. One mitigation measure is for the project to construct a paved trail that would connect Theodore Wirth Parkway trail to Sochacki Park. Additional mitigation measures include environmental remediation, a revegetation plan, and prep for a future off-leash dog park. Additional measures can be found in the Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation.
117AY	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	Where is the cost-benefit analysis that incorporates the fact that an average mile of light-rail line costs two to five times as much as one mile of an urban freeway lane? In Portland, the light rail carries one percent of the city's travelers but cost 2.3 billion. How does that make sense, as opposed to a more comprehensive approach to travel in general: electric buses, go cars, better highways and street repair, integrating other green transportation like segways, pedal cabs, bikes, whatever. More jobs, more development, less pain.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #4.
117AZ	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	North Minneapolis is in deep need of urban transit and of the hoped-for accompanying development opportunities. Yet it is excluded as a preferred alternative. North Minneapolis is already a busy urban corridor that would be far more appropriate for light rail or for RBT or a more modern and green comprehensive treatment of mass transit. Residents actually need it; Golden Valley does not. Ways to avoid the concerns expressed about D-2 in North Minneapolis have been inadequately explored (what about tunnels and subways? what about	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #20.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							moving homes rather than removing them; what about revisiting a path other than Penn Avenue?)	
117B	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	Sochacki and Mary Hills Nature Preserve will be irreversibly damaged. The DEIS inappropriately downplays the damage to Sochacki and Mary Hills (and other) parks and says they are not being converted to transportation use. The DEIS is in error with respect to its conclusions about impact and FTA Section 4(f).	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #15.
117BA	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	How much is BNSF paying toward the costs of the DEIS, EIS and related procedures? How much will it pay for construction? 2. How much is BNSF to be paid for the prospective use of its ROW all along the “preferred alternative” versus other alternatives studied?	The Council continues discussions with BNSF for the use/purchase of 50 feet of their right-of-way. To date, BNSF has not agreed to any participation in the cost of the proposed BLRT Extension project. See response to Comment 117AM regarding cost estimate for BNSF right-of-way.
117BB	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Is there anything about this project that enables BNSF to significantly change its freight traffic along the “preferred alignment” especially D-1? In other words, does the colocation, new proposed tracks or type of tracks, building of an access road, shift in the location of the current tracks, total and partial and constructive takings of private land, permitting and zoning processes – does any of that enable BNSF to increase its own use over what it could have otherwise done independently without the LRT? For example, is it going to be easier to transport hazardous products like frac sand or frac sand oils because of public cooperation? What are its plans for its future freight traffic along D-1 in particular? Who are BNSF’s lobbyists for this project and is there any record of their activities? Planners at open houses repeatedly justified the choice of D-1 and the impact on the parks by saying that BNSF could use its right of way however it wanted, anyway, so the cities might as well have some degree of control. First, does BNSF really have carte blanche and second, what did BNSF indicate it planned to do if planners did not choose alignment D-1 in particular? Why is everybody so eager to recite unknown future activity of BNSF to justify D-1? Help the public understand what pressures, if any, were brought to bear.	BNSF is a private railroad company over which the Council has no jurisdiction to control freight traffic frequency. The proposed BLRT Extension project would relocate the BNSF tracks to the west of their present location to accommodate the LRT project elements. Chapter 3 (Section 3.2) of the Final EIS provides additional detail about the design of freight rail in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor.
117BC	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	The Gateway Project is now ahead of Bottineau in terms of preference for federal funding. What impact does that have on projected time frames? Does that mean we have more time to start all over again and get this right, choosing other more sensible alternatives than an already obsolete technology along an alignment that destroys public parks and benefits so few?	The Gateway (Gold Line) Project is identified in the County Transit Improvement Board’s (CTIB) Program of Projects Investment Strategy. As of July 15, 2015, the proposed BLRT Extension project and Gateway Exclusive BRT were included in Program of Projects Phase 1. The proposed BLRT Extension project is further along in the process with publication of the Draft EIS and initiation of the Project Development phase in 2014. It is the Council’s intent to request to enter the Engineering phase in 2016. The Gateway Project will be requesting entry into project development from FTA following publication of that project’s Draft EIS.
117BD	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	What empirical support is there for the idea that the art gallery and historical museum in the Robbinsdale Library Building would not be disturbed by three tracks, 50 feet closer at an open intersection with bells and whistles and wheel squeal?	There would be a severe noise impact at the museum resulting from the proposed BLRT Extension project. However, with the inclusion of a Quiet Zone at 42nd Avenue, the noise impact would be eliminated at this location. Additionally, based on the vehicle and soil characteristics at this location, there would be no vibration impact. Noise and Vibration is discussed in Chapter 5 (Sections 5.6 and 5.7) of the Final EIS.
117BE	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Where is the discussion of impacts on the Golden Valley fire station?	Section 4.7 of the Final EIS addresses safety and security. In locations where there would be at-grade light rail crossings of roadways, the potential exists for increases in emergency response time as a result of delay to emergency vehicles while LRVs are in the crossing. During the peak weekday hour, up to 12 light rail trains (six in each direction) would pass through these at-grade crossings, causing approximately 50 seconds of delay per light rail train crossing. These delays could increase fire, emergency medical services, and police response times on routes using the crossings. To help avoid or minimize delays, the Council would coordinate with emergency services providers by providing them with the light rail operating

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								schedule and identification of alternative crossing routes. Additional coordination would occur through the FLSSC, as described in the proposed BLRT Extension project's SSMP (Council, 2014). However, Golden Valley Fire Station 3 (3700 Golden Valley Road) is at a location where no delays due to the passage of LRT vehicles are anticipated, since Golden Valley Road is grade separated from the proposed BLRT Extension project alignment.
117BF	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	A station at Saint Mary Margaret's would interfere with learning for the children at this school. The DEIS inadequately addresses these problems.	Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. No noise impacts were identified at St. Margaret Mary Church. Table 5.6-6 in the Final EIS summarizes noise impacts at institutional land uses. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit's noise mitigation policy, have been recommended.
117BG	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Minneapolis wants to see intensive commercialization and development along the LRT route. That is not appropriate for Wirth Park, Mary Hills, and Sochacki and the adjoining quiet residential neighborhoods.	See Section 4.1 of the Final EIS for a discussion of proposed BLRT Extension project compatibility with the corridor cities' Comprehensive Plans. Also see Section 4.2 for the discussion of development along the proposed BLRT Extension project.
117BH	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Throughout this process, the public has been told that answers will come later – during initial phases, the Scoping Process would be the answer; after the Scoping Process, we were assured that the DEIS would be the answer; now, we will probably be told that answers will come at the 30 percent engineering phase or in the final EIS. Why not answer questions quicker, faster and cheaper rather than continually postponing responses to legitimate inquiry?	The Draft EIS discusses numerous alternatives that were analyzed as a part of the environmental review process. Key issues or changes to the proposed BLRT Extension project occurring since publication of the Draft EIS were identified, analyzed, and are summarized in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. The process included a public comment period on the Draft EIS which provided the public a forum to raise concerns with respect to environmental issues. A revised cost estimate and updated project scope was adopted by the Council in December of 2015. Also in December 2015, 15-percent design plans were released to all corridor cities and Hennepin County. Each of these milestones has provided more information to the public regarding the development of the proposed BLRT Extension project.
117BI	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	The DEIS is 834 pages long, full of technical jargon. The comment period is too short to enable the public to fully assimilate, study, organize and comment on the complex issues covered (or not covered) in the report. This is especially true when supporting information for the DEIS was withheld, see above.	Please see response to Comment 24A and MASTER RESPONSE #5.
117BJ	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Efforts to inform the public of the release of the report were inadequate. Low tech methods of notification like leafleting and posters in public places, as well as higher tech mechanisms like television, radio and social media, were all underutilized. The process has been handled almost exclusively with website notifications, which do not reach everyone. Local residents have expressed surprise that the process was even happening right now. A few evening and afternoon public meetings was not enough. The comment period should be extended or reopened and better notice given. The DEIS is highly technical and difficult for any non-engineer, non-acoustic expert, non-biologist, etc. to understand, so if any of these comments are flat-out in error, it is unintentional. We can only do our best! Many people no doubt worked in good faith on the DEIS and so to them, thanks.	Please see response to Comment 24A and MASTER RESPONSE #5.
117C	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	The community character of D-1 will be severely impacted. Alignment D-1 contains acres of land with mature forests, ponds, wetlands, wildlife, and a quietude that merits classification as rural. High speed transit running every seven to ten minutes 24 hours a day in such a setting is a fundamental and extremely negative change to the land and to community character. The DEIS inadequately explains any reason for concluding otherwise.	Section 4.2 of the Final EIS describes each of the communities along the proposed BLRT Extension project (the cities of Minneapolis, Golden Valley, Robbinsdale, Crystal, and Brooklyn Park) including park resources along the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. The analysis of long-term and short-term direct neighborhood and community effects is based on the following three criteria: changes to community facilities access; changes to community character; and changes to community cohesion. No direct impacts are anticipated for the community facilities along the D1 alignment. Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #9.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
117D	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	Cost assessment of D-1 appears understated which means comparisons among alternatives cannot be accurately made. The real cost for D-1 appears understated because the Report makes no reference to or analysis of “constructive takings” of properties through noise and other intense transit disturbances. All of the homes adjacent to parks along D-1 are especially vulnerable and likely to experience diminution in value because of the LRT; yet such takings and damages are apparently not accounted for. It also appears that no economic analysis of the impact of loss of parkland on property values and therefore on city tax bases was done.	The project cost estimates for each of the alternatives considered as reported in the Draft EIS were developed with the same underlying assumptions for each project element. The cost estimates represent an “apples-to-apples” comparison of the alternatives. Many elements go into deciding the LPA including cost, social elements and environmental impacts, among others. Table 10.1-1 in Chapter 10 – Financial Analysis of the Final EIS outlines a breakdown of cost for the different project elements totaling \$1.496 billion. Cost reviews would continue throughout the design process to further refine the cost.
117E	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	The DEIS inadequately addresses numerous additional open questions.	Please see response to Comment 21C.
117F	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Notification about the DEIS and the comment period have been insufficient.	Please see response to Comment 24A and MASTER RESPONSE #5.
117G	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	Parks along Alignment D-1 are Passive and Natural Settings. The most telling single word in the DEIS about alignment D-1 is a punctuation mark. When the Report refers to the character of Sochacki, Mary Hills, South Halifax, Rice Lake (and even Wirth) parks, it puts quotation marks around the word “natural.” Like this: the “natural” character of the parks (Chapter 4). Is it suggesting that the parks are “fake” or “unnatural?” Or unworthy of serious consideration? This disrespect for community attitudes and concerns about these important neighborhood resources reflects a biased rather than objective assessment.	Please see MASTER RESPONSES #14 and #15.
117H	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	The same bias shows at page 1 where the DEIS recites that the character of the Bottineau Transitway project area “transitions from a moderately dense urban setting in north Minneapolis to a less dense suburban setting starting in Robbinsdale, Golden Valley, and Crystal, and extending through Brooklyn Park and Maple Grove at the north end of the corridor.” It should state that “in the area from Golden Valley Road to 36th Avenue, the setting is light residential density enhanced by natural parks and rural ambient sound levels.”	Please see response to Comment 117C.
117I	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Altering the land from natural forests and wetlands to a very active rail and freight corridor has serious community and economic consequences unrecognized in the DEIS.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #13 and #16.
117J	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	The DEIS apparently does not treat Sochacki Park or Mary Hills Nature Preserve as noise sensitive. They are not specifically listed as category 1 receptors nor identified as passive use. See Technical Report, Noise and Vibration, Appendix. The report recites FTA guidelines which state that parks in general are not noise sensitive, Chapter 8. However, the report omits the rest of the guideline which instructs: “some parks---even some in dense urban areas---are used for passive recreation like reading, conversation, meditation, etc. These places are valued as havens from the noise and pace of everyday city life and they should be treated as noise sensitive. The noise sensitivity of parks should be determined on a case-by-case basis after carefully considering how each facility is used.” FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment FTA-VA-90-1003-06 May 2006 (emphasis added). The DEIS neither mentions this language, conducts a “case by case”	Please see response to Comment 5B.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							study, delves into the actual character of the parks, nor explains why this guideline was not followed.	
117K	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	<p>The DEIS does not offer any explanation for how and whether the proposed Project is consistent with city comprehensive plans regarding the parks. DEIS Chapter 4 talks about comprehensive plans in general, but does not address the chapters of those plans that specifically cover parks.</p> <p>a. The City of Robbinsdale’s Comprehensive Plan Update 2030, Chapter 6 designates Sochacki as a “conservancy community park” intended for passive uses such as nature identification.</p> <p>b. Mary Hills Nature Preserve is identified in the City of Golden Valley’s Comprehensive Plan Chapter 6 as “Nature and Open Space” and described as a nature area intended for visual aesthetics/buffering and preservation of natural resources, walking and “other passive uses.”</p> <p>The DEIS does not appear to treat Sochacki as a passive use or conservancy property and does not treat Mary Hills Nature Preserve as “nature and open space” intended for passive use.</p>	Section 4.1 – Land Use Plan Compatibility of the Final EIS describes the methodology used to assess compatibility with local comprehensive plans. The Council has worked collaboratively with the local municipalities and Three Rivers Park District on park specific issues throughout the design issue resolution process. Sochacki Park: Sochacki Management Unit and Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit are characterized in Chapter 8 – Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation in the Final EIS. The proposed BLRT Extension project would require a temporary occupancy of approximately 0.57 acre along the eastern border of Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit to facilitate construction activities and stormwater conveyance improvements. It has been determined that temporary occupancy of portions of Sochacki Park: Sochacki Management in Robbinsdale is needed in order to provide access and construction staging for the construction of a new LRT bridge structure across Grimes Pond. All non-park construction staging options have been considered and proven to not be feasible. Also, please see MASTER RESPONSE #15.
117L	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	The DEIS does it explain how high decibel transit every 7-10 minutes day and night promotes or is consistent with each cities’ (Robbinsdale and Golden Valley) plans and uses for these properties as serene natural havens.	Please see response to Comment 5B.
117M	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	<p>The DEIS does not accurately catalogue the activities, features or attributes of the parks which omission in turn affects every other conclusory statement throughout the report about the purported lack of impact of the Project on the parks, see Chapters 4, 5, 6, 8 and 10. Yet, information about park activities, features and attributes on a case by case basis is readily available:</p> <p>a. Current. If residents and park visitors, who come from all around the two host communities, were asked how they use the parks, the answers would be: hiking, dog-walking, cross-country skiing, snow-shoeing, biking, running, photography, bird and wildlife observation, quiet contemplation, solitude – these uses are the heart of the parks’ existence. Users are so adamant about the importance of these park features that in May 2009, for example, community testimony defeated a proposition to allow as mild an activity as disc golf in Sochacki Park. A typical comment at the public hearing back then explains the park’s use: “[the user] has found Sochacki Park to be a jewel and a place to escape and to commune with nature. It is secluded and beautiful and he finds spirituality and peace of mind at the park. He sees dogs, kids, and older people out walking getting exercise. The park gives the City of Robbinsdale a sense of wonderment and elation.” City Council Meeting Minutes, City of Robbinsdale, May 12 2009.</p> <p>See also, Reuse, “Robbinsdale Gem Sacrificed for Disc Golf and Chump Change,” Star Tribune, May 10, 2009, http://www.startribune.com/featuredColumns/44646172.html. The park has always been used in that passive way. For uses of Mary Hills as a quiet getaway in a wetland woodland, see e.g., http://goldenvalley.patch.com/listings/mary-hills-nature-area; City of Golden Valley Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 6.</p>	Please see response to Comment 21C and MASTER RESPONSE #15. Section 4.2 of the Final EIS introduces all of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor parks, and Chapter 8 presents the Amended Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation of the proposed BLRT Extension project impacts to park properties.
117N	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	The DEIS does not appear to report any baseline measurements of noise within the parks; the closest approximation that a lay reader can	Please see response to Comment 5B.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							discern is from two homes that were monitored, Receptors L-10 and L-11, Noise and Vibration Technical Report at p.14. Their noise levels in 24 hours of monitoring ranged from 45 to 51 decibels, or “rural ambient noise” levels. Within the parks it is likely even quieter. Although common sense seems conclusive that converting rural ambient noise levels into 82 decibels of linear LRT noise every 7-10 minutes is a “severe impact” if there is any doubt, at a minimum, base noise levels must be measured within the parks and impacts specifically assessed (including in winter months when any dampening effects of foliage would be gone).	
117O	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	The DEIS did not explore noise criteria and does not report on specific community attitudinal factors related to these parks and to their conversion to predominate transitway use.	Please see responses to Comments 5B and 117C.
117P	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	The DEIS does not carefully address or analyze vibration within the parks. Trails are within and closer than 50 feet from the proposed tracks in many locations and common sense says they would be negatively impacted by vibration.	Vibration impacts are an indoor phenomenon and are not assessed for outdoor land uses. Vibration is discussed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.7) of the Final EIS. There are no vibration impacts within the parks anticipated from the proposed BLRT Extension project.
117Q	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	The DEIS concludes, without supplying adequate facts or reasoning, that visual impacts within the Parks are “moderate.” Photos of Sochacki reflect an effort to create an “industrial feel” by including shots of the current power lines in every photo.	Please see response to Comment 91B.
117R	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	No specific description of the trees to be removed, or their number, or vegetation to be stripped is given, nor is any assessment of whether replacements or replanting would even be possible. Mature trees cannot be replaced; defoliation cannot always be overcome.	The Council has analyzed the extent of plant communities that would be impacted by the proposed BLRT Extension project, including forested areas. Several areas have been identified where tree re-planting would occur. These analyses are described in the Final EIS (Section 5.8). It is true that mature trees cannot be planted and that some mortality of re-planted trees is likely to occur.
117S	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	No description or sketch or analysis is given of the planned appearance of anything within the parks including the dramatic change based on planned raised berms, tracks, roads and catenaries as well as artificial retaining walls, all of which would traverse Grimes Pond and the wetlands. This visual impact (and wetland destruction) does not appear to have any realistic mitigation possibilities.	The Final EIS (Section 4.5 and Appendix F) includes several visualizations depicting what the proposed BLRT Extension project would look like from several points of view. Some methods may be feasible to lessen potential visual impacts, such as with strategic plantings. The Council will continue to coordinate with cities and other stakeholders as design advances, including landscaping in areas that are disturbed by the project.
117T	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	The DEIS does not specifically address the impact of one track being replaced by three new tracks plus a service road; that the current power lines and towers are well-screened but will be moved for the LRT and presumably become unscreened; that additional support poles, catenaries, TPSS buildings, and the trains themselves create a permanent visual intrusion in the narrow confines of Sochacki and Mary Hills. Instead, the Report concludes blandly and without factual support that impacts on the perceived natural characters of the parks would only be moderate. The conclusion is unsubstantiated.	Please see response to Comment 91B.
117U	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	The DEIS does not answer the question: How can replacing bucolic views with a constant vision of passing trains day and night and secondary utilitarian structures be anything other than a “high” visual impact?	Please see response to Comment 91B.
117V	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Although the DEIS mentions “mitigation” over and over again, no explanation is given as to how light rail noise could be mitigated within the parks.	Table 5.6-7 in the Final EIS details the proposed noise mitigation for the proposed BLRT Extension project. Specifically, noise mitigation would include the construction of a noise barriers on the east side of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor generally between Golden Valley Road and 36th Avenue.
117W	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	5 – Environmental	Although the DEIS mentions “mitigation” over and over again, no explanation is given as to how visual impact could be mitigated within	Please see response to Comment 91B.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
						Effects	the parks.	
117X	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	Although the DEIS mentions “mitigation” over and over again, no explanation is given as to how destruction of wetlands could be mitigated within the parks.	Mitigation within public parks is subject to Section 4(f) and 6(f) review (see Chapter 8 of the Final EIS). Proposed mitigation within public parks would have to be compatible with the intended use of those portions of the public parks. The Council analyzed areas that may be compatible with wetland mitigation in public parks. The Council realizes that in constrained urbanized areas, every opportunity for wetland mitigation must be examined as to whether it would be feasible. (Also see Section 5.3 of the Final EIS.) Also please see response to Comment 26B and MASTER RESPONSE #16.
117Y	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Sound walls are proposed on the east side of the parks near heavily impacted homes and would sacrifice views on both sides of the parks and do nothing for park users on the trails and meandering paths right next to noisy unscreened trains. Nothing is proposed that could feasibly or physically enclose the tracks from 36th Avenue to Golden Valley Road and beyond into Wirth Park in order to mitigate visual impact and sound.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
117Z	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	117	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	It seems the only realistic option is to reject D-1 and place trains in an urban environment instead or put them underground. Where is the analysis of the alternative of tunnels, in D-1 or D-2? (common sense suggests they wouldn’t work in a wetland park but a subway in North Minneapolis might well be a terrific resource that would lessen undesirable impacts of the LRT and enhance density and development).	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #20.
118A	Lindeman	LeAnn	None provided	118	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	When I bought my future retirement home in Maplebrook Estates – over 20 years ago – it never occurred to me that my home would be condemned. Broadway was well developed and has continued to fill in the few empty spots – example churches, a business complex, many houses, a large townhouse complex, the college, a car dealership, a park, a ball diamond, 4 shopping areas. Why must the light rail destroy the neighborhood? This area is too developed for light rail. It should be placed in a route which does not destroy established neighborhoods. Broadway is not a proper place.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects. No residential property displacements would occur as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Chapter 4 (Section 4.2) of the Final EIS discusses community facilities/community character and cohesion. Impacts associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project were not severe enough to affect overall community character and cohesion, or the accessibility to and use of community facilities.
118B	Lindeman	LeAnn	None provided	118	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	What about the 20 hour per day noise of the Light rail?	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17. No moderate or severe noise impacts are anticipated along West Broadway Avenue as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project after Quiet Zones are implemented.
118C	Lindeman	LeAnn	None provided	118	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	What about the vibration from the light rail?	Vibration impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures have been recommended. Vibration is discussed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.7) of the Final EIS. No vibration impacts are anticipated along West Broadway Avenue as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #18.
118D	Lindeman	LeAnn	None provided	118	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	This LR should be placed elsewhere where there is room so homes, etc. do not have to be destroyed or impacted. I am not against Broadway becoming 4 lanes. But Broadway is no place for light rail or medians with trees, grass. Too much damage is being done to our community.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
122A	Moren	Mae	None provided	122	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Having lived on Theodore Wirth Parkway most of my life, I’m opposed to the LRT here because of problems with the bus system. When I was a teenager, it was no problem taking a bus downtown for a dance or to meet friends at night. While working downtown, I’d take the bus and there were few problems. But now if you don’t go at rush hour it becomes a very different experience not at all pleasant.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
122B	Moren	Mae	None provided	122	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	If there isn't safety measures for buses why add more problems? Address the problems that are here. A new shiny LRT is not going to make going to places safe.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.
123A	RocheFord	Mike	None provided	123	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	What is the impact on water tables – level and flow of water in Sochacki and Mary Hills. Where will the water go? We have many issues with flooding. What is the impact of the new LRT going to have on this? I see nothing addressing this.	Please see response to Comment 26A.
124A	Sannes	Norm	None provided	124	US Mail	1 – Purpose and Need	<p>After listening to proponents make a case for this project, it is clear that this idea is half baked.... An expensive solution struggling to find a problem it might solve. This is nothing more than an opportunity for government to spend a billion dollars or more of other people's money on itself while plunging clumsy footprints through "environmentally sensitive" areas of Theodore Wirth Park, Mary Hills Nature Area and Sochaki Park. In the EIS material this portion of the route is euphemistically described merely as "existing railway corridor." An "in person" walk along this "railway corridor" reveals it is literally PACKED with stuff environmentalists routinely go to the mat to protect: large ponds, bogs, swamps, other wetland...a literal wildlife refuge in the middle of town. I can't imagine ANY other project, public or private, that would be granted permits required to build access ways and infrastructure in these areas.</p> <p>It is obvious this route was chosen over more typical routes for public transportation – routes through neighborhoods where there are PEOPLE LIVING – because IT IS MORE EXPEDIENT to build where THERE ARE NO PEOPLE LIVING NEARBY. When you plow through existing neighborhoods, people push back. When you slash through the parks, ponds and marshes, there's no on living there you have to bother with. The deer, rabbits, turtles and owls don't VOTE and they don't PAY TAXES – the only two things that matter tie our government "betters". But deer, rabbits and birds don't ride trains, either. If anyone is going to ride in these shiny streetcars (cutting edge technology if we were living in the 1870's) you ought to route them thru neighborhoods where more than a handful of people are going to get on or off these trains along the proposed route all the way from Highway 55 to Penn Avenue in Minneapolis to 63rd Avenue North in Brooklyn Park. And projected ridership north of that is what used to be called "blue sky". But none of this matters because the project MUST BE BUILT! That is ALL that matters. Dozens of government jobs and political "careers" depend on the money tied to project moving forward. By the time everyone sees that nobody rides the train and taxpayers are left saddled with the costs of keeping them running attention will be focused on some other project THAT MUST BE BUILT!</p> <p>When I attended the public meeting in Golden Valley and looked at the ID tags on people promoting the project and the names of various and numerous governmental units and agencies hoping to gorge themselves on pieces of this billion dollar pie it brought into focus just "WHY" the train MUST BE BUILT. The economic value of this project is LESS than worthless; taxpayers would be better served if the money were poured into a trench and burned.</p>	Please see MASTER RESPONSES #1, #3, #6, #13, #14, #15, and #16.
125A	Smith	Marietta	None provided	125	US Mail	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	When the Pre-Planning Committee issued its July 2012 report, there was no mention of a Plymouth Avenue Station. My concern is how did Plymouth Avenue Station go from not even being considered to the LPA status in such a short span of time. It appears that there was not	Please see MASTER RESPONSES #6 and #19.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							the amount of advance planning notices with opportunities for input, comments from the most directly impacted communities on the “proposed” new route as was available during the original planning pre-July 2012.	
125B	Smith	Marietta	None provided	125	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Originally, D2 Route (there was no Plymouth Avenue D1) was scheduled to go down Penn Avenue North -- the route which most directly services the target community in several of the LRT project’s objectives. Now it has been totally ruled out of consideration. When asked why, the answer given is because it would have required the removal of too many homes. However, at the Crystal Community Center DEIS meeting on Thursday, May 14, 2014, one of the commenters stated that according to the current plans about 80 homes -- in just one area around the 93rd Avenue North area (and many around 63rd Avenue) would have to be removed to accommodate the current configuration of the Bottineau LRT. Why is that acceptable there but not on the more appropriate Penn Avenue configuration?	The PAC recommended Alignment D1 over Alignment D2 because Alignment D1 would result in significantly less property and neighborhood impacts, improved travel time, greater cost-effectiveness, and less disruption of roadway traffic operations. Discussion focused on the adverse impacts of Alignment D2 and that Alignment D1 better meets the project goals. The costs (impacts) of Alignment D2 for the people on Penn Avenue would outweigh the potential benefits. Since publication of the Draft EIS, modifications to the preliminary design have resulted in the avoidance of several anticipated property acquisitions and resulting displacements with the proposed BLRT Extension project. No residential property displacements would occur as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117.
125C	Smith	Marietta	None provided	125	US Mail	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	I am also concerned that the DEIS investigators did not do a thorough investigation of the Plymouth Avenue-Theodore Wirth area -- including some of the Golden Valley areas especially since this corridor was a more recently considered route than those detailed in the July 2012 Pre-Planning Report.	The Final EIS discloses all known social, environmental, and economic impacts of the proposed BLRT Extension project on the Plymouth Avenue-Theodore Wirth area.
125D	Smith	Marietta	None provided	125	US Mail	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	After having attended numerous meetings and reviewing several documents -- although insufficient time was NOT ALLOWED to review the DEIS Report -- it appears that the decision was already made to build this stretch of the Bottineau LRT corridor as “proposed” regardless of the community input and concerns. It appears that many of these meetings and “exercises” were/are just held to satisfy requirements of “community input” without due consideration to concerns raised.	FTA and HCRRRA published the Draft EIS in April 2014. The Notice of Availability was published in the Federal Register on April 11, 2014, and in the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board (EQB) <i>Monitor</i> on April 14, 2014. These notices were followed by a 45-day public comment period that concluded on May 29, 2014. Copies of the Draft EIS were available at 16 locations for public review during the comment period. Four public hearings were held on May 7, May 8, May 13, and May 14, 2014. Chapter 9 of the Final EIS provides a summary of public involvement for the Final EIS, including a summary of open houses held during Final EIS preparation. The Council has hosted numerous events for public input in all corridor cities. Open houses, public hearings, and city council work sessions have all been organized to provide information about the proposed BLRT Extension project and to solicit feedback from community members. The Council also attends community events and presents to local organizations.
126A	Berg	H. Nils	None provided	126	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	I don’t want to spend much time talking about process, but a few words need to be said. My wife and I attended the last DEIS meeting on May 7, but since I hadn’t had the opportunity to read the document beforehand, I decided to just listen. I did have the opportunity to ask a few questions after the meeting and that was helpful. I learned the document was 1200 pages long and even the representatives present probably had not read it either. After all, it had only been “recently released.” And then this past Tuesday evening a new set of demographics appeared from Hennepin County. I guess it leaves me wondering why all of this pertinent material arrives just prior to these get together. Terrible timing. Who can possibly wade through all of this stuff and then hope to participate in an intelligent conversation on the other side of it? The materials are either a month too late or these meetings are a month too soon to be productive or useful. It makes this whole venture feel like a quick shuffle.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #5.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
126B	Berg	H. Nils	None provided	126	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	One thing I did learn from the latest meeting that I did find interesting, though, was that the Bottineau Preferred Alternative route was selected because the planners did not want to displace somewhere between 72 and 175 families in North Minneapolis. (LRT representatives have given me both of these figures in this very room). That's a noble thought— even if it is more than a tad disingenuous. In reality, LRT is all about social engineering and about telling people where they have to live. Retrofitting trains through valued neighborhoods, parks and lake areas is all about community disruption and displacement. To think of it as anything else is an exercise in deception and illusion.	The PAC recommended Alignment D1 over Alignment D2 because Alignment D1 would result in significantly less property and neighborhood impacts, improved travel time, greater cost-effectiveness, and less disruption of roadway traffic operations. Discussion focused on the adverse impacts of Alignment D2 and that Alignment D1 better meets the project goals. The costs (impacts) of Alignment D2 for the people on Penn Avenue would outweigh the potential benefits. Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would not displace any residential properties. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117.
126C	Berg	H. Nils	None provided	126	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	The DEIS document has an extensive section on water management. That's good. Water flow going in and out of Rice Lake is a major concern for many of us. Robbinsdale apparently plugged up the flow under the BNSF tracks a number of years ago and we experienced significant flooding in both Mary Hills and our backyards as a result. The flow was so strong you could nearly whitewater raft in our yards. When Robbinsdale put in the new drainage culverts, things improved somewhat for us, but not for our neighbors who live downstream. To this day we all remain interested in any water tampering that is occurring upstream.	The proposed BLRT Extension project would run on a bridge over Grimes Pond. North Rice Pond would be largely unaffected, as the existing embankment upon which the BNSF rail corridor lies would not be altered.
126D	Berg	H. Nils	None provided	126	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	What is in it for freight? Reports about train delays, accidents and oil movement seem to appear on a frequent basis in our edition of The Star Tribune. Maybe you have seen the articles. It makes me think that if I was running the BNSF and I have trains backed up I would be interested in gaining shipment capacity. If you won't or can't give that to me, why would I be interested in sitting across the table from you? And if I am on the Golden Valley City Council, I wouldn't want to have to go back to my constituents and tell them that I had been successful in getting the railroad to bring longer, heavier and possibly oil laden trains through our neighborhood.	The Council continues discussions with BNSF Railway for the use/purchase of 50 feet of their right-of-way. To date, BNSF has not agreed to any participation in the cost of the proposed BLRT Extension project.
126E	Berg	H. Nils	None provided	126	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	Finally, my real concern for the evening. I see nothing in the DEIS addressing the fact that the Mary Hills Nature Center and Sochacki Park are both sitting on a landfill. The landfill area is the final resting place of old Highway 100. If you walk through the various paths in the parks, the concrete slabs you will readily see are the remnants of the roadway. The interesting thing about this is that much of Highway 100 was built as a post depression, Department of Public Works Project in the 1930's. Back then, before people knew better, a mineral called asbestos was commonly used in many forms of construction-- including highways. Asbestos fibers apparently bonded to and strengthened the cement. They were not affected by temperature changes and they helped provide protection from salt damage. I don't know if there actually is asbestos present in the concrete and, from what I can tell, neither does the DEIS document mention it. I do know though that a variety of respiratory ailments can be directly traced to asbestos. And according to the Mesothelioma website, exposure over time can have dire consequences. The article states " an unmarred block of cement presents no danger, but.... any time it is cracked or broken, microscopic bits of asbestos are released. Once airborne, they can be breathed in by unsuspecting victims who discover years later that the material has lodged in their respiratory system. The article states that people can still be exposed to asbestos if they come across broken chunks of cement that contain the hazardous mineral." I bring	Please see response to Comment 117AD.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							this up not to instill fear but to encourage caution should this project proceed. Light rail does not exist in its own little vacuum. Any effort to displace freight and reroute it through the Mary Hills Nature Center could conceivably turn a dormant landfill into a Hazardous Waste site.	
127A	Berg	H. Nils	None provided	127	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	<p>Assisting with my infant grandsons tub bath last evening got me to thinking about, of all things, water displacement. The more toys we added, the higher the water rose. We didn't get anywhere near the point where the tubs built-in drain took over, but if we had, that drain would have automatically siphoned off water to prevent overflow. Funny how the mind works, but this, in turn, got me to thinking further about the Mary Hills flood plain.</p> <p>We live on Dresden Lane abutting the Mary Hills Nature Center. Since we have experienced times of substantial flooding in the past, we remain very concerned about any development occurring upstream from our property. I mentioned this at the Golden Valley Bottineau concerns meeting on May 15, 2014. Actions undertaken by Robbinsdale both caused and corrected a portion of our flooding problem. But, again, our concern remains...and here is why.</p>	The Council refined estimates of floodplain impacts and requirements for stormwater management. The Council is cognizant that innovative techniques would be needed to counteract potential flooding downstream (including Bassett Creek) from infrastructure related to the proposed BLRT Extension project. See Section 5.2 of the Final EIS, and see also response to Comment 20A.
127B	Berg	H. Nils	None provided	127	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	<p>Like the tub, the water-holding areas in Sochacki Park are a limited, well-defined area. They can only contain a certain volume of water. If you place more things in the water, like the substantially enlarged footings for three sets of railroad tracks instead of the current one, you wind-up filling in a significantly larger segment of the water catchment area. This would cause the water to deepen and/or spread out. This would pose a major problem for those of us living downstream and for the Mary Hills Nature Center.</p>	The Council analyzed construction methods that would offset proposed fill in low-lying areas in and around Sochacki Park. Prior to construction of the existing railroad tracks, Grimes Pond and North Rice Pond were one waterbody. The fill from the railroad ballast that now bisects these ponds decreased their water holding capacity. The proposed BLRT Extension project would construct the LRT tracks on top of a bridge structure with a limited impact to the Grimes Pond floodplain (200 cubic yards). Compensatory flood storage will be constructed in Grimes Pond to eliminate floodplain impacts.
127C	Berg	H. Nils	None provided	127	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	<p>Even a small rainfall could produce major flooding. If you were to try to address this issue by placing more large culverts in the two water basin areas, the volume of water flowing out of these areas and into Rice Lake would increase markedly and would potentially be a problem for landowners who live around the Lake. Even if those culverts functioned efficiently, like the aforementioned tub drain, the amount of water they would channel into Rice Lake would quickly overtake the capacity of the lake. The Lake, in turn would try to pass this faster moving, higher volume of water into Bassett Creek. The problem would now be shared with property owners downstream. I say shared because the problem has not disappeared for the residents upstream. Bassett Creek, you see, already has difficulty handling the volume of water we get in a heavy rainfall. It is unable to stay within its banks and will frequently overflow. If you were to walk along the creek banks, you would readily see that the water is in the process of carving a deeper channel with wider banks. Erosion is becoming more of an issue as the root systems of bank-anchoring trees are being more progressively exposed and the trees themselves are falling into the Creek. Even though the outflow of water has depend and sped up, the Creek is unable to handle the increasing volume of water flowing into it. As a result, the water can't get downstream so it backs up. And for those of us living upstream from Bassett Creek, while our flooding used to come from upstream, it now comes from downstream. Our recent rainstorms bore witness to that.</p> <p>The only feasible way to correct this worsening situation is to start corrective actions below Theodore Wirth Park and then begin working your way back upstream.</p>	In Chapter 5 (Section 5.2) of the Final EIS, the relationship between the Council and entities such as the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission are described. Floodplains are protected by local, state, and federal legislation because of their ecological value and functionality. Regulatory and permitting authority for floodplain impacts falls to the local government unit (LGU), which is typically the municipality. Watershed management organizations (WMOs) also regulate floodplain impacts to waters within their jurisdictional authority. Table 5.2-1 in the Final EIS shows that there is a loss of 16,800 cubic yards of flood storage volume in Bassett Creek due to the construction of the alignment and station. The floodplain mitigation area between the main stem of Bassett Creek and the proposed BLRT Extension project and BNSF rail corridor (partially in Theodore Wirth Regional Park and partially on private property; initially identified in the Draft EIS) has been further refined. The mitigation would include excavating adjacent ground below the 100-year floodplain elevation to provide compensatory floodplain storage for the fill placed in the floodplain.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
127D	Berg	H. Nils	None provided	127	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Any Draft EIS document that does not address this issue is little more than a “fill-in-the-blanks” exercise at best. At worst, if the motivation behind the Draft is to “prove” that the Preferred Alternative is the only rail route worth considering, then the Draft itself is little more than a cherry-picking document that is determined to prove its case at the expense of the facts and the experiences of those of us who live along the proposed route.	The AA and Draft EIS process examined numerous alignment options summarized in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. The proposed BLRT Extension project includes an alignment that meets the purpose and need most efficiently and minimizes project impacts. Also, please see response to Comment 21C.
129A	Nieman	Scott	None provided	129	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	This letter is a follow up to my 3 minutes allotted time for comments at the public forum held at Crystal Community Center. As previously stated, I am very much in support of the intent of the Bottineau Transitway as a positive step forward to advancing our public transportation needs in the Twin Cities area. However, after review of the Draft EIS, I am very concerned that:	Pease see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
129B	Nieman	Scott	None provided	129	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	The report misrepresents the environmental consequences and overall benefits of the “Preferred Alternative”, specifically the D1 segment that passes through Theodore Wirth Parkway the proposed construction of either of the two stations options at the park.	Please see response to Comment 21C.
129C	Nieman	Scott	None provided	129	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	A D2 subway option was never even considered, mentioned, or cost estimated (based on total cost of ownership, not just immediate project construction costs.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #20.
129D	Nieman	Scott	None provided	129	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	There was very limited public service announcements for the public forums, especially to known community groups that have vested interest in public transportation and embarrassingly insufficient time for residents to articulate their views, and there was no representation from Minneapolis City Council.	FTA and HCRRA published the Draft EIS in April 2014. The Notice of Availability was published in the Federal Register on April 11, 2014, and in the EQB <i>Monitor</i> on April 14, 2014. These notices were followed by a 45-day public comment period that concluded on May 29, 2014. Copies of the Draft EIS were available at 16 locations for public review during the comment period. Four public hearings were held on May 7, May 8, May 13, and May 14, 2014. Chapter 9 of the Final EIS provides a summary of public involvement for the Final EIS, including a summary of open houses held during Final EIS preparation. The Council has hosted numerous events for public input in the City of Minneapolis. Open houses, public hearings, and city council work sessions have all been organized to provide information about the proposed BLRT Extension project and to solicit feedback from community members. The Council also attends community events and presents to local organizations.
129E	Nieman	Scott	None provided	129	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	The summary statement in Section 2.6 completely contradicts the summary of the EIS data in Table 5.2-1. The D1 option through the Theodore Wirth Park along Bassett Creek has the most environmental impact of all segments (A, B, C, D1, D2). Why was this concluded as the preferred option in Section 2.6?	As summarized in Chapter 2 – Alternatives of the Final EIS, the LPA meets the purpose and need of the proposed BLRT Extension project and is the environmentally preferable alternative because it best protects, preserves and enhances social, historic and cultural resources. However, the LPA does not cause the least damage to the biological and natural resources of the physical environment.
129F	Nieman	Scott	None provided	129	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	The D1-7 wetland (as discussed in Section 5.2.4.1) floods near the proposed Plymouth Avenue station practically every year I have lived in the area including the week of May 3 of this year, requiring closure of the parkway. Flooding of the roadway limits access to the proposed station, making it an illogical option.	Please see response to Comment 26A.
129G	Nieman	Scott	None provided	129	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	This Bassett Creek area has an incredible and very sensitive ecosystem that would be disturbed if there is any attempt to mitigate (5.2.5) future flooding for the sake of a light rail station. That is unacceptable – every historical attempt that humans have made to “make nature better” has ultimately failed via some form of downstream ripple effect.	In Section 5.2 of the Final EIS, the relationship between the Council and entities such as the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission are described. Floodplains are protected by local, state, and federal legislation because of their ecological value and functionality. Regulatory and permitting authority for floodplain impacts falls to the LGU, which is typically the municipality. WMOs also regulate floodplain impacts to waters within their jurisdictional authority. Table 5.2-1 in the Final EIS shows that there is a loss of 16,800 cubic yards of flood storage volume in Bassett Creek due to the construction of the alignment and station. The floodplain mitigation area between the main stem of Bassett Creek and the LRT and BNSF rail corridor (partially in Theodore Wirth Regional Park and partially on private property;

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								initially identified in the Draft EIS) has been further refined. The mitigation would include excavating adjacent ground below the 100-year floodplain elevation to provide compensatory floodplain storage for the fill placed in the floodplain.
129H	Nieman	Scott	None provided	129	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	The Golden Valley station option on the D1 segment is clearly not a much better environmental option; the construction of the proposed underground parking -- especially the access road to the parking area -- will feed unwanted sediment into Bassett Creek.	Underground parking at the Golden Valley Road Station is no longer being explored as a feasible option for parking. The design that has been moved forward as part of the revised scope of the proposed BLRT Extension project is a surface lot that would accommodate about 100 spaces and is to be designed with stormwater management mitigation measures.
129I	Nieman	Scott	None provided	129	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	It is naïve to believe that North Minneapolis residents would be well served by placing a substation at either the proposed Plymouth Avenue or Golden Valley Road locations. Very few people will take a bus traveling west, so they can ride the light rail to travel east – they will instead use a bus – therefore the use by North Minneapolis residents will be extremely limited, failing to meet ridership objectives. When I brought this matter up with Joe Gladke of Hennepin County, he responded that most northsiders prefer to ride the bus anyway – which raises suspicion that by-passing North Minneapolis was very intentional.	The Council used its regional travel demand forecasting model to develop the transit ridership forecasts for the project. The proposed BLRT Extension project ridership modeling is discussed in Section 3.1 of the Final EIS.
129J	Nieman	Scott	None provided	129	Email	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Report does not address the noise pollution for residents, or provide a mitigation plan for the noise in the form of diffusion walls, which would not be acceptable in areas near Theodore Wirth Park adjacent to residential areas. This was one of the major concerns raised by residents attending the <u>secret public forums</u> .	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
129K	Nieman	Scott	None provided	129	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	By-passing North Minneapolis is a huge mistake and lost opportunity for economic development in an area that has been economic depressed, worsened by the 2011 tornado which devastated the specific area which a train station should be located. It has wide open spaces for development, hence very low cost.	The PAC recommended Alignment D1 over Alignment D2 (through North Minneapolis) because Alignment D1 would result in significantly less property and neighborhood impacts, improved travel time, greater cost-effectiveness, and less disruption of roadway traffic operations. Discussion focused on the adverse impacts of Alignment D2 and that Alignment D1 better meets the project goals. The costs (impacts) of Alignment D2 for the people on Penn Avenue would outweigh the potential benefits.
129L	Nieman	Scott	None provided	129	Email	1 – Purpose and Need	In summary, the D1 option therefore fails to meet a majority of the key objectives of the project, including increasing ridership for those in need, minimizing environmental impact, and promotion of economic development for North Minneapolis residents who need jobs. I provide later for the record, a detailed ‘report card’ of how the D1 option compares to the key objectives outlined in the Draft EIS.	The LPA (Alternative B-C-D1) meets the purpose of and need for the proposed BLRT Extension project.
129M	Nieman	Scott	None provided	129	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Regarding point #2, I find it disturbing that the D2 option was ruled out when all the available options were not considered or documented. An urban subway approach fits Minnesota weather much more than above ground light rail, and shows a sense of maturity in the form of urban public transportation. Applying light rail in a dense urban setting is not logical, and is a symptom of the classic ‘I have a hammer everything looks like a nail’ mistake. Light rail transit only works in the suburbs, and when you get into the city, you must go underground. I recommend a rail approach modeled after the Metrorail in Washington D.C., whereas when you get out to Gaithersburg, Maryland, the rail goes above ground. The D2 subway approach provides the following benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Lower long term maintenance costs since the rail would not be exposed to winter elements. ■ Lower construction costs than above-ground total construction and maintenance costs 	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #20.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider Seattle's on-going efforts where they are drilling through volcanic rock, vs. Minneapolis' clay, sand and limestone • Reduced land acquisition costs since the rail would be directly under Penn Avenue Station • No bridges to construct or bridge maintenance • No sound barriers to construct • No snow removal required <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Little to no impact to vehicle traffic and parking after construction, improved access to local businesses; compared to the new traffic problems on University Avenue since the Green Line construction ■ Reduced noise pollution, which was echoed as a major concern at the public forums I attended ■ Increased ridership for those in need ■ Improved public safety <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • low risk to pedestrians and bicycles, • eliminates the potential of accidents, consider we have had an average of 8 accidents per year on the existing Hiawatha Avenue Blue line in the last 10 years, and 3 car accidents already on the Green line before it officially opens http://kstp.com/article/stories/s3438823.shtml ■ Guaranteed rider payment, if Metro Transit uses of a similar ticketing system to the Metrorail, ■ Utilization of available, wide open spaces created by the North Minneapolis 2011 tornado; there is great opportunity to place an escalator at the NW corner of Penn Avenue and West Broadway intersection, for access to the subway. ■ Placing a transfer station at Penn Avenue and West Broadway intersection provides great economic development opportunities in an area that has long attempted to create an Arts District; e.g., consider the redevelopment of the Capri Theater and the Five Corners development project, which is still struggling to find an anchor business such as the jazz club/restaurant originally envisioned. (This approach is consistent with the Penn Avenue Community Works Project RESOLUTION NO. 12-0238, which has had extremely little progress since passed in 2012). ■ Eliminates the perception of racism. 	
129N	Nieman	Scott	None provided	129	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	<p>Regarding point #3, implementation of a D2 subway option addresses the concerns raised by Neighborhoods Organizing for Change (NOC). Recently, this group has made presentations to Metropolitan Council members, as there is great concern that North Minneapolis not getting its fair share of transit amenities, despite having a heavily transit-dependent population. They have raised concerns about disproportion number of shelters to protect against the weather, when compared to South Minneapolis riders, who have much lower ridership levels. This group has appeared to gain support of Metropolitan Council Member Gary Cunningham, husband of Minneapolis Mayor Betsy Hodges. http://www.startribune.com/local/minneapolis/258843021.html Please take note that I will be forwarding this analysis/letter to Met Council members as well.</p>	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #20.
129O	Nieman	Scott	None provided	129	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	<p>When compared to the D.C. Metrorail system, our rail system is infant in its maturity, and is not yet viewed as the strategic asset it could be, to improve the vitality of downtown Minneapolis and St Paul. By</p>	The Council acknowledges your concern about placing rail underground on 5th Street in Downtown Minneapolis. The proposed BLRT Extension Project would not

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
						Design	comparison, downtown Washington D.C. economy thrives largely due to the Metro -- in general, there are very few vehicles downtown other than taxis. Most people hop on the MetroRail to very quickly get downtown and its mostly underground for a reason. As for Minneapolis, its downtown is struggling because its too much of a hassle to park and businesses are leaving as they cannot survive as a result. And we lost a huge opportunity to place the rail system underground on 5th Street, eliminating traffic and pedestrian concerns, preserving the limited on-street parking.	modify any rail on the existing Blue Line east of the Target Field Station.
129P	Nieman	Scott	None provided	129	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	In light of these concerns, while I am in support of the Bottineau Transitway to extend the Blue line, the project needs to be put on hold until a D2 subway option through North Minneapolis analysis is completed. We must do better.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #20.
132A	Applebaun	Steve	None provided	132	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	My wife and I live directly across the street from Sochachi Park. The proposed Bottineau Transitway will go through the park. We are opposed to the development of this project. We believe it will destroy the pristine nature of the park. The noise of the train frequently going through the area will scare away the wildlife. We might have a new way to transport people with this transitway but we will lose the irreplaceable jewel that this park represents for all the residents that live nearby. Please vote against this project.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #15.
134	Bartell	Julie	None provided	134	Email		Same comments as Billy Binder, co-signed letter	Chapter 3 (Section 3.4) of the Final EIS summarizes bike and pedestrian improvements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would provide several long-term improvements to pedestrian and bicycle accessibility and safety. All LRT stations would provide safe access for pedestrian and bicycle traffic. Bicycle parking would be included at or near stations as space allows, with the type and location of parking to be determined by the Council as station design and site development progress. The issue-resolution process conducted with Metro Transit, Hennepin County, and staff from the cities along the proposed BLRT Extension project alignment resulted in several modifications to the pedestrian and bicycle environment beyond that presented in the Draft EIS.
134A	Binder	Billy	None provided	134	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	We found the Bottineau Light Rail Transit (LRT) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) to be adequate in every way. We believe that the Bottineau LRT line is an important part of our regional transit way system, and that the project effectively addresses regional transportation and accessibility needs of a growing population in Minneapolis and the northwest suburbs in the future.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
134B	Binder	Billy	None provided	134	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	The Bottineau line proactively addresses increasing traffic congestion with an environmentally sustainable solution and serves a uniquely transit dependent population--in all of Minneapolis and inner ring suburbs--with reverse commute access to jobs in the northwest suburbs.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
134C	Binder	Billy	None provided	134	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	We believe that we need to provide both the Golden Valley Road and the Plymouth Avenue North stations to provide LRT access to two very different communities, Golden Valley and North Minneapolis, respectively.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #19.
134D	Binder	Billy	None provided	134	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	We think that we need to listen carefully to our neighbors in Golden Valley who are rightly concerned about all of the environmental consequences that will be a part of the LRT project and we think that the DEIS is very sensitive to these concerns	The Final EIS discloses environmental impacts of the proposed BLRT Extension project and includes avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures. The Council engages and will continue to engage the public in the preliminary engineering process and into construction. The Council 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

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								outreach program provides many avenues for people to submit comments and concerns, which are forwarded to the planners and engineers.
134E	Binder	Billy	None provided	134	Email	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	<p>We believe that we should establish “Quiet Zones” proscribed in the DEIS in the areas north of Highway 55 and South of 36th Avenue North. Since there will be no on grade crossings in this section every effort should be made to completely eliminate all train bells entering and exiting the Golden Valley Road and Plymouth Avenue stations, eliminate all wayside bells on the stations and eliminate all train horns except in cases of emergencies, and eliminate or minimize all public address announcements on the train or in the station to a very, very low volume.</p> <p>We appreciate the DEIS discussion of noise barriers in the project and expect that a productive discussion can be made with specific nearby neighborhoods about what is most effective, and of eliminate all tight radius curves at stations or along the line.</p>	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
134F	Binder	Billy	None provided	134	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	<p>Many of our Golden Valley neighbors spoke about the need for security on the LRT trains, stations and in the Golden Valley Road corridor itself and all lighting and additional security accommodations must be made because the location of this particular station is isolated.</p>	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.
134G	Binder	Billy	None provided	134	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	<p>Adequate bus, vehicle, bike, wheelchair, and pedestrian access should be an integral part of LRT station area design, it should be safe and convenient to drop off and pick up passengers.</p>	<p>Chapter 3 (Section 3.4) of the Final EIS summarizes bike and pedestrian improvements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would provide several long-term improvements to pedestrian and bicycle accessibility and safety. All LRT stations would provide safe access for pedestrian and bicycle traffic. Bicycle parking would be included at or near stations as space allows, with the type and location of parking to be determined by the Council as station design and site development progress.</p> <p>The issue-resolution process conducted with Metro Transit, Hennepin County, and staff from the cities along the proposed BLRT Extension project alignment resulted in several modifications to the pedestrian and bicycle environment beyond that presented in the Draft EIS.</p>
134H	Binder	Billy	None provided	134	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	<p>Thank you for allowing us to comment on the DEIS, we think that it is very well done and we are looking forward to the construction of this necessary and important project.</p> <p>Beyond the narrower scope of the DEIS, we would like to add that the LRT station on Golden Valley Road and the project itself with its regional reach will open up many exciting possibilities for the City of Golden Valley to work with Hennepin County to modernize County Highway 66 to truly connect all of Golden Valley to a new world class transit system.</p> <p>Golden Valley can get its own upgraded bus service along Golden Valley Road (it is a patchwork system today) that connects to the City Center by the way of Honeywell, Byerly’s, Courage Kenney Center, and the LRT station. Our city can have off street bike lanes that are family friendly along Golden Valley Road to make all of the same connections and pedestrians and people with disabilities will have their own safer sidewalk spaces if bike riders are accommodated on defined bike lanes.</p> <p>We can all enter the 21st Century with the positive changes that the Bottineau LRT line will bring if we all work together to use the most modern engineering and design practices both on the LRT line and on all of our connecting roadways!</p>	Chapter 3 of the Final EIS discusses the transit conditions of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor and region. The proposed BLRT Extension project transit ridership forecasts reflect future development and planned and programmed transportation system investments. The 2040 regional travel demand model incorporates roadway system improvements identified in the fiscally constrained (current revenue) scenario of the Council’s regional <i>Transportation Policy Plan (TPP)</i> adopted in January 2015. The alternatives analyzed in the travel demand forecast model include specific network modifications to existing transit service including changes in routing, frequency, and travel time. Network modifications are focused on providing an integrated “feeder” bus network to connect people to the proposed BLRT Extension project stations. Bus networks and transit plans would continue to be refined as the project progresses; final bus network changes would be subject to a robust public involvement process in accordance with Title VI requirements.
135A	Wall-Romana	Christophe	None provided	135	Email	4 – Social and	1. The Bottineau Line project aims to bring the LRT to the northeast	The commenter is correct in stating that north Minneapolis neighborhoods have

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
						Economic Effects	<p>quadrant of the greater Twin Cities area. Among the benefits sought and adduced as rationales are road decongestion and positive economic fallout for the region. But the Bottineau Line plans serve mostly low-density areas, shirking low-income communities of color of North Minneapolis, and instead, as touted in the Hennepin County video ‘Bottineau LRT’ it uses the “190 high-paying jobs” planned at Baxter Pharmaceuticals in Brooklyn Park as a justification. Linking with corporate campuses seems to play too central a role in the design and location of the Bottineau Line, to the detriment of other factors, such as the distribution of low-income high mass transit users in the project area. The Bottineau Blvd axis running SE-NW from the Target Field Transit Center to W. Broadway Ave. (closest to proposed alignment 2d) is the obvious and preferred location as it intersects the areas of North Minneapolis (roughly between Glenwood and Dowling and Penn and Lyndale) that are all at once the densest (according to the 2008 Population Census Density Map by Census Block Group [ESRI, 2008, DEIS 7-7]), have the lowest income (according to the 2013 Median Household Income Map by Census Block Group [ESRI, 2013]), and the least proportion of vehicles per household (DEIS 1-22). My main opposition to the project centers therefore on its avoidance of the central challenge presented by the North metro area: committing to develop a historically under-served and economically segregated area for the betterment of the greater Twin Cities. The D2 proposed line (and its avatars, D2a, b and c) was a very poor choice: it has high environmental impacts with insufficient mitigation; low neighborhood buy-in or participation (Section 11-10 mentions the Maple Grove express bus whose service is so good that users may not switch to LRT, proving that low-impact express bus service is a stronger alternative than investigated by the DEIS); and botched interactions with the public (2012 presentation of D2 project, for instance; also the Golden Valley joint commission meeting on 5/21 was said to have been badly advertised and explained to the citizenry by one member of the commission). The Bottineau Line project fails to contribute adequately to economic injustice redress while the input of corporate stakeholders is disproportionately represented, to the detriment of the majority of the low-income population of color of the area. The push for a regional LRT solution instead of expanded local, express and suburban bus service—which represent together 86% of ALL transit in the metro area, and is thus the favored mode by most transit riders—may be misdirected when it comes to the North. The Bottineau study area is 52.4% minority, that is minorities are the majority. Yet the bulk of that population in North Minneapolis, will not be served by the D1 alternative. The rationale of the project is to aid minorities which aren’t being helped by the final design.</p>	<p>large percentages of low-income and transit-dependent residents. The evaluation of Alignments D1 (part of the proposed BLRT Extension project) and D2 (located along Penn Avenue in north Minneapolis) considered several environmental and social issues and impact areas. While each alternative has a number of benefits and impacts the surrounding area and residents, the social and environmental justice impacts associated with the displacement of many homes and disruption of community cohesion with Alignment D2 would be disproportionately adverse. With Alignment D1, the north Minneapolis community would not have the proposed BLRT Extension project stations on Penn Avenue; however, Metro Transit has been advancing the planning and design of an enhanced transit service for the Penn Avenue corridor to serve the transit-dependent populations. A network of arterial BRT lines is planned for the Minneapolis–St. Paul area, including the C Line along Penn Avenue. BRT is an enhanced transit service providing 25–30 percent faster trips and an improved experience for transit riders. This new BRT line would provide enhanced transit for this community, as well as opportunities for economic development, without the significantly adverse impacts associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges your concern about public input into the planning process for the proposed BLRT Extension Project. Chapter 9 of the Final EIS describes the public outreach process used for public and stakeholder outreach. For the proposed BLRT Extension project, the Council has implemented a comprehensive public outreach program that has engaged nearby communities and underrepresented groups in the project design and engineering process. This includes appointing two voting members to the proposed BLRT Extension project Corridor Management Committee that represent the Blue Line Coalition (a community-based group working to advance local and regional equity and community health along the Blue Line corridor). The project has also established a Business Advisory Committee and Community Advisory Committee to seek public input and advise the CMC and the Council. The Council will continue to engage community groups directly and via local/neighborhood-based media to inform on project progress.</p>
135B	Wall-Romana	Christophe	None provided	135	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	<p>2. Page 7-33 of the DEIS stipulates that transit provides a positive role in promoting social equity. The problem with the Environmental justice section is that it does not analyze economic justice. In fact, that is the greatest problem with the Bottineau project: it is blatantly unfair to the community that is most in need of economic justice and it simply circumvents the key issue of how the Met Council approaches the redevelopment and reinvigoration of North Minneapolis.</p>	Please see response to Comment 135A.
135C	Wall-Romana	Christophe	None provided	135	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	<p>3. Golden Valley and other Southern Corridor communities (Crystal, New Hope, Robbinsdale) whose populations have declined over the last 20 years, are asked with the Bottineau Line to help with the job</p>	Sochacki Park and Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Nature Area would be restored and enhanced following the completion of construction and continued coordination with the Sochacki Park Joint Powers Agreement partners (the Three Rivers Park District,

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							creation and residential increase in population of the Northern Corridor communities of Brooklyn Park and Maple Grove (DEIS, p. 1-13). The Southern cities should therefore receive the highest level of mitigation from the project for being 'good citizens', and Southern Corridor municipalities should hold back consent until project leaders recognize the need for respectful mitigations. The language in 4.2.5 proposes minimal or non-existent mitigations. Because there is no planned impact on community cohesiveness and character, mitigations are quickly reduced to Best Management Practices, limited to informing residents about construction disruptions and deigning "to keep access to bus stops open" (DEIS 4-36). Yet the DEIS has insufficiently studied the importance of Sochacki Park/Mary Hills for both the character and cohesiveness of populations of Golden Valley, Crystal and others that use and love these beautiful and peaceful watershed areas. Mitigation offered by the DEIS are paltry, patronizing and downright offensive	the city of Golden Valley, and the city of Robbinsdale). Additional supporting data and explanation have been added to the Final EIS and Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation (Chapter 8). The park will remain open to recreational use during construction. Impacts to wetlands would be addressed in accordance with the Clean Water Act and the Wetland Conservation Act. One mitigation measure is for the project to construct a paved trail that would connect Theodore Wirth Parkway trail to Sochacki Park. Additional mitigation measures include environmental remediation, a revegetation plan, and prep for a future off-leash dog park. Additional measures can be found in the Final Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation. Section 4.2 of the Final EIS describes each of the communities along the proposed BLRT Extension project (the cities of Minneapolis, Golden Valley, Robbinsdale, Crystal, and Brooklyn Park) including park resources along the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. The analysis of long-term and short-term direct neighborhood and community effects is based on the following three criteria: changes to community facilities access; changes to community character; and changes to community cohesion. No direct impacts are anticipated for the community facilities along the D1 alignment.
135D	Wall-Romana	Christophe	None provided	135	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	Letter from the Army Corps of Engineer, March 22, 2012: to US dept. of transportation: "Time and money spent on the proposal prior to applying for a section 404 permit cannot factored into the corps' decision whether there is a less damaging practicable alternative to the proposal." I ask that the same rationale be made clear in the final EIS: that money and efforts invested in this project must not constitute not the basis for its final acceptance by lead agency, the Met Council or municipalities that can withhold their consent if mitigations to their citizenry is not deemed sufficient.	Coordination between the Council and USACE for obtaining permit approval under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act has been ongoing since the initiation of the Draft EIS. Coordination with the USACE also included FTA and Council participation in a merger process between the NEPA and the Clean Water Act Section 404 permitting processes. The NEPA/404 merger process provided USACE with an opportunity to review and comment on four sequential concurrence points at key milestones during project development: (1) purpose and need (concurrence on June 19, 2013), (2) array of alternatives and alternatives carried forward (concurrence on June 19, 2013), (3) identification of the Preferred Alternative (concurrence on October 1, 2013), and (4) design phase impact minimization (concurrence on June 16, 2016).
135E	Wall-Romana	Christophe	None provided	135	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	5. Frequency and alarm system are two key areas. The Bottineau is supposed to have a frequency into the 3-4 min. at peak times when the green line with 50% more ridership has only a 10 min. maximum with noise mitigation such as floating slab platforms. I ask that the Bottineau be not given carte blanche when it comes to frequency—and aggregate noise impact on quality of life has not been properly studied in the DEIS—and instead that municipalities reserve consent until a frequency lower than that of the green line is offered, that is, proportionally to the respective planned ridership of both lines. Horn should only be used for emergency or special operation as in the green line, and bell should be the default.	The Final EIS assumes that trains would operate at 10-minute frequencies for weekday operations. Travel times and operating assumptions for the proposed BLRT Extension project are discussed in Section 2.5.2.3 of the Final EIS. Concerning noise impacts: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
135F	Wall-Romana	Christophe	None provided	135	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	6. The DEIS should include a section regarding mitigations offered on the Southwest Corridor line since residents and municipalities have a right to know and project leaders have a duty to inform. Frequency and noise levels should also be compared across the green line, the Southern corridor line and the Bottineau: again, there are no grounds to keep this very useful information out of the final EIS.	The proposed BLRT Extension project and the Southwest light rail project are independent projects with differing impacts and mitigation measures. While the Council is coordinating the development of both projects, it would not be appropriate to discuss the Southwest light rail project mitigation measures in the Final EIS for the proposed BLRT Extension project.
135G	Wall-Romana	Christophe	None provided	135	Email	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	7. Construction hours. The project's leaders need to commit to respectful and reasonable construction hours, regardless of local noise ordnances: All residents impacts should have their noise comfort equally protected so that no environmental justice issues when it comes to noise is equal throughout the project area. The maximum construction allowed should be 8 am to 6pm, no work on weekends or holidays.	Construction would occur within the hours prescribed in each city's noise ordinance as summarized on page 5-56 of the Draft EIS. Construction activities would generally take place between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Anything outside of hours allowed in the respective noise ordinances would require a special permit and notification of residents. Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria for construction and operating phases. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit's noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
135H	Wall-Romana	Christophe	None provided	135	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	I note in closing an aggressive and dismissive tone among project leaders that is reflected by the DEIS when it comes to describing more candidly the pros and cons of the project and its impact. The tone is reflected by the use of the phrase “it is anticipated that” which conceals both the author(s) of the anticipated item and the rationale for it. I would like every important decision – frequency, mitigation, aggregate noise impact – to be clearly and transparently explained to residents involved. The DEIS is a federally mandated way of entering into a fair discussion with the people which large project will impact. That conversation thus far is a bureaucratic monologue: most residents have no idea what is in store, the DEIS is dismal. Municipalities also must do a much better job at getting the word out of their citizenry, and elected officials have a duty to be answerable to their communities whether on the Met Council or in smaller entities. Do a better job at giving a clear picture of what the future holds for all residents impacted by Bottineau! In fact, it should be mandated that a document with pros and cons be circulated to all residents directly impacted per the DEIS.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #6.
137A	Chesney	Steve	None provided	137	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I support the routing of the transitway as described in the public meetings and the draft statement. There are negatives of course, homes will be bought out. There will be a different kind of traffic and noise through the neighborhood.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
137B	Chesney	Steve	None provided	137	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	But I think the routing mostly minimizes those effects by avoiding large natural areas and mostly following commercial and institutional strips. I think the cultural and human benefits outweigh the negatives. It’s a new way to bind together downtown, older neighborhoods and new developments in a way that highway and roads simply cannot accomplish. I do look forward to seeing the benefits on such things as the underused strip mall on 85th and Broadway. But mostly I look forward to being able to park near the intersection (only a mile or so from my home) and having easy access to Downtown and Target Field. It will be a plus to my environment.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
138A	Christle	Terry	None provided	138	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Promise we won’t fight over a tunnel, just want and need our transit way done.....hope we get funding and stay on schedule! Good work to all involved, we look forward to the train!	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
140A	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	140	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I walked a ring around our woods from 27th Avenue North and the BN rail line to Golden Valley Road, then down the east side of the BN line to Highway 55, a 100+ acre expanse of wild life habitat your Draft EIS makes no reference about. I knocked only on the doors of properties abutting the BN line or abutting the wooded parkland that abuts the BN line (many of those owners have maintained private wild life habitat bordering park woods for decades) with some owners living directly across the street from park or BN wild life habitat. The owners on the front lines. Here are 96 of the 102 addresses I have collected so far. 4 of them are not on the front lines but I wasn’t telling anyone that they couldn’t sign a petition for no LRT in their woods. My biggest problem is people not answering doors. I have listened to many property owners and I can say with assurance that the true local preference is NO BUILD. A petition was attached as well. (This is the same correspondence as #27 sent to a different person)	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
141A	Deikman	Cathy	None provided	141	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I am writing to express my opposition to using the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad corridor for LRT. This alignment is a triple negative: 1) it does not serve urban transit needs	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
141B	Deikman	Cathy	None provided	141	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	2) it is a physical and sensory blight that will significantly and permanently degrade adjacent Theodore Wirth Park	Please see response to Comment 91B and MASTER RESPONSE #14.
141C	Deikman	Cathy	None provided	141	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	3) it ruins the potential urban greenspace of the rail corridor.	Please see response to Comment 91B.
144	Flower	Jane	None provided	144	Email		Same comments as Paul Flower, cosigned letter	
144A	Flower	Paul	None provided	144	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	We are residents of Golden Valley. We live near the proposed route for the Bottineau light rail line. We are opposed to the proposed route for the light rail for the following reasons.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
144B	Flower	Paul	None provided	144	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	While we are not opposed, per se, to the idea of improving mass transit, we believe this particular proposal to be a bad idea. The area of the proposed route in Golden Valley is in an undeveloped nature area, with wetlands, a forest, a peaceful walking trail, and abundant wildlife. It is used and enjoyed by many people who have purposefully chosen to purchase homes near such an area to live and raise their families. Such as areas is something to be valued and preserved in the midst of a major urban center.	Chapter 8 of the Final EIS and the Amended Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation address the effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on parkland. Theodore Wirth Regional Park, Sochacki Park: Sochacki Management Unit, and Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit were analyzed under Section 4(f). Please see also MASTER RESPONSES #14 and #15.
144C	Flower	Paul	None provided	144	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	This will all be greatly disturbed by the creation of additional rail lines and trains running every 7.5 minutes and continuing into the night. Besides the negative environmental impact, we believe that this proposal also needs to be looked at from the perspective of how will this particular route be of benefit to residents of Golden Valley. It does not run through a densely populated area, and it does not provide easy access for those who may wish to use the light rail. Rather, it goes through a nature area that will not provide much, if any, room for a stop or parking for a station. It would seem to make much more sense to run the line through a more populated area, such as along Penn Avenue, where many more people would be served by light rail. Rather, it goes through a nature area that will not provide much, if any, room for a stop or parking station. Such route would also serve North Memorial Hospital. Or, if the light rail is to serve Golden Valley, it should follow route near a major thoroughfare, such as Hwy 100 or 169. In short, we hope that this is not a “done deal”, and that the powers that be will look very closely at the negative aspects of the proposed route and will decide against proceeding with this plan.	Chapter 3 – Transportation of the Final EIS addresses ridership and connectivity of the Golden Valley Road and Plymouth Avenue stations by car, bus, and walk up. A park-and-ride would provide 100 parking spaces for users of the Golden Valley Road Station. Approximately 905 daily boardings would occur at the Golden Valley Road Station and 229 at the Plymouth Avenue Station. The evaluation of Alignments D1 and D2 (Penn Avenue) considered several environmental and social issues and impact areas. While each alternative has a number of benefits and impacts the surrounding area and residents, the social and environmental justice impacts associated with the displacement of many homes and disruption of community cohesion with Alignment D2 would be disproportionately adverse. With Alignment D1, the north Minneapolis community would not have the proposed BLRT Extension project stations on Penn Avenue; however, Metro Transit has been advancing the planning and design of an enhanced transit service for the Penn Avenue corridor. A network of arterial bus rapid transit (BRT) lines is planned for the Minneapolis–St. Paul area, including the C Line along Penn Avenue. BRT is an enhanced transit service providing 25–30 percent faster trips and an improved experience for transit riders. This new BRT line would provide enhanced transit for this community, as well as opportunities for economic development, without the significantly adverse impacts associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project.
145A	Heim	Erv	None provided	145	Email (to Jason Zimmerman)	5 – Environmental Effects	Jason, hope you had a good holiday. I would like to make you aware of the wildlife along Bassett Creek and the surrounding area along the LRT. This area has noted at least 21 different birds. From this group only one is protected by the new U.S. Migratory Bird Act of 2013. That would be the Pileated Woodpecker. We (the neighborhood) are concerned that with this bird since it is seen about 8 months the year and requires larger dead trees for its habitat.	Chapter 5 (Section 5.8) of the Final EIS describes the preferred habitats of rare, threatened, and endangered species in the proposed BLRT Extension project study area and the expected impacts to plants and animals and their habitat from the No-Build Alternative and the proposed BLRT Extension project. The analysis includes all federally listed endangered and threatened species that have been documented in the area. The pileated woodpecker is not specifically listed as a species of note documented in the proposed BLRT Extension project study area. With implementation of acceptable measures to minimize impacts, there would be no impacts from the proposed BLRT Extension project to species covered under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.
147A	Holm	Pamela	None provided	147	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	What is it about our green spaces that humans love to attack? Is it because of the lush greenness, the silence between birdsongs that makes some sadly afflicted humans think Hey! Let’s make noise! Let’s build! The less green space we have, even when it is a park, the more people want to “utilize” the space. Minimize everything green! Just	Concerning Sochacki Park: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #15. Section 5.8 of the Final EIS describes the preferred habitats of rare, threatened, and endangered species in the proposed BLRT Extension project study area and the expected impacts to plants and animals and their habitat from the No-Build Alternative and the proposed BLRT Extension project. The analysis includes all

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							another casualty of human progress. And so it goes for the poor Mary Hills Nature area and Walter Souchaki Park. Which, by the way, is the Bassett Creek Water Shed. Which is, of course, the Bassett Creek Watershed run off flood plain. Apparently your “Environmental Impact Studies” must be asleep at the wheel or even more sadly paid off by Target PAC because if one goes to the City Offices of Robbinsdale and Golden Valley, one can get the insurance environmental assessments of the area which state that this area is Flood Plain. This is also a marshland. So, how cynical and against the public interest does one have to be to infer that engineering wise, the costs of building on this will be significantly more than stated? Not to mention the environmental impact.	federally listed endangered and threatened species that have been documented in the area. Additionally, The Council reviewed the DNR NHIS Database, which provides information about Minnesota’s Special Concern and State Watchlist plants and animals, native plant communities, and other sensitive rare natural resource features. Species of State Special Concern and species on the State Watchlist have no specific legal protections under state endangered species law. Similarly, inventoried native plant communities have no specific legal protection. Floodplains are protected by local, state, and federal legislation because of their ecological value and functionality. Regulatory and permitting authority for floodplain impacts falls to the LGU, which is typically the municipality. WMOs also regulate floodplain impacts to waters within their jurisdictional authority. Table 5.2-1 in the Final EIS shows that there is a loss of 16,800 cubic yards of flood storage volume in Bassett Creek due to the construction of the alignment and station. The floodplain mitigation area between the main stem of Bassett Creek and the LRT and BNSF rail corridor (partially in Theodore Wirth Regional Park and partially on private property; initially identified in the Draft EIS) has been further refined. The mitigation would include excavating adjacent ground below the 100-year floodplain elevation to provide compensatory floodplain storage for the fill placed in the floodplain.
147B	Holm	Pamela	None provided	147	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	And so let us go now to the alternative route Penn Avenue which has sadly been forgotten. This is the corridor refused because Target didn’t want it’s precious employees subjugated to the poor and the black Americans as it trundled through North Minneapolis. As good Minnesotans, lets us state the real truth. It was going to go through “too slow” as I heard in one meeting. Yeah, that’s the reason. Shall we say RACISM. Let’s not let those dirty blacks contaminate our light rail line. We’ll just pay them off. And so to, sad to say, are the community activists cozy in the Penn and Plymouth intersection. Why should they be bothered while their constituents have to suffer? I’m sure that Target will give them money to “help the economically disadvantaged out”. As I have pointed out in several meetings, apparently people have not studied the world public transit ways or even examined Minneapolis’s own public bus line. There could be direct transit lines just like direct bus lines into Minneapolis from the suburbs to send people from Targets’ campus down their federally subsidized transit line to downtown. Never mind, that that over 35% of houses on Penn or landlord owned. Never mind that over 50% of people in North Minneapolis do not have a car. Who are we federally and statewide subsidizing? Target corporation. Great. Poor birds. Poor animals. I live in hope that the people who attempted/succeeded to get this through will, in the future, have their effigies pilloried and descendants live in shame.	The proposed BLRT Extension project meets the intended purpose and need for the project, to effectively address long-term regional transit mobility and local accessibility needs while providing efficient, travel-time competitive transit service that supports economic development goals and objectives of local, regional, and statewide plans. Chapter 1 of the Final EIS also describes the purpose and need for the project. In the Draft EIS, the evaluation of Alignments D1 and D2 (Penn Avenue) considered several environmental and social issues and impact areas. While each alternative has a number of benefits and impacts the surrounding area and residents, the social and environmental justice impacts associated with the displacement of many homes and disruption of community cohesion with Alignment D2 would be disproportionately adverse. With Alignment D1, the north Minneapolis community would not have the proposed BLRT Extension project stations on Penn Avenue; however, Metro Transit has been advancing the planning and design of an enhanced transit service for the Penn Avenue corridor. A network of arterial BRT lines is planned for the Minneapolis–St. Paul area, including the C Line along Penn Avenue. BRT is an enhanced transit service providing 25–30 percent faster trips and an improved experience for transit riders. This new BRT line would provide enhanced transit for this community, as well as opportunities for economic development, without the significantly adverse impacts associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project.
149A	Laundreaux	Rich	None provided	149	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	First, I understand what light rail can do for communities and future development within the city. Light rail is considered clean transportation. Benefits can be accounted for. However, what you have to understand is how it affects individual families. Fortunately for me, I bought my house and had a significant down payment. However with devaluation, etc., IF I were forced to sell, I would not come out. The proponents and agencies involved stated they would pay off mortgages where people are underwater. That’s all fine and dandy, but what about potential sweat equity people put into their homes? What about the fact that they’ll be forced to move and purchase new property? Do they have the money to put down on a new property? Will they have similar interest rate with what they are paying now? Those are all differences that must	Please see MASTER RESPONSES #7 and #10.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							be accounted for with these families. If they're not forced to move, they don't to worry about those circumstances.	
149B	Laundreaux	Rich	None provided	149	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	For me specifically, I will be having my first child in the next few weeks. At this time, I have no idea what light rails means for me and my growing family. Proponents say values will increase and that anybody would want to have my home. Really?? What's the guarantee? And if values decrease because of this, how do you make up for it? Thankfully, values are now rebounding and will continue to do so, but when this process plays out, the shit of this deal is that values will naturally continue to rebound and improve but yet "an appraisal" will be done now, prior to values naturally rebounding. This is a pile of dung as the entities involved will be forcing home owners to take "fair market" value based on the low point of valuations in the past 10 years or more. How can you say this is a "fair" deal?	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #7.
149C	Laundreaux	Rich	None provided	149	Email	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	<p>Next, my home was built with the intent of "normal" residency.....whatever that means. To me, it means normal traffic, normal neighbors, etc. Light rail isn't NORMAL. My home was not constructed with the intent of trains coming by every 10 minutes shaking and rattling my (our) home foundations. Unfortunately, I don't believe a value can be placed on what kind of damage all this vibration will do to homes, homes that weren't constructed with this in mind.</p> <p>The new library that is going in.....I'd be willing to bet they are specifically planning how to construct the foundation with the intent that light rail will be there. I'd also be willing to bet that there would a different plan in place to construct the library if light rail was in the plans. Thus, homeowners who will have land bought, are getting screwed again.....but most, including me, will have no idea how extensive this damage could be until it's too late. Who will be stuck with the damages and bills? More than likely, the unfortunate home owner is my guess.</p>	The vibration levels generated by LRT operations are several orders of magnitude below even the most stringent thresholds for damage to the most sensitive structures. Vibration is discussed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.7) of the Final EIS. No vibration impacts are anticipated in Brooklyn Park as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project.
149D	Laundreaux	Rich	None provided	149	Email	8 – Transportation System Effects	<p>Next, traffic. Light rail will be in my back yard. Traffic will be increased. What is going to be done to homeowners who have to tolerate this? Air traffic was diverted in Minneapolis and home owners were provided upgrades to help with the sound issue.</p> <p>Is that in the plans for us home owners? Its bad enough local cops speed up and down W. Broadway with sirens blaring! It's ridiculous and now adding this will be dreadful. As for traffic, how will be able to access streets? Will be have full right of way? My guess is no. Again, as a homeowner it's affecting me. I will have to change plans to get to work. This adds minutes to my commute. I say minutes which doesn't sound like much, but add it up! Time is money!!! Over time, I'm losing a lot of money possibly!</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are warranted for long-term impacts to roads and traffic because the identified avoidance measures would prevent any adverse impacts as a result of roadway modifications. As shown in Table 3.3-2 of the Final EIS, the proposed BLRT Extension project includes a variety of roadway modifications that would avoid new congested intersections, and, with one exception, the proposed BLRT Extension project would not worsen conditions at intersections that would be congested with the No-Build Alternative in 2040.</p> <p>Concerning noise impacts: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.</p>
149E	Laundreaux	Rich	None provided	149	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	How about the increase in random light rail travelers coming right through our back yard?	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.
149F	Laundreaux	Rich	None provided	149	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	What is the safety concerns that we need to worry about? What will BP or Hennepin County do to ensure our safety?	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.
149G	Laundreaux	Rich	None provided	149	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	As my children age, how will this affect my taxes? How will this affect schooling and commuting for my family?	Tax increases are affected by a variety of market conditions. Impacts of an LRT project on association dues and taxes are difficult to assess conclusively. The proposed BLRT Extension project meets the intended purpose and need for the project, to effectively address long-term regional transit mobility and local accessibility needs while providing efficient, travel-time competitive transit service that supports economic development goals and objectives of local, regional, and

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								statewide plans. Chapter 1 of the Final EIS also describes the purpose and need for the project. Section 4.6 of the Final EIS describes economic effects of the project to 2040.
149H	Laundreaux	Rich	None provided	149	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	General inconvenience...how about when the construction goes on? I will have to tolerate constant dust. Dust which gets into homes and makes for constant cleaning. Again, more dollars spent by me, the home owner! I've done a lot of work in my back yard...taking land is one thing but it may mean tearing up additional land to complete the road construction. What will become of my privacy fence and all my gardening plots? What will happen to my trees and bushes that I trim each year? What will the access from street to my backyard be? How much is safety taken into account?	Concerning construction dust: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #12. Concerning acquisitions and displacements: Please see response to Comment 94C and MASTER RESPONSE #10.
149I	Laundreaux	Rich	None provided	149	Email	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	As for taxation, the project says it won't cost us anything...hat they're hoping for federal funds...what do the idiots of these projects think???? Do you realize we all pay taxes so we're paying for it in some way!	A breakdown of funding sources is located in Table 10.1-2 of Chapter 10 – Financial Analysis of the Final EIS totaling \$1.496 billion. The Council is intending to seek CIG Program funding from FTA. The Council assumes that the region will secure 49 percent of the capital cost from FTA through the New Starts fund (through the CIG Program). FTA must evaluate and rate proposed projects seeking funding from the CIG Program under a set of project justification and local financial commitment criteria specified in law. The criteria evaluate the merits of the project and the project sponsor's ability to build and operate it as well as the existing transit system.
149J	Laundreaux	Rich	None provided	149	Email	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	For me, take the \$500 million or whatever that number is and invest it in our education system! That's where this money should go! For \$500m, how about simply busing people to the light rail hubs???? That seems much more cost effective.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #4.
149K	Laundreaux	Rich	None provided	149	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I could go on and on with concerns...many of which are just beginning with a growing family. Many concerns will present themselves as time goes on so there are a lot of unanswered questions.....a lot of questions that won't even be realized until later as the project unfolds..... I'd hope the council or whomever considers taking this project up through or by Fleet farm. Far less homes are affected... In closing, place yourself in the place of us homeowners. If you were us, how would you handle it? How would it affect you and your children? Just think about it.....	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
150A	Lehman	Karen	None provided	150	Email (to Jason Zimmerman)	5 – Environmental Effects	Given that my home is literally in in the wildlife corridor between Wirth Park and Golden Valley Road, I am concerned that this development maintain as much of the natural character of the habitat as possible, as well as the darkness and quiet that go with that. Happy to learn that the line will only be lighted at the stations. I am in favor of that. I heard that no matter what, the wildlife corridor between Wirth Park and Golden Valley Road is going to be divided because the line will be fenced on both sides. That is a sad development for the foxes and deer who roam that area freely.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #13.
150B	Lehman	Karen	None provided	150	Email (to Jason Zimmerman)	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	If there will be a barrier regardless, then I strongly support erecting a sound barrier wall, which could act as a visual barrier on the east side of the line below Zephyr Place and York. A sound barrier wall would blend in better visually with the natural environment for those living above it than just having a chain link fence with the trains whooshing by. For the engineering study, I would like them to assess how high such a wall would need to be, given that the affected houses are above grade and noise travels up. The ideal would be for the wall to be high enough that residents would not see the trains, and that sound would be greatly diminished. I would be happy to provide	Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit's noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Impacts were identified in the Draft EIS in this area. An additional noise measurement was conducted in this area for the Final EIS and the results of the assessment and mitigation recommendations are included in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS. Interior testing to determine the appropriate mitigation measure is recommended for certain homes between 16th Avenue North and Golden Valley Road in Golden Valley, near Zephyr Place and York. See Table 5.6-7 in the Final EIS for a summary of

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							access to my property if that is necessary to take sound measurements.	proposed mitigation measures by location.
150C	Lehman	Karen	None provided	150	Email (to Jason Zimmerman)	8 – Transportation System Effects	Want resident parking for Zephyr Place and York so that the quiet neighborly streets don't become parking lots.	Chapter 6 of the Final EIS addresses parking mitigation for indirect spillover parking in neighborhoods. The Council would coordinate with local jurisdictions to address the potential for spillover parking in neighborhoods adjacent to proposed LRT stations.
150D	Lehman	Karen	None provided	150	Email (to Jason Zimmerman)	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Strongly oppose any trail development below Zephyr Place and York on the east side of the line. Wirth Park has adequate biking and hiking trails.	The proposed BLRT Extension project does not include trail development near Zephyr Place and York. A trail is proposed connecting Theodore Wirth Regional Park and Sochacki Park that would be located on the west side of the rail corridor within park property. See the Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation (Chapter 8) of the Final EIS for additional information about this trail connection.
150E	Lehman	Karen	Golden Valley Residents	150	Email from Zimmerman	8 – Transportation System Effects	Lighting only at stations is a good thing.	Comment noted.
150F	Lehman	Karen	None provided	150	Email (to Jason Zimmerman)	5 – Environmental Effects	Concerned about visual impacts to Zephyr Place and York.	Please see response to Comment 91B.
153A	Peschong	Jennifer	None provided	153	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	The Bottineau Transit Way was voted on and approved for segment B to be the alternate route years ago. However those studies showed only 11 homes being removed from segment B in the final report as of March 2010 and the current DEIS in March 2014 shows only 8 houses of full acquisition all south of Brooklyn Blvd. In 2007, the county road 103 plan was just to add turn lanes and sidewalks, not the project has turned into removal of at least 28 homes, another 23 homes and a church are in jeopardy, and 17 homes and 2 business partial acquisitions will be needed, all due to running a median in road for LRT. What the former report and the current DEIS are missing is that segment B from Candlewood drive to east 93rd avenue is not included in the report due to a county road project already planned. From Bottineau representatives at the meetings I was told, they only needed to disclose the project is already planned and not any additional information. As a citizen of this state, I ask how can a report say for Bottineau Transitway only 11 homes being removed and Met Council approve the alternate route based on this information. The option A was except to take a similar number of homes, which does seem realistic since the train would go through a small residential area and then through gravel yards.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects. Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would not displace any residential properties. All property would be acquired in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117. The Council would pay fair market value for the property.
153B	Peschong	Jennifer	None provided	153	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Segment B's information is incorrect in all the documentation provided on the Bottineau Transitway studies. What good is it to issue a report and information for met council to vote on that does not include all the information pertain to all projects involved? Where is the transparency of the project? Where is the accountability for met council to gather all the information regarding light rail line? I feel that this project was intentionally left out so segment B would be approved since it showed minimal impact and comparable to segment A option to Maple Grove. IT almost seems like the way it has been handled could border the definition of fraudulent. Is this a unique or a recurring situation that the county road projects can hide the significant impacts of LRT and not fully disclosed other projects in LRT projects/studies, so they get approved? For example, when you compare two different vehicles, the Ford F150 and the Dodge 1500, estimates are the same with same features. You agree and sign a deal with Dodge. Then Dodge comes back later and	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							says well it stated on the sticker the base package the engineer is built by Joe Smith Company. Dodge now informs you the cost will be 3X the vehicle total but you already agreed and signed you were buying the Dodge. Then Dodge explains to the same customer that Dodge only builds the outside of the truck and the engineer is built by Joe Smith Company. Sorry it is two different projects but sorry we didn't have to disclose that information other than saying Joe Smith Company makes the engine. You need to go to Joe Smith Company and get the estimate for the engineer, sorry where have you been not attending the executive meetings with Dodge. In no other form of business would this be legal. This was example is basically what has happened to impacted neighborhoods.	
153C	Peschong	Jennifer	None provided	153	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	The residents of Brooklyn Park that are impacted just get answers like the Bottineau transit will have to answer that or Bottineau transitway representatives say the county represents need to answer. At May 21, 2014 meeting on the West Broadway Reconstruction, the question came up about funding and county representatives could not answer but handed off the question to the Bottineau transitway representatives. So the person explains how the Bottineau transitway is funded by that is incorrect for the County road 103 meeting which per county website is funded only by city and county. No one is accountable in this project to the impacted citizens, everyone either gives answers true to their project but not true to other parts of the project. The Bottineau transitway study, Hennepin County, and the City of Brooklyn Park should be ashamed at how this project has preceded without proper disclosure to the public. "I'm not saying that means we take homes, but I do think there are aspects of this project that are important," said Brooklyn Park Mayor Jeff Lunde on April meeting per Channel 12. However, the West Broadway Hennepin County website shows homeowner acquisition information for property owners in March. There seems to be so much confusion and wrong information given.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects. The EAW findings for the separate road reconstruction project may affect the Maplewood Estates townhomes. Since publication of the Draft EIS, modifications to the preliminary design have resulted in the avoidance of several anticipated property acquisitions and resulting displacements with the proposed BLRT Extension project. No residential property displacements would occur as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117.
153D	Peschong	Jennifer	None provided	153	Email	1 – Purpose and Need	I still do not understand how the project presented only can have this impact when walking down West Broadway. I wonder if more homes will be need to be taken from the project. I have concerns about noise, vibrations of the trains, safety for small children, special assessments to home owners, traffic lights (not being able to turn across tracks without signal light), how close house will be to the train, and what will be done for landscaping/barriers to improve the look of the area.	Concerning homes: Please see MASTER RESPONSES #10 and #21 and the response to Comment 94C. Concerning noise: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17. Concerning vibration: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #18. Concerning safety: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8. Concerning assessments to home owners: The Council does not assess home owners. Concerning traffic operations: Section 3.3 of the Final EIS analyzes the impact of restricted left turns across the tracks at locations other than signalized intersections. This "right-in/right-out" operation does not resulting in a degraded level of service along the street running portions of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Concerning visual: Please see response to Comment 91B.
153E	Peschong	Jennifer	None provided	153	Email	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	It needs to be looked into how LRT project and anything else the met council is involved in, are the projects being fully disclosed of the impacts and costs. Why is it just coming out on May 19, 2014 the number of properties impacted, when studies and etc. have been occurring since 2008 per the Bottineau transitway website? Reviewing the prior historical documentation of the Bottineau transit and the attendance to the meetings is very questionable. It seems the impacted people are not finding out they are impacted before everything is all ready for a final vote or already voted on. Policies and	Please see response to Comment 21C.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							procedures need to be reviewed. Decisions can still be made, the point is that everything is done secretive and deceptive.	
154A	Reiter	Chris	None provided	154	Email	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	It has become clear that this proposed (and now starting to be implemented) construction of this LRT line is motivated by money. Federal and State funds being dedicated to a fixed rail system this is unsuitable for police/EMS use and is uniquely vulnerable to attacks by potential terrorists. This project as proposed need to be chopped off at the ankles. It amounts to subsidized transportation and (in cases of non-daily riders who don't pay fares) free transportation. It is much easier for those who would prefer to ride for free to take light rail versus having to face a bus driver who may demand payment of a fare.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.
154B	Reiter	Chris	None provided	154	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I don't have the time to list all the reasons why this project is immoral, evil and just plain wrong. I saved for years to buy my house and now I'm facing being tossed out on the street for this fool's venture so a few people can grab their piece of the action, just like many others who face being unjustly displaced. Fortunately, in their smug arrogance, the people who rammed this through forgot a few vital details, which may likely lead to legal derail. The sad part is, I will funding both sides of this, as a Complainant and a Taxpayer.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1. Concerning acquisitions and displacements: Please see response to Comment 94C and MASTER RESPONSE #10.
155A	Rock	Amy	None provided	155	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Abandon the LPA in Mpls. Routing LRT through the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad corridor is extremely short term thinking. The corridor is an enormous asset as urban greenspace. Do not ruin it with LRT for which there can be only limited ridership in this location The County is not required by law to use this land for mechanized mass transit and should not proceed with this LPA.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
155B	Rock	Amy	None provided	155	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	Most importantly, LRT in this location will permanently degrade Theodore Wirth Park.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #14.
155C	Rock	Amy	None provided	155	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	The purported and projected benefit of LRT is not equal to the vast economic and public health losses of permanently degrading adjacent Mpls parkland. What would Theodore Wirth do? Honor the legacy that has made Minneapolis' parks number 1 in the nation. http://parkscore.tpl.org/rankings.php	Economic benefit to the region is not the sole purpose for the proposed BLRT Extension project and is not the equalizer for potential park impacts. The Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation (Chapter 8) of the Final EIS discusses impacts on park resources affected by the proposed BLRT Extension project and mitigation measures. Also, please see MASTER RESPONSE #14.
157A	Stein	Ben	None provided	157	Email	1 – Purpose and Need	Thank you for taking time to consider my comments. Three years ago, almost to the day, my family and I moved to Brooklyn Park from a north eastern suburb. Had we been aware of a plan to bring light rail down West Broadway, we would not have purchased the house we did. We have been blessed enough to be able to find and afford a good home in a cul-de-sac in a good neighborhood. At least two of our neighbors have lived here since the neighborhood was developed. Our house is now a home. Our neighbors are now are friends. Our children play together, we help each other with snow removal, yard and house projects and have grown stronger as a community. I understand the need for improving West Broadway. What I do not understand is need for light rail to run down the middle of West Broadway. I choose to live in the suburbs to avoid overly dense neighborhoods and the infrastructure that accompany it, such as trains.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
157B	Stein	Ben	None provided	157	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Light rail would bring disruption to our community, including sight, sound, vibration, safety concerns for our children and motorists on West Broadway, not to mention the impact to housing values for those of us who would be very close to the trains.	Concerning sight: Section 4.5 of the Final EIS addresses visual and aesthetics impacts associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project. Visual impact assessment was based on direct field observation from multiple vantage points, including from neighboring properties and roadways; evaluation of existing visual character; and

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								<p>review of proposed BLRT Extension project plans and features. Visual impact assessment was also based on photographic documentation of existing conditions for several key views of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Adverse effects to visual quality would occur in some areas, such as areas where recreational and residential uses are located along or in the vicinity of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. At locations where adverse visual effects are anticipated, project elements added to the rail corridor may be visually screened or softened using landscaping where adequate space permits, and the loss of existing vegetation on side slopes for grading or access purposes would be replaced to the extent feasible.</p> <p>Concerning sound: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17. No residual noise impacts requiring mitigation are anticipated along West Broadway Avenue.</p> <p>Concerning vibration: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #18. No vibration impacts are anticipated along West Broadway Avenue.</p> <p>Concerning safety: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.</p>
157C	Stein	Ben	None provided	157	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Please consider alternate routs for the train such as 83rd Ave N to Wyoming Ave N / Winnetka. Such a route would line the train for future expansion into Champlin.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
157D	Stein	Ben	None provided	157	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Please consider not only all the homes which would be razed to make room for light rail, but the adjacent properties that will be impacted. If the road is to be improved, please skip the median and the train, do not send our community down the tracks.	Please see response to Comment 94C and MASTER RESPONSE #10.
161A	Wall-Romana	Margaret	None provided	161	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	This letter is to voice my strong objection to the Preferred Alignment of the proposed Bottineau LRT through Golden Valley, as described in the Draft Environmental Impact Study.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
161B	Wall-Romana	Margaret	None provided	161	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	Hennepin County Commissioner Mike Opat has described the area through which the line would run as “an active freight rail corridor, not a pristine wildlife corridor”, which he described as strewn with litter and poorly maintained. This is a disingenuous characterization. He is referring to a lovely, peaceful, wildlife-filled wetland area upon whose trails people stroll, run, bike, bird watch and dose their souls with the balm of natural beauty – through which a freight train track currently happens to run. Is it “pristine”? No it is not. Is anything in our urban area “pristine”? Is it wonderfully quiet except for birdsong? A great deal of the time it is, in fact. Is it of value, and a special, irreplaceable natural resource for its neighbors, its city and the Twin Cities area? Yes! Should we who value it accept that it will be ravaged? No!	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #13.
161C	Wall-Romana	Margaret	None provided	161	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	I object to this disingenuous denigration of Sochacki Park and Mary Hills Nature Area in pursuit of the Bottineau Line.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #15.
161D	Wall-Romana	Margaret	None provided	161	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	What it will do is destroy a cherished nature area and the peace of neighbors along its path in order to allow several hundred trains a day to speed through the city, bypassing areas of greatest transit need, while serving the desires of other entities and communities.	The evaluation of Alignments D1 (part of the proposed BLRT Extension project) and D2 (located along Penn Avenue in north Minneapolis) considered several environmental and social issues and impact areas. While each alternative has a number of benefits and impacts the surrounding area and residents, the social and environmental justice impacts associated with the displacement of many homes and disruption of community cohesion with Alignment D2 would be disproportionately adverse. With Alignment D1, the north Minneapolis community would not have the proposed BLRT Extension project stations on Penn Avenue; however, Metro Transit has been advancing the planning and design of an enhanced transit service for the Penn Avenue corridor to serve the transit-dependent populations. A network of arterial BRT lines is planned for the Minneapolis–St. Paul area, including the C Line along Penn Avenue. BRT is an enhanced transit service providing 25–30 percent

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								faster trips and an improved experience for transit riders. This new BRT line would provide enhanced transit for this community, as well as opportunities for economic development, without the significantly adverse impacts associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project.
161E	Wall-Romana	Margaret	None provided	161	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	The Preferred Alternative will not serve the transit interests of Golden Valley – it is very badly placed for that.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
162	Heelan	Erin	West Broadway Business and Area Coalition (WBC)	162	Email	-	Not coded because just a summary of excerpts from DEIS.	Comments noted.
163A	Crawford	Freddy	None provided	163	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	In theory, I am personally very much in favor for mass transit in urban areas which I believe alleviates congested roads and drives down pollution.	Chapter 1 of the Final EIS summarizes the purpose and need for the project. Due to a continued increase in travel demand coupled with few highway capacity improvements planned for regional roadways in this area, congestion is expected to worsen by 2040. While transit investment is recognized regionally as one of the key strategies for managing congestion, transit would offer many other benefits to address the needs of proposed BLRT Extension project area residents and businesses.
163B	Crawford	Freddy	None provided	163	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	However, one area of the report particularly stands out as being contradictory and that is the decision that route D1 should take preference over route D2.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
163C	Crawford	Freddy	None provided	163	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	To build from Robbinsdale over the Walter Sochacki Park, through the Mary Hills Nature Area up to Golden Valley Road is a mistake based on these observations: 1. This is a floodplain. Building on floodplains is both notoriously difficult and expensive. In this area there are deep lakes, bogs and marshland which would require deep and costly drilling to find secure foundations for the track.	Floodplains are protected by local, state, and federal legislation because of their ecological value and functionality. Regulatory and permitting authority for floodplain impacts falls to the LGU, which is typically the municipality. WMOs also regulate floodplain impacts to waters within their jurisdictional authority. Table 5.2-1 in the Final EIS shows that there is a loss of 16,800 cubic yards of flood storage volume in Bassett Creek due to the construction of the alignment and station. The floodplain mitigation area between the main stem of Bassett Creek and the proposed BLRT Extension project and BNSF rail corridor (partially in Theodore Wirth Regional Park and partially on private property; initially identified in the Draft EIS) has been further refined. The mitigation would include excavating adjacent ground below the 100-year floodplain elevation to provide compensatory floodplain storage for the fill placed in the floodplain. Areas of poor soils complicate the design and construction phases of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Poor soils in the proposed BLRT Extension project study area could allow non-uniform settlement of built infrastructure if the soils are not adequately accommodated for in the design phase. The most concentrated area of poor soils is along the BNSF rail corridor between Olson Memorial Highway and 36th Avenue in Golden Valley and Robbinsdale. In order to address this concentrated area of poor soils, the Council has evaluated a range of mitigation alternatives from a relatively expensive conventional bridge structure spanning the poor soils to low-cost wick drains. Section 5.4 of the Final EIS discusses impacts to geology, soils, and topography.
163D	Crawford	Freddy	None provided	163	Email	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	To build from Robbinsdale over the Walter Sochacki Park, through the Mary Hills Nature Area up to Golden Valley Road is a mistake based on these observations: 2. Route D1 does not serve anybody. Route D1 runs through uninhabited wetlands. D2 runs through an urban area. Mass transit is built to serve and transport people. I agree that the uninhabited route D1 is a quicker option if you are trying to transport people from one end to the other, but if this is the case why not use busses? I note it would be easy to have 'fast trains' during peak periods along route D2 if speed from one end to the other is a major concern, but this has not been mentioned in the report. Route D1 appears to be a private line avoiding the urban areas, which	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							contradicts the reason for mass transit in the first place.	
163E	Crawford	Freddy	None provided	163	Email	4 – Social and Economic Effects	To build from Robbinsdale over the Walter Sochacki Park, through the Mary Hills Nature Area up to Golden Valley Road is a mistake based on these observations: 3. Neighborhood needs. Route D2 runs through a working class neighborhood. In other working class areas of Minneapolis where mass transit has been introduced, regeneration has been quick and has given a much needed boost to the economy of that area from property prices to flourishing local businesses. Building D1 through an uninhabited floodplain would offer none of these advantages and deprive a community of much needed growth. This appears to be an opportunity to do some good for a Minneapolis community and it is being squandered.	The PAC recommended Alignment D1 over Alignment D2 because Alignment D1 would result in significantly less property and neighborhood impacts, improved travel time, greater cost-effectiveness, and less disruption of roadway traffic operations. Discussion focused on the adverse impacts of Alignment D2 and that Alignment D1 better meets the project goals. The costs (impacts) of Alignment D2 for the people on Penn Avenue would outweigh the potential benefits.
163F	Crawford	Freddy	None provided	163	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	To build from Robbinsdale over the Walter Sochacki Park, through the Mary Hills Nature Area up to Golden Valley Road is a mistake based on these observations: 4. This area is full of wildlife. Walter Sochacki Park links into Theodore Worth Parkway and is a thoroughfare for deer and much other wildlife. When I walked the route I saw deer, coyote, turtles and raccoons including a doe giving birth to a fawn directly next to the current track. To have to build tunnels/bridges through the wetlands to accommodate these creatures' natural roaming patterns would be expensive.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #13.
163G	Crawford	Freddy	None provided	163	Email	5 – Environmental Effects	To build from Robbinsdale over the Walter Sochacki Park, through the Mary Hills Nature Area up to Golden Valley Road is a mistake based on these observations: 5. Minneapolis is famous for its parks. The reason many people choose Minneapolis over other urban areas is due to its metro-area parks. These should be protected at all costs and not destroyed.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #15.
163H	Crawford	Freddy	None provided	163	Email	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	To build from Robbinsdale over the Walter Sochacki Park, through the Mary Hills Nature Area up to Golden Valley Road is a mistake based on these observations: 6. Cost. Revenue is generated by the paying customer. Although the initial build costs of D1 may perhaps be less expensive, building a line through an uninhabited area will not generate any future income. D2 will immediately generate revenue from the onset.	Please see response to Comment 3B.
164A	Binder	Lois	None provided	164	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	The Bottineau Transitway will be a great boon to our area and city and state.	Please MASTER RESPONSE #2.
164B	Binder	Lois	None provided	164	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Every effort should be made to lessen noise impacts for the neighborhood.	Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit's noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS.
164C	Binder	Lois	None provided	164	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	I know it will alleviate the pollution factor from the thousands of cars that would otherwise drive through our area.	Comment noted.
164D	Binder	Lois	None provided	164	US Mail	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	Build the project fast and build it safe.	Section 4.7 of the Final EIS addresses safety and security. Safety for rail users, area residents, local pedestrians and bicyclists, project construction workers, operators and vehicle occupants is an important consideration for the project. The framework for ensuring the highest level of safety to these groups would be established through conformance with the project site safety and health plan, construction contingency plan, the Council's Safety and Security Management Plan and the Metro Transit Security and Emergency Preparedness plan. Project operations in conformance with

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								these plans would necessarily be closely and continuously coordinated with local area law enforcement, medical, fire, transportation and other organizations with related emergency responsibilities within the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. The proposed BLRT Extension project is anticipated to begin revenue service in 2021.
165A	Dalrymple	Pam	None provided	165	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Does not want trains going through the middle of a neighborhood.	The Council seeks to develop the proposed BLRT Extension project while avoiding the disruptions to neighborhoods as much as possible. The Council strives to avoid and minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas. However, for those impacts that are unavoidable, the Council has developed mitigation measures that comply with appropriate local, state, and federal regulations. Where displacements cannot be avoided, mitigation measures required by the Federal Uniform Relocation Act, as well as any other state (Minn. Stat. 117) and local policies would be followed. Chapter 4 (Section 4.2) of the Final EIS discusses community character and cohesion. Impacts associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project were not severe enough to affect overall community character and cohesion.
165B	Dalrymple	Pam	None provided	165	US Mail	8 – Transportation System Effects	West Broadway does not need to be redone to 2 lanes on the other side of 85th Avenue – since 610 exits have opened there is not the 13,000 cars indicated in the 2011 study.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #21.
165C	Dalrymple	Pam	None provided	165	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	There will be houses within 50 feet of the Light Rail. As far as I know the current and proposed Light Rails don't go through a neighborhood with houses 50 feet from the train.	The Council seeks to develop the proposed BLRT Extension project while avoiding the disruptions to neighborhoods as much as possible. The Council strives to avoid and minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas. However, for those impacts that are unavoidable, the Council has developed mitigation measures that comply with appropriate local, state, and federal regulations. Where displacements cannot be avoided, mitigation measures required by the Federal Uniform Relocation Act, as well as any other state (Minn. Stat. 117) and local policies would be followed. Chapter 4 (Section 4.2) of the Final EIS discusses community character and cohesion. Impacts associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project were not severe enough to affect overall community character and cohesion.
165D	Dalrymple	Pam	None provided	165	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	I don't want to replace my peace and quite at my home with train noise. I work downtown and know what noise the trains make.	Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit's noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS. No residual noise impacts requiring mitigation are anticipated along West Broadway Avenue.
166A	Lamker	Darlene	None provided	166	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	I live behind the preferred alternative less than one block away – I've walked the valley for over 19 years – 4/5 days a week – 6:00 AM. The only noise you hear are animals and wildlife – ex – owls and birds and deer.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
166B	Lamker	Darlene	None provided	166	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	Wetlands – you will ruin – the 9.4 to 10.2 – acres of wetland – mitigation with moderate and severe impacts will take the only nature center in Golden Valley.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #16.
166C	Lamker	Darlene	None provided	166	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	People in North Minneapolis want and need transit – D2 alignment would satisfy the reason for this train.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
166D	Lamker	Darlene	None provided	166	US Mail	1 – Purpose and Need	Our area is quiet with NO people who depend on transit. Only Target want our area for their employees.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17. The Council used its regional travel demand forecasting model to develop the transit ridership forecasts for the project. The proposed BLRT Extension project ridership modeling, as discussed in Section 3.1 of the Final EIS, is anticipated to be 27,000 riders per day.
166E	Lamker	Darlene	None provided	166	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	In Section 5.3 – all wetland areas with the potential area of disturbance were considered an impact.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #16.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
166F	Lamker	Darlene	None provided	166	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	The only reason the B-C-D1 is preferred is because A) the one small trail was in expensive. B) its the cheapest.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
166G	Lamker	Darlene	None provided	166	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	The Environmental Impact forgot to mention all the wildlife within the area – a few are – Deer, woodchucks, wood ducks, geese – Loons (sometimes) Owls, Canadian Geese -, Fox, coyotes – Raccoons.	Please see response to Comment 21C and MASTER RESPONSE #13.
166H	Lamker	Darlene	None provided	166	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	Hazardous risks for material contamination should be NO-WHERE!	Please see response to Comment 117AD.
166I	Lamker	Darlene	None provided	166	US Mail	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	This study is very limited and BIASED – I expected more from the Environmental experts.	Please see response to Comment 21C.
166J	Lamker	Darlene	None provided	166	US Mail	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	Please have the federal government use the money elsewhere – this is a nature center please don't ruin it. We have very few people even using the buses in this area. The district uses the area for environmental classes.	Your comment regarding the use of federal government funding is noted. See Chapter 8 – Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation of the Final EIS for impacts to proposed BLRT Extension project corridor parks.
166K	Lamker	Darlene	None provided	166	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	There is not noise at all except from animals – the train that goes thru twice a day is very quiet with no BELLS.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
167A	Lamker	Dean	None provided	167	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	We really need to do something for the environment and the future of our parks and wet-lands. Lets not just talk and have notes and money be a priority, but show that the environment is important by stopping the expansion of light-rail. This would show that we are serious about the future and put some real meaning in our words.	The Final EIS and Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation addresses the effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on parkland. Concerning wetlands: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #16.
168	Lundgren	Suzanne	None provided	168	US Mail		Same comments as Harriett Lerdal, co-signed letter	
168A	Lerdal	Harriett	None provided	168	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Eliminate B-C-D1 and consider D2 alignment.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
168B	Lerdal	Harriett	None provided	168	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	We have lived at this address for 38 years and bought here because of green space, wildlife (Deer, wild turkeys, quiet eagles, hawks, and a variety of migratory birds). Theodore Wirth Park, the drive, St. Margaret's Church with open green space, parks and adjoining trails were all the reason to live in this area. The above will all be affected if the LRT-D1 route follows the present RR right of way through Golden Valley under GV Road.	No direct or indirect impacts are anticipated for the community facilities along Alignment D1 in Golden Valley. An evaluation of noise, access, and changes in visual character determined that the transitway would not disrupt the function of these community facilities. See Section 4.2 of the Final EIS. The Final EIS and Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation (Chapter 8) addresses the effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on Theodore Wirth Regional Park (please see MASTER RESPONSE #14).
168C	Lerdal	Harriett	None provided	168	US Mail	8 – Transportation System Effects	The GV/Wirth Intersection is already busy during certain times of the day. Adding parking, taking away green space to accommodate LRT and placing a station here would only cause more problems (traffic, noise, crime).	Concerning traffic: The traffic operations analysis indicates that the Golden Valley Road/Theodore Wirth Parkway intersection would operate at a level of service E in 2040 with either the No-Build Alternative or the proposed BLRT Extension project. See Table 3.3-3 in the Final EIS. Concerning noise: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17. Concerning crime: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.
168D	Lerdal	Harriett	None provided	168	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	There has been a discussion to take out the fire station placing all of the area east of 100 in jeopardy.	Fire stations located within the proposed BLRT Extension project area are not anticipated to be impacted.
168E	Lerdal	Harriett	None provided	168	US Mail	8 – Transportation System Effects	The D1 route ridership is less than possibilities on D2, with D2 offering greater access to employment and housing.	Please see response to Comment 3B.
168F	Lerdal	Harriett	None provided	168	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	If I read correctly, 10.5 acres of wetlands would be affected with route D1. Filling in these areas will affect other areas that have not been addressed, not to mention the horticultural and wildlife impact.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #16.
168G	Lerdal	Harriett	None provided	168	US Mail	7 – Alternatives,	If light rail is appropriate for Washington Ave. through the U of M,	The PAC recommended Alignment D1 over Alignment D2 because Alignment D1

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
						Engineering and Design	why can't it run down Penn instead of through parks, wetlands, and green space? You will never be able to replace what you destroy – only to create other problems.	would result in significantly less property and neighborhood impacts, improved travel time, greater cost-effectiveness, and less disruption of roadway traffic operations. Discussion focused on the adverse impacts of Alignment D2 and that Alignment D1 better meets the project goals. The costs (impacts) of Alignment D2 for the people on Penn Avenue would outweigh the potential benefits. The Final EIS and Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation (Chapter 8) addresses the effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on Theodore Wirth Regional Park (please see response to Comment 92C). The Final EIS describes in detail several types of impacts to wetlands including direct impacts, indirect impacts, and potential cumulative effects and secondary impacts to wetlands. Section 5.3 of the Final EIS discusses the wetland impacts for both short- and long-term impacts as well as the avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures (please see response to Comment 168F).
168H	Lerdal	Harriett	None provided	168	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Therefore: Eliminate D1 and consider D2 where there will be potentially more ridership and fewer impacts to the environment.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
169A	Paulson	Linda	None provided	169	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	My back yard backs up against West Broadway. I've been told I'll probably lose "about 10 feet from that side of my yard due to this project." That will probably mean my fence will have to be removed as well as my lilac bushes and lilac tree will be removed. If that is the case then what I would like to see happen is: 1.) move my lilac tree to another location in my back yard 2.) Remove the hill completely leaving my yard as one level 3.) Install an 8-foot sound proof fence 4.) Remove the boulevard completely of grass eliminating my having to mow grass on the other side of the fence. Thank you for listening to me.	Please see response to Comment 94C.
170A	Spencer	Marta	None provided	170	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Random thoughts: I speak as someone who will never use the Transitway to go to work, due to motion sickness. Also – I can drive to work faster than the transitway will get me there.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
170B	Spencer	Marta	None provided	170	US Mail	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	I resent the fact that the word transitway was used instead of some for of railway city system. Transitway is a vague word. I thought it dealt with roads – not rail.	The term <i>transitway</i> is a route designed for use by public transportation, such as a busway or light rail line.
170C	Spencer	Marta	None provided	170	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Maplebrook Estates will be greatly impacted by all of the construction along with noise, detours, our east entrance will not allow us to travel north along Broadway. The new library will add traffic, and possible accidents. There will be longer wait times for us at 85th as we try to leave our complex.	During construction, the Council will require the contractor to maintain access to all properties and to comply with appropriate state and local requirements concerning the closing of roadways. The mitigation measures required by the city for roadway access and traffic control also apply. Permits will be acquired by project contractors from the appropriate city offices for roadway disruptions and blockages. In cases of roadway blockages, neighboring property owners/operators would be notified and provided with descriptions of alternative routes. Concerning traffic operations: Section 3.3 of the Final EIS analyzes the impact of restricted left turns across the tracks at locations other than signalized intersections. Moving from an undivided configuration that allows full access into and out of every driveway along the West Broadway Avenue corridor to a divided configuration is expected to increase traffic capacity, improve traffic operations, and lower the rate of incidents (crashes). Multiple studies have documented the capacity, mobility, and safety improvements that can be achieved with this type of roadway design. By directing traffic to designated median openings, the proposed West Broadway Avenue corridor design would allow businesses and other private driveways full access to one direction of travel, with right-in/right-out access.
170D	Spencer	Marta	None provided	170	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	I don't look forward to hearing the chime of the bells ringing at intersections as trains cross, nor the sound of the train honking, no	Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							feel the possible vibrations of the train passes.	criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit’s noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS. No residual noise impacts requiring mitigation are anticipated along West Broadway Avenue. Vibration impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures have been recommended. See Section 5.7 of the Final EIS. No vibration impacts are anticipated along West Broadway Avenue.
171A	Berg	Nils	None provided	171	Email from Zimmerman	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	He said it seems like the materials are month too late or this meeting is a month too early to be productive and it feels as though this whole venture has a quick shuffle.	Please see response to Comment 24A and MASTER RESPONSE #5.
171B	Berg	Nils	None provided	171	Email from Zimmerman	4 – Social and Economic Effects	He said he finds it interesting that the Bottineau preferred alternative was selected because the planners didn’t want to displace either 72 or 175 families in North Minneapolis both of which the LRT representatives have said. He said that’s a noble thought even if it is more than a tad disingenuous.	The PAC recommended Alignment D1 over Alignment D2 because Alignment D1 would result in significantly less property and neighborhood impacts, improved travel time, greater cost-effectiveness, and less disruption of roadway traffic operations. Discussion focused on the adverse impacts of Alignment D2 and that Alignment D1 better meets the project goals. The costs (impacts) of Alignment D2 for the people on Penn Avenue would outweigh the potential benefits.
171C	Berg	Nils	None provided	171	Email from Zimmerman	1 – Purpose and Need	In reality, the LRT is all about social engineering. It goes beyond social planning it is about telling people where they have to live. Retrofitting trains through valued neighborhoods is all about community disruption and displacement and to think of it as anything else is an exercise in deception and illusion.	Section 4.2 of the Final EIS summarizes effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on community character and community cohesiveness. No direct impacts are anticipated for the community facilities in the City of Golden Valley. An evaluation of noise, access, and changes in visual character determined that the proposed BLRT Extension project would not disrupt the function of these community facilities in the City of Golden Valley.
171D	Berg	Nils	None provided	171	Email from Zimmerman	5 – Environmental Effects	He said the DEIS document has an extensive section on water management and that’s a good thing. Water flow going in and out of Rice Lake is a major concern for those who live in the area. He said Robbinsdale plugged up the flow under the BNSF tracks a number of years ago and as a result they experienced significant flooding in both Mary Hills Park and in their back yards. The water flow was so strong that they could literally white water raft in their yards. When Robbinsdale put in the new drainage culverts the matter was resolved and to this day those who live south of that area remain interested in any water tampering that’s occurring upstream.	The proposed BLRT Extension project would run on a bridge over Grimes Pond. North Rice Pond would be largely unaffected, as the existing embankment upon which the BNSF rail corridor lies would not be altered.
171E	Berg	Nils	None provided	171	Email from Zimmerman	8 – Transportation System Effects	He asked what is in it for freight. Reports about train delays, accidents and oil movement seem to appear on a frequent basis in the Star Tribune. He said it makes him think that if he was Burlington Northern Rail and he had trains backed up he would be interested in gaining shipping capacity. If you won’t or can’t give that to them, why would they be interested in sitting across the table from them and if he was the Golden Valley City Council, he wouldn’t want to have to go back to his constituents and tell them that he had been successful in getting the railroad to bring longer, heavier and possibly oil laden trains through their neighborhood.	The Council continues discussions with BNSF Railway for the use/purchase of 50 feet of their right-of-way. To date, BNSF has not agreed to any participation in the cost of the proposed BLRT Extension project.
171F	Berg	Nils	None provided	171	Email from Zimmerman	5 – Environmental Effects	He said his real concern is that he sees nothing in the DEIS addressing the fact that Mary Hills Nature Center and Sohacki Park are both sitting on a landfill. The landfill area is the final resting place for old Highway 100. The various paths in the parks have concrete slabs that can readily be seen are the remnants of the old roadway. The thing of interest about that is much of Highway 100 was built as a post-depression Department of Public Works project in the 1930s. Back then, before people knew any better, asbestos was commonly used in many forms of construction including highways. Asbestos fibers	Please see response to Comment 117AD.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							<p>bonded to and strengthened the cement. It was not affected by temperature changes and helped provide protection from salt damage to the roadways. He said he doesn't know if there is actually any asbestos present in the concrete and from what he can tell neither does the DEIS document because it doesn't mention it. He said he does know that a variety of respiratory ailments can be directly traced to asbestos.</p> <p>According to the Mesothelioma website exposure over time can have dire consequences. An article he read states that an unbroken block of cement presents no danger, but any time it is cracked or broken, microscopic bits of asbestos are released. Once airborne they can be breathed in by an unsuspecting victim who discovers years later that the material has lodged in their respiratory system. The article states that people can still be exposed to asbestos if they come across broken chunks of cement that contain the hazardous material. He said he doesn't bring this up to instill fear but to encourage caution. He said light rail does not exist in its own little vacuum you need to look at the whole picture. The City Council does not live in a vacuum either and needs to be acutely aware of how moving heavy freight more deeply into Mary Hills could negatively impact the health and welfare of City residents</p>	
171G	Berg	Nils	None provided	171	Email from Zimmerman	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Anything that causes ground vibration could disturb materials that need to be kept dormant.	Vibration impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures have been recommended. See Section 5.7 of the Final EIS.
172A	Clausen	Joanie	None provided	172	Email from Zimmerman	5 – Environmental Effects	She received an email from a resident that she would like put on record. She has been told that there will be fencing around the Bottineau line and she is concerned that would make it hard for animals and residents to go back and forth. The residents in the area near St. Margaret Mary would not be able to use the nature area in the same manner. She is also concerned about noise and said a sound wall with natural trees and bushes would be best or a temporary sound wall should be installed until trees mature.	Strategically placed fencing would be necessary to minimize collisions between the train and pedestrians and animals. Wildlife crossings are mentioned in the Final EIS under Unavoidable Impacts and Mitigation for wildlife environments (Section 5.8.5.5): "Where effective and feasible, suitable wildlife crossings would be accommodated within proposed culverts to allow wildlife species to cross from one side of the LRT/freight rail tracks to the other." Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #13.
172B	Clausen	Joanie	None provided	172	Email from Zimmerman	4 – Social and Economic Effects	The residents in the area near St. Margaret Mary would not be able to use the nature area in the same manner (due to fencing).	<p>The proposed BLRT Extension project would be located within an existing active rail corridor. The construction of the proposed BLRT Extension project may result in temporary modifications to roadways and/or pedestrian or bicycle facilities that may result in changes to park access patterns.</p> <p>The informal (prohibited) crossings into Theodore Wirth Regional Park across the BNSF tracks at-grade will be fenced off during construction and permanently fenced off once the proposed BLRT Extension project is in operation. However, crossings at Golden Valley Road, Plymouth Avenue, and Olson Memorial Highway will be maintained permanently.</p>
172C	Clausen	Joanie	None provided	172	Email from Zimmerman	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	She is also concerned about noise and said a sound wall with natural trees and bushes would be best or a temporary sound wall should be installed until trees mature.	Trees and bushes (and any other foliage) are not effective noise barriers. Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit's noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS.
173A	Fahey	Sean	None provided	173	Email from Zimmerman	5 – Environmental Effects	The DEIS shows that Golden Valley is not going to get any open space or environmental benefit. If anything, there is going to be increased traffic and reduced air quality.	<p>Concerning traffic: The traffic operations analysis indicates that the Golden Valley Road/Theodore Wirth Parkway intersection would operate at a level of service E in 2040 with either the No-Build Alternative or the proposed BLRT Extension project. See Table 3.3-3 in the Final EIS.</p> <p>Concerning air quality: Chapter 5 (Section 5.10) of the Final EIS contains a full</p>

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								evaluation of air quality issues as they pertain to the existing conditions of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor and the projected future conditions with construction and operation of the proposed BLRT Extension project. The analysis presented in this Final EIS demonstrates that air pollutant concentrations during the operating phase of the proposed BLRT Extension project would not exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards; therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary. The State of Minnesota does not require permits related to air quality for projects of this type.
173B	Fahey	Sean	None provided	173	Email from Zimmerman	5 – Environmental Effects	He said there may be development opportunities but from an environmental standpoint that just means there will be environmental degradation and wetland filling according to chapters five and six in the DEIS. He said the City should try to fight for mitigations as much as possible and use municipal consent as a way to get mitigations needed for sound and light.	<p>Concerning wetlands – The Final EIS describes in detail several types of impacts to wetlands including direct impacts, indirect impacts, and potential cumulative effects and secondary impacts to wetlands. Section 5.3 of the Final EIS discusses the wetland impacts for both short and long-term impacts as well as the avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures. The proposed BLRT Extension project would require coordination and permitting from local, state, and federal water resource agencies. The Council coordinated with the Wetlands Technical Evaluation Panel regarding mitigation strategies prior to submitting the Water Conservation Act and Clean Water Act Section 404 permit applications. The Council’s analysis of preliminary mitigation strategies included establishing project-specific permittee-responsible mitigation sites and purchasing wetland mitigation bank credits. Based on this analysis, the Council determined that wetland impacts from the proposed BLRT extension project would be mitigated through a combination of on-site wetland mitigation and purchases of private wetland credits from existing mitigation banks in suitable major watersheds and Bank Service Areas.</p> <p>Concerning sound – Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit’s noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS.</p> <p>Concerning light – Chapter 4 (Section 4.5) of the Final EIS describes the process for determining visual impacts to natural areas. The visual impacts of the proposed BLRT Extension project were determined by evaluating the changes to existing visual resources that would occur as a result of project implementation, and assessing the anticipated viewer response to those changes. Visual impact assessment was based on direct field observation from multiple vantage points, including from neighboring properties and roadways; evaluation of existing visual character; and review of proposed BLRT Extension project plans and features. Visual impact assessment was also based on photographic documentation of existing conditions for several key views of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Adverse effects to visual quality would occur in some areas, such as areas where recreational and residential uses are located along or in the vicinity of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. At locations where adverse visual effects are anticipated, project elements added to the rail corridor may be visually screened or softened using landscaping where adequate space permits, and the loss of existing vegetation on side slopes for grading or access purposes would be replaced to the extent feasible. Several local plans address aesthetic and visual resources in the proposed BLRT Extension project area, and applicable policies include the establishment of design and landscape guidelines.</p>
173C	Fahey	Sean	None provided	173	Email from Zimmerman	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	He said the City shouldn’t be afraid to use municipal consent as a tool to make this project as beneficial as possible to Golden Valley.	Municipal consent is not a part of the NEPA process.
174A	Johnson	Edward	None provided	174	Email from Zimmerman	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	He is concerned about the comments that have been made so far. He hopes that this has not devolved into another situation currently being faced with the Southwest Corridor where the NIMBYs are definitely on the way to destroying that line. He would hate to see the	Comment noted.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							same thing happen to this line. This nation, whether we want to realize it or not, is running out of energy, cheap oil, gas and coal and we need to do all we can to develop electrified rail in this country and especially here in the Twin Cities where we are so far behind compared to other cities.	
174B	Johnson	Edward	None provided	174	Email from Zimmerman	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	He said he wants to make sure that this project is realized as a benefit both to the environment and to future generations.	Comment noted.
174C	Johnson	Edward	None provided	174	Email from Zimmerman	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	He said there will be some construction noise and he lived along the Hiawatha line while it was being built and he had no problem with living with the construction noise and he has found that the line itself have very little noise compared to the traffic on Hiawatha Avenue.	An assessment of the impacts of construction noise was included in the Draft EIS and has been included in more detail in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS. Construction noise levels are subject to local noise ordinances and noise rules administered by MPCA (Minnesota Rules, Chapter 7030). The primary means of mitigating noise from construction activities is to require the contractor to prepare a detailed Noise Control Plan. A noise control engineer or acoustician would work with the contractor to prepare a Noise Control Plan in conjunction with the contractor's specific equipment and methods of construction.
174D	Johnson	Edward	None provided	174	Email from Zimmerman	8 – Transportation System Effects	He said he hopes the line and stations will be retrofitted with restrooms for the aging population because that seems like something that has been missed in the plans.	According to the Council's <i>Station and Support Facility Design Guidelines User Guide</i> (February 2012), "...transitway stations generally should not include public restrooms unless the station is part of a multi-use building or a major transfer point requiring significant wait times. Where stations are located within, or they themselves qualify as, an assembly area according to the State Building Code, public restrooms may be provided. Evaluation criteria include the number of passengers, and the routine length of wait times of one hour or more." Since none of the stations included in the proposed BLRT Extension project meet these criteria, public restrooms would not be provided.
174E	Johnson	Edward	None provided	174	Email from Zimmerman	8 – Transportation System Effects	He also hopes there will be some connecting street car lines eventually to mitigate some of the bus and traffic noise. He said we've got to get serious about electrified rail in this country and if we don't progress with the federal money that will help, we won't get any and Minnesota doesn't get much federal money compared to what we put into Washington. This is one way of getting some of our money back.	Chapter 3 (Section 3.1) of the Final EIS discusses the transit conditions of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor and region. The proposed BLRT Extension project transit ridership forecasts reflect future development and planned and programmed transportation system investments. The 2040 regional travel demand model incorporates roadway system improvements identified in the fiscally constrained (current revenue) scenario of the Council's regional <i>TPP</i> adopted in January 2015. The alternatives analyzed in the travel demand forecast model include specific network modifications to existing transit service including changes in routing, frequency, and travel time. Network modifications are focused on providing an integrated "feeder" bus network to connect people to the proposed BLRT Extension project stations. Bus networks and transit plans would continue to be refined as the project progresses; final bus network changes would be subject to a robust public involvement process in accordance with Title VI requirements.
175A	Leach	Mary Ann	None provided	175	Email from Zimmerman	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	She absolutely cannot understand why usage isn't being maximized. She finds it very difficult to understand why the Bottineau line is not running through North Minneapolis for people who need the transportation the most. There is the most vacant land for parking lots all along Broadway which is one demolished building after another.	The AA/Draft EIS and Final EIS process examined numerous alignment options detailed in Chapter 3 of both documents. The Draft EIS disclosed similar ridership forecasts among the build alternatives ranging from 26,000 to 27,600 daily boardings. See Table 3.1-5 in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS for more information on ridership between alternatives considered. The proposed BLRT Extension project meets the purpose and need most efficiently and minimizes project impacts. The proposed BLRT Extension project anticipates approximately 27,000 daily boardings. See Chapter 3 (Section 3.1) of the Final EIS for more information on ridership.
175B	Leach	Mary Ann	None provided	175	Email from Zimmerman	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	She just fails to understand why we aren't taking all this federal money and maximizing the usage for the greatest benefit for the greater good and people who really need this.	Table 10.1-1 in Chapter 10 – Financial Analysis of the Final EIS outlines a breakdown of cost for the different project elements totaling \$1.496 billion. The Council is intending to seek CIG Program funding from FTA for one or more of the alternatives examined in the Final EIS. The Council assumes that the region will secure 49 percent of the capital cost from FTA through the New Starts fund (through the CIG Program). FTA must evaluate and rate proposed projects seeking funding from the CIG Program under a set of project justification and local financial commitment criteria

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								specified in law. The criteria evaluate the merits of the project and the project sponsor's ability to build and operate it as well as the existing transit system.
175C	Leach	Mary Ann	None provided	175	Email from Zimmerman	5 – Environmental Effects	She said she is also concerned about going through parkland which is such a precious and rare commodity. She said it is very hard to understand how plans have evolved to this point considering what the needs and objectives are.	The Final EIS and the Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation (Chapter 8) address the effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on parkland (see MASTER RESPONSES #14 and #15).
176A	Moudry	Father Paul	None provided	176	Email from Zimmerman	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Their concerns are noise and pollution. If a station is built across the street from their church and the tracks go along their western border the noise will be really incredible with 200 trains per day going by with bells ringing as the train comes and goes from the station.	Concerning noise: Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with FTA methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit's noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS. In the section between 16th Avenue North to Golden Valley Road only one moderate noise impact is anticipated and with mitigation there would be no residual noise impacts. Table 5.6-7 in the Final EIS for a summary of proposed mitigation measures by location. Concerning air quality: Chapter 5 (Section 5.10) of the Final EIS contains a full evaluation of air quality issues as they pertain to the existing conditions of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor and the projected future conditions with construction and operation of the proposed BLRT Extension project. The analysis presented in this Final EIS demonstrates that air pollutant concentrations during the operating phase of the proposed BLRT Extension project would not exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards; therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary. The State of Minnesota does not require permits related to air quality for projects of this type.
176B	Moudry	Father Paul	None provided	176	Email from Zimmerman	8 – Transportation System Effects	The lights that would go on at the station and potential parking areas would be detrimental to some of things that they do at their campus with the neighborhood as well.	Concerning visual: Chapter 4 (Section 4.5) of the Final EIS describes the process for determining visual impacts. The visual impacts of the proposed BLRT Extension project were determined by evaluating the changes to existing visual resources that would occur as a result of project implementation, and assessing the anticipated viewer response to those changes. At locations where adverse visual effects are anticipated, project elements added to the rail corridor may be visually screened or softened using landscaping where adequate space permits, and the loss of existing vegetation on side slopes for grading or access purposes would be replaced to the extent feasible. Several local plans address aesthetic and visual resources in the proposed BLRT Extension project area, and applicable policies include the establishment of design and landscape guidelines. Concerning parking: Section 3.3 estimates the impact of all park-and-ride locations on local traffic. Traffic operations in these areas are not anticipated to deteriorate to an unacceptable level of service.
176C	Moudry	Father Paul	None provided	176	Email from Zimmerman	5 – Environmental Effects	Another concern is the pollution. He knows the buses are scheduled to stop on Golden Valley Road which might be environmentally friendly, but all the automobiles coming to and from the station and park and ride with all their noise and exhaust would not.	Concerning pollution: Chapter 5 (Section 5.10) of the Final EIS contains a full evaluation of air quality issues as they pertain to the existing conditions of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor and the projected future conditions with construction and operation of the proposed BLRT Extension project. The analysis presented in this Final EIS demonstrates that air pollutant concentrations during the operating phase of the proposed BLRT Extension project would not exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards; therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary. The State of Minnesota does not require permits related to air quality for projects of this type.
176D	Moudry	Father Paul	None provided	176	Email from Zimmerman	4 – Social and Economic Effects	He said their campus looks quiet and melancholy but it's very active 12 months of the year and they have an elementary school on the property so there are a lot of safety concerns. He said strangers cannot go across the school property. There are currently a few who go to the bus stop, but this would really increase if there is any kind of a light rail station.	Section 4.7 of the Final EIS addresses safety and security. Safety for rail users, area residents, local pedestrians and bicyclists, project construction workers, operators and vehicle occupants is an important consideration for the project. The framework for ensuring the highest level of safety to these groups would be established through conformance with the project site safety and health plan, construction contingency plan, the Council's Safety and Security Management Plan and the Metro Transit

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								Security and Emergency Preparedness plan. Project operations in conformance with these plans would necessarily be closely and continuously coordinated with local area law enforcement, medical, fire, transportation and other organizations with related emergency responsibilities within the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor.
176E	Moudry	Father Paul	None provided	176	Email from Zimmerman	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	There have been offerings in some of the printed materials that their campus is one site being considered for a park and ride, they strongly oppose that. He wants to make it clear to everybody that their campus isn't for sale, their parish isn't dying, it is growing and that the parish owns the property, not the arch diocese. So noise, light and air pollution are some of their greatest concerns.	As design for the proposed BLRT Extension project has progress, an approximate 100 space park-and-ride at the Golden Valley Road Station has been developed. It is not on the church campus or property.
176F	Moudry	Father Paul	None provided	176	Email from Zimmerman	4 – Social and Economic Effects	And the traffic going to and from their parish with lots of senior citizens is confusing for them now, it will be even worse with added traffic.	Concerning additional traffic: The traffic operations analysis indicates that the Golden Valley Road/Theodore Wirth Parkway intersection would operate at a level of service E in 2040 with either the No-Build Alternative or the proposed BLRT Extension project. See Table 3.3-3 in the Final EIS.
177A	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	177	Email from Zimmerman	5 – Environmental Effects	The Draft EIS is legally inadequate in a number of ways. It doesn't analyze whether Mary Hills and Sochacki are being constructively used by the project within the meaning of Section 4F of the Federal Transportation Act when noise and vibration and defoliation and deforestation impacts essentially rob parks of their essence, that is a use, and a whole lot of things follow from that in terms of what needs to occur next if the parks are being used. Yet, the draft EIS is silent as to these two parks and that part of the required analysis. The same is true with respect to temporary occupancy. She said the DEIS recites in chapter four that the project is consistent with Comprehensive Plan of Golden Valley and Robbinsdale, but it doesn't mention the park sections of those plans. Chapter six in Golden Valley's plan says Mary Hills is a natural preserve for visual aesthetics and buffering, for walking and for passive recreational uses. Those appear to be inconsistent with shooting 82 decibels of linear noise down the tracks every 7 minutes, but you wouldn't even know that because that analysis is not provided, the facts are not there on which to base a decision.	Please see response to Comment 117AJ. The Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation (Chapter 8) of the Final EIS use determinations for Sochacki Park: Mary Hills Management Unit and Sochacki Park: Sochacki Management Unit are both temporary occupancy during construction. Each management unit would be restored to pre-construction or better conditions (see MASTER RESPONSES #14 and #15).
177B	Thorsen	Madge	None provided	177	Email from Zimmerman	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	If the costs are understated they can't be compared to the D2 or any other alignment and the comparison of options are deprived which is a core flaw in the analysis of the EIS document. So Golden Valley as stewards of public land really needs to make some serious comments about this draft EIS.	The project cost estimates for each of the alternatives considered as reported in the Draft EIS were developed with the same underlying assumptions for each project element. The cost estimates represent an "apples-to-apples" comparison of the alternatives based upon approximately 1-percent engineering. A revised project scope and cost estimate was approved by the Council on December 9, 2015, for the proposed BLRT Extension project in the Final EIS at a level of approximately 15 percent engineering. The revised project scope and cost estimate includes potential property acquisitions that are necessary to construct the proposed BLRT Extension project. Table 10.1-1 in Chapter 10 – Financial Analysis of the Final EIS outlines a breakdown of cost for the different project elements totaling \$1.496 billion.
178A	Thorsen	Brad	None provided	178	Email from Zimmerman	5 – Environmental Effects	He needs to see some renderings of what this is going to look like. If you look at the environmental impacts in the DEIS they are moving the rail line, they are adding two other lines, they are putting up a sound barrier or possible fence, he has no idea what this will look like. He said some renderings have been done for the station in the Wirth area but there is nothing at all for the public to see as to what sort of impact that will have and how it will change the way the park can be used.	Project renderings are available to the public at public events or through individual requests. Aesthetics of noise barriers coincide with more advanced levels of design that occurs after the publishing of the Final EIS. The Final EIS (Section 4.5) includes several visualizations depicting what the proposed BLRT Extension project would look like from several points of view. Some methods may be feasible to lessen potential visual impacts, such as with strategic plantings. The Council will continue to coordinate with cities and other stakeholders as design advances, including landscaping in areas that are disturbed by the project.
179	Comment #179 was deleted. It was documented twice and is a repeat of #191.							

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
180	Comment #180 was deleted. It was documented twice and is a repeat of #190.							
182A	Dalrymple	Gwyn	None provided	182	US Mail	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I have lived in Maplebrook Estates for 13 years. I am a single mom, my son is 15 years old. I have always worked full time with no outside financial assistance help, except from family when needed. I have put a lot of money into this house just for up keep and expected to get some money out of it. My house is very close to West Broadway. As far as I can tell- the four or five units in front of me will be gone, which seems to me that I will be way too close to the light rail. NOT HAPPY about that at all. A lot of residents will be affected in many ways, not just the people that will be displaced. What about my property value?	The Council seeks to develop the proposed BLRT Extension project while avoiding the disruptions to neighborhoods as much as possible. The Council strives to avoid and minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas. However, for those impacts that are unavoidable, the Council has developed mitigation measures that comply with appropriate local, state, and federal regulations. Section 4.3 of the Final EIS reports there would be no residential displacements. Where business displacements cannot be avoided, mitigation measures required by the Federal Uniform Relocation Act, as well as any other state (Minn. Stat. 117) and local policies will be followed. Concerning property value: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #7.
182B	Dalrymple	Gwyn	None provided	182	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	What about the noise? This is a RESIDENTIAL AREA – what are you thinking ?!?!	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
182C	Dalrymple	Gwyn	None provided	182	US Mail	8 – Transportation System Effects	I have no problem with fixing up West Broadway but the light rail is taking it to far. Please remember we all have a story – we are families. Times are tough already and this will not help some of our lives get better. Just worse!	Please see response to Comment 67L.
183A	Heim	Carmen	None provided	183	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I support LRT that is in area of redevelopment, or existing roadways. Look how ugly university avenue is now. Mirror that in a concrete redev area that needs life.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
183B	Heim	Carmen	None provided	183	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	Unbelievable our GV council let this be explored for years and dollars. It's a CURSE ON GRACE" to do this to our parks in this city.	The Final EIS and Amended Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation (Chapter 8) address the effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on proposed BLRT Extension project corridor parks (also please see MASTER RESPONSES #14 and #15).
183C	Heim	Carmen	None provided	183	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	No more noise disruption. I live in flourishing parks and wetlands. We live on Bassett Creek. We play outdoors. So maybe you are responsible for decreasing our God Given soulful serene life.	Please see MASTER RESPONSES #14, #15, #16, and #17. The proposed BLRT Extension project would not result in residential noise impacts in the area of Bassett Creek.
183D	Heim	Carmen	None provided	183	US Mail	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	No D1. Low ridership for cheapest fastest route in the Grand Rounds National Scenic area. Scandal is what the EI of years of construction.	Please see response to Comment 3B.
184A	Heim	Ervin	None provided	184	US Mail	8 – Transportation System Effects	Upon review and pending process, the D1 line through Golden Valley is not well served. It does not serve the residents through walking – limited parking presently the local residents use the bus service find minimal riders, even at peak hours. This may be due to the fact that most GV residents have at least one car.	The proposed BLRT Extension project would serve approximately 368 walk up riders per day out of the 905 total riders per day at the Golden Valley Road Station. Chapter 3 (Section 3.1) of the Final EIS provides information about ridership by station and by mode of arrival at the station.
184B	Heim	Ervin	None provided	184	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	We would be better served with a review of the bus service. It can move through neighborhoods. Current blogs about the green line talk about having to travel further to get to the LRT since bus routes will be delayed.	The proposed BLRT Extension project would improve the transportation system by providing the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor with more travel choices and faster travel times between residential areas, major destinations, and employment centers.
184C	Heim	Ervin	None provided	184	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	But the major fact is the east edge of Golden Valley is a rural setting near a major downtown city with wild life not seen or equal in any part of the country, with the LRT this will be lost.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #13.
184D	Heim	Ervin	None provided	184	US Mail	1 – Purpose and Need	We do not need the LRT as north Minneapolis residents stated – add more buses or that type of transportation.	The proposed bus network would be refined with input from the public prior to the proposed BLRT Extension project's opening day. Additionally, planning for the C Line, Bus Rapid Transit along Penn Avenue began in 2013.
185A	Jordan	Pat	None provided	185	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	I am concerned about losing the animals and park of Theodore Wirth.	Please see MASTER RESPONSES #13. The Final EIS and the Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation (Chapter 8) address the effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on parklands and recreational properties (please see MASTER RESPONSES #14 and #15).
185B	Jordan	Pat	None provided	185	US Mail	8 –	I am concerned that other people from Golden Valley will not use the	Please see response to Comment 3B.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
						Transportation System Effects	trains like North Minneapolis would.	
185C	Jordan	Pat	None provided	185	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	I am concerned that the flood plain by the tracks will pose problems.	Section 5.2 of the Final EIS discusses floodplains, which are protected by local, state, and federal legislation because of their ecological value and functionality. Regulatory and permitting authority for floodplain impacts falls to the LGU, which is typically the municipality. WMOs also regulate floodplain impacts to waters within their jurisdictional authority. The mitigation would include excavating adjacent ground below the 100-year floodplain elevation to provide compensatory floodplain storage for the fill placed in the floodplain.
185D	Jordan	Pat	None provided	185	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	I am concerned that the dumped debris from old Hwy 100 will be a hazardous mess when they have to dig it out.	Please see response to Comment 117AD.
185E	Jordan	Pat	None provided	185	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	I am concerned about the way it will damage the park along the tracks.	The Final EIS and the Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation (Chapter 8) address the effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on parklands and recreational properties (please see MASTER RESPONSES #14 and #15).
185F	Jordan	Pat	None provided	185	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	I am concerned about the noise from the trains.	Please see MASTER RESPONSES #17.
185G	Jordan	Pat	None provided	185	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	I am concerned about pollution from trains.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #11.
187A	Steinberg	Dan	None provided	187	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	Table 5.1-3 Sanitary/MCES Interceptor Sewers is missing Kewanee Way.	It does not appear that there is a Metropolitan Council Environmental Services sewer line at Kewanee Way based on review of utility plans in that area. There is a city of Minneapolis water line in the area that is noted in Section 5.1 – Utilities of the Final EIS.
187B	Steinberg	Dan	None provided	187	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Figure 5.7-3 Noise/Vibration Measurement Locations and Table 5.7-6 Ground-Borne Vibration Propagation Measurement Location do not show Bonnie Lane.	The Final EIS impact assessment includes Bonnie Lane; however, no vibration impacts have been identified for that location. Vibration is discussed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.7) of the Final EIS.
187C	Steinberg	Dan	None provided	187	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	Table 8.3-2 Historic Properties Evaluated for Section 4(f) Use does not include St. Margret.	The St. Margaret Mary Church and School campus has been determined not eligible for listing in the NRHP due to a lack of historical significance. The St. Margaret Mary Church and School campus is a good example of a large post-World War II suburban church complex. However, the church does not appear to have played any significant role in the development of Golden Valley or the Catholic Church, rather its development merely reflects a broader national trend of growth post-World War II. Also, it does not appear to be either a notable or an outstanding example of this type of complex. Therefore, the campus does not have significance under NRHP Criterion A. Additionally, architecturally, the church does not embody the characteristics of Mid-Century Modern ecclesiastical architecture and so does not have significance under NRHP Criterion C. St. Margaret Mary Church and School campus are not protected by Section 4(f) because they are not eligible for listing on the NRHP.
187D	Steinberg	Dan	None provided	187	US Mail	5 – Environmental Effects	Figure 5.5-1 Known Private Wells within Potential Area of Disturbance – no mention of hazardous materials.	Figure 5.5-1 in the Draft EIS does show the location of High to Low Contamination Risk sites along the proposed alignment corridors.
187E	Steinberg	Dan	None provided	187	US Mail	8 – Transportation System Effects	Need more information on proposed bus route changes.	Additional transit system enhancements, including changes in feeder bus routes and increased service frequencies, would be reviewed as design continues. Network modifications are focused on providing an integrated “feeder” bus network to connect people to the proposed BLRT Extension project stations. Bus networks and transit plans would continue to be refined as the project progresses; final bus network changes would be subject to a robust public involvement process in accordance with Title VI requirements. Additional information can be found in Section 3.1 of the Final EIS.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
187F	Steinberg	Dan	None provided	187	US Mail	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Figure 5.7-3 Noise/Vibration Measurement Locations and Table 5.6-3 Summary of Existing Ambient Noise Measurement Results do not show Bonnie Lane and Kewanee Way.	An additional noise measurement was conducted as a part of the Final EIS on Bonnie Lane. Chapter 5 (Section 5.6) of the Final EIS impact assessment includes Bonnie Lane and Kewanee Way.
187G	Steinberg	Dan	None provided	187	US Mail	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Study a tunnel section along D1 from Golden Valley Road to Abbot Road on the other side of North Memorial Hospital then cross the line up to back on C alignment	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #20.
189A	Comment #189 was deleted. It was documented twice and is a repeat of #20.							
190A	Wall-Romana	Margaret	None provided	190	Email from Zimmerman	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	She is concerned about the noise that will come with this project and how it will impact the D1 neighborhood.	Section 4.2 of the Final EIS summarizes effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on community character and community cohesiveness. No direct impacts are anticipated for the community facilities in the City of Golden Valley. An evaluation of noise, access, and changes in visual character determined that the proposed BLRT Extension project would not disrupt the function of these community facilities in the City of Golden Valley.
190B	Wall-Romana	Margaret	None provided	190	Email from Zimmerman	4 – Social and Economic Effects	She said a deeply felt imperative and core pleasure of every Minnesotan is to be outdoors as much as possible once winter is gone. A lot of recreational activities take place not necessarily at parks, but at home in front and back yards and on porches, stoops and balconies. Soaking up the warmth of family and friends, drinking, grilling, throwing a ball, watching the kids run through the sprinkler, chasing the dog, gardening, and taking a nap in the sun are the kinds of things we live to do in the warm weather months after suffering through our long winters, everybody knows this.	Please see response to Comment 190A.
190C	Wall-Romana	Margaret	None provided	190	Email from Zimmerman	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	The DEIS includes a noise reading for her neighborhood that characterizes the ambient noise as rural ambient, that’s how quiet their neighborhood is, it’s unbelievable, and it’s into this peaceful environment that the LRT will charge, effectively destroying people’s ability to enjoy the use of their outdoor spaces in the way that they expect to be able to do. This will radically change people’s lives not only temporarily with the construction activities, for how many years she hasn’t been able to find out, but permanently with constant noise interruptions day in and day out. Some of her worst impacted neighbors will basically only be able to enjoy their homes when they are asleep, if they can stay asleep, which is a very wrong thing. She said she was flabbergasted to learn that in Golden Valley construction noise will be allowed 365 days a year between the hours of 7 am and 10 pm. This is an outrage and it must be corrected. Right now she asks that the City Council or the powers that be swiftly amend the City’s noise ordinance to bring it in line with that of Minneapolis. It’s ironic that Minneapolis, the big noisy, bustling city recognizes that its citizens need, and have the right to have, quiet after 6 pm while Golden Valley, whose quiet is one of its main treasures does not, and in fact has given it away and for what? It’s admirable to be a cooperative regional neighbor, but not when the well-being and property rights of your own citizens are thrown under the train.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17. An assessment of the impacts of construction noise was included in the Draft EIS and has been included in more detail in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS. Construction noise levels are subject to local noise ordinances and noise rules administered by MPCA (Minnesota Rules, Chapter 7030). The primary means of mitigating noise from construction activities is to require the contractor to prepare a detailed Noise Control Plan. A noise control engineer or acoustician would work with the contractor to prepare a Noise Control Plan in conjunction with the contractor’s specific equipment and methods of construction.
191A	Wall-Romana	Christophe	None provided	191	Email from Zimmerman	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	He is a daily bus user and is strongly against the Bottineau LRT proposed alignment.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
191B	Wall-Romana	Christophe	None provided	191	Email from Zimmerman	4 – Social and Economic Effects	He said the DEIS asks Golden Valley to sacrifice its environmental and recreational assets for an LRT project that will benefit the City very little and will serve mostly other communities further north. He said	The proposed BLRT Extension project would improve the transportation system by providing the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor with more travel choices and faster travel times between residential areas, major destinations, and employment

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							only 2.5% of the population will use the LRT and will meanwhile damage forever the peace and quality of life of all.	centers.
191C	Wall-Romana	Christophe	None provided	191	Email from Zimmerman	5 – Environmental Effects	It will also affect the beauty of two parks as well as Theodore Wirth which thousands of people from Golden Valley use. He said the project is expedient rather than respectful of people’s lives.	Please see response to Comment 91B.
191D	Wall-Romana	Christophe	None provided	191	Email from Zimmerman	4 – Social and Economic Effects	He said the LRT alignment completely bypasses North Minneapolis which is a big problem because they are the densest users of mass transit, with the lowest income and lowest car ownership in all of the Twin Cities area.	The evaluation of Alignments D1 and D2 considered several environmental and social issues and impact areas. While each alternative has a number of benefits and impacts the surrounding area and residents, the social and environmental justice impacts associated with the displacement of many homes and disruption of community cohesion with Alignment D2 would be disproportionately adverse. With Alignment D1, the north Minneapolis community would not have the proposed BLRT Extension project stations on Penn Avenue; however, Metro Transit has been advancing the planning and design of an enhanced transit service for the Penn Avenue corridor to serve the transit-dependent residents in this area. A network of arterial BRT lines is planned for the Minneapolis–St. Paul area, including the C Line along Penn Avenue. BRT is an enhanced transit service providing 25–30 percent faster trips and an improved experience for transit riders. This new BRT line would provide enhanced transit for this community, as well as opportunities for economic development, without the significantly adverse impacts associated with the proposed BLRT Extension project.
191E	Wall-Romana	Christophe	None provided	191	Email from Zimmerman	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	He said the D2 option along Penn Avenue is the only other given option which the DEIS invalidates in the name of environmental justice, rightly so and D2 is a bad alignment, but other alignments should be considered. Time and money should not pressure the City into accepting a flawed alignment.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
191F	Wall-Romana	Christophe	None provided	191	Email from Zimmerman	5 – Environmental Effects	He asked the Commissioners to preserve the natural environment in the City’s recreational facilities and more importantly preserve the right of all present and future Golden Valley residents to enjoy these fragile resources by keeping the precious wetlands and beautiful landscape intact.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #16.



Appendix G

Response to Draft EIS Comments

5 Index of Comments and Response to Comments – General Public Verbal Testimony



This page intentionally left blank



General Public Verbal Testimony Comments and Responses Index – Golden Valley Hearing

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Adair	Richard	12A
Adair	Richard	12B
Adair	Richard	12C
Bonniwell	Constance	6A
Bonniwell	Constance	6B
Bonniwell	Constance	6C
Bonniwell	Constance	6D
Bonniwell	Constance	6E
Bonniwell	Constance	6F
Bonniwell	Constance	6G
Coifman	Vicki	11A
Coifman	Vicki	11B
Fahey	Sean	7A
Fahey	Sean	7B
Fahey	Sean	7C
Lamker	Darlene	9A
Lamker	Darlene	9B
Lamker	Darlene	9C
Lamker	Darlene	9D
Lamker	Darlene	9E
Lamker	Darlene	9F
Lehman	Karen	13A
Lehman	Karen	13B
Lehman	Karen	13C
Lehman	Karen	13D
Lehman	Karen	13E
Lehman	Karen	13F
Linder	Bill	16A
Linder	Bill	16B
Linder	Bill	16C
Linder	Bill	16D
McMahon	Kasia	10A
McMahon	Kasia	10B
McMahon	Kasia	10C
McMahon	Kasia	10D
Milstein	Bernie	14A



General Public Verbal Testimony Comments and Responses Index – Golden Valley Hearing

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Milstein	Bernie	14B
Milstein	Bernie	14C
Milstein	Bernie	14D
Milstein	Bernie	14E
Milstein	Bernie	14F
Milstein	Bernie	14G
Rosenquist	Gillian	15A
Rosenquist	Gillian	15B
Rosenquist	Gillian	15C
Steinberg	Dan	18A
Steinberg	Dan	18B
Steinberg	Dan	18C
Wall-Romana	Margaret	17A
Wall-Romana	Margaret	17B
Wall-Romana	Margaret	17D
Wildung	Cathy	8A
Wildung	Cathy	8B
Wildung	Cathy	8C
Wildung	Cathy	8D

General Public Verbal Testimony Comments and Responses Index – Minneapolis Hearing

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Adams	Curtis	39A
Bakion	Candy	41A
El-Amin	Arlene	30A
El-Amin	Arlene	30B
Gallant	Linda	33A
Gallant	Linda	33B
Gallant	Linda	33C
Gallant	Linda	33D
Greene	David	37A
Lipke-Pier	Alyssa	40A
Lipke-Pier	Alyssa	40B



General Public Verbal Testimony Comments and Responses Index – Minneapolis Hearing

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Moore	Vicki	29A
Moore	Vicki	29B
Moore	Vicki	29C
Shabazz	Aasim	35A
Shabazz	Aasim	35B
Shabazz	Aasim	35C
Shabazz	Aasim	35D
Smithrud	Roger	34A
Smithrud	Roger	34B
Ware	Lenora	38A
Ware	Lenora	38B
Ware	Lenora	38C
Wynne	Elaine	31A
Wynne	Elaine	31B
Wynne	Elaine	31C
Wynne	Elaine	31D
Wynne	Elaine	31E
Wynne	Elaine	31F
Yaeger	Natalie	36A
Yaeger	Natalie	36B

General Public Verbal Testimony Comments and Responses Index – Brooklyn Park Hearing

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Althouse	Randy	50A
Berne	Chris	55A
Berne	Chris	55B
Berne	Chris	55C
Berne	Chris	55D
Berne	Chris	55E
Berne	Chris	55F



General Public Verbal Testimony Comments and Responses Index – Brooklyn Park Hearing

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Berne	Chris	55G
Couture	Daniel	56A
Couture	Daniel	56B
Couture	Daniel	56C
Couture	Daniel	56D
Couture	Daniel	56E
Ensrud	Lana	51A
Ensrud	Lana	51B
Ensrud	Lana	51C
Ensrud	Lana	51D
Ensrud	Lana	51E
Ensrud	Lana	51F
Ensrud	Lana	51G
Greenman	Scott	59A
Greenman	Scott	59B
Greenman	Scott	59C
Greenman	Scott	59D
Hanson	Thomas Alfred	57A
Hanson	Thomas Alfred	57B
Hanson	Thomas Alfred	57C
Hanson	Thomas Alfred	57D
Jones	Steve	60A
Kidd	Jean	58A
Kidd	Jean	58B
Kidd	Jean	58C
Kroll	George	62A
Kroll	George	62B
Kuehn	Harry	61A
Lokken	Barbara	49A
Lokken	Barbara	49B



General Public Verbal Testimony Comments and Responses Index – Brooklyn Park Hearing

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Lokken	Barbara	49C
Lokken	Barbara	49D
McCarthy	John	52A
McCarthy	John	52B
McCarthy	John	52C
McCarthy	John	52D
McCarthy	John	52E
Ostroum	Mary	53A
Sutphen	Chuck	54A
Sutphen	Chuck	54B
Sutphen	Chuck	54C
Sutphen	Chuck	54D
Sutphen	Chuck	54E
Sutphen	Chuck	54F
Sutphen	Chuck	54G

General Public Verbal Testimony Comments and Responses Index – Crystal Hearing

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Berne	Chris	82A
Berne	Chris	82B
Berne	Chris	82D
Berne	Chris	82E
Bonniwell	Constance	75A
Bonniwell	Constance	75B
Bonniwell	Constance	75C
Bonniwell	Constance	75D
Bonniwell	Constance	75E
Bonniwell	Constance	75F
Bonniwell	Constance	75G
Bonniwell	Constance	75H



General Public Verbal Testimony Comments and Responses Index – Crystal Hearing

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Bonniwell	Constance	75I
Bonniwell	Constance	75J
Bonniwell	Constance	75K
Bonniwell	Constance	75L
Bonniwell	Constance	75M
Bonniwell	Constance	75N
Couture	Daniel	80A
Couture	Daniel	80B
Couture	Daniel	80C
Couture	Daniel	80D
Couture	Daniel	80E
Couture	Daniel	80F
Couture	Daniel	80G
Fischer	Bob	79A
Fischer	Bob	79B
Fischer	Bob	79D
Fischer	Bob	79C
Nelson	Jolene	78A
Nelson	Jolene	78B
Nelson	Jolene	78C
Nieman	Scott	77A
Nieman	Scott	77B
Nieman	Scott	77C
Nieman	Scott	77D
Nieman	Scott	77E
Nieman	Scott	77F
Reiter	Christopher	81A
Reiter	Christopher	81B
Reiter	Christopher	81C
Reiter	Christopher	81D



General Public Verbal Testimony Comments and Responses Index – Crystal Hearing

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID
Reiter	Christopher	81E
Reiter	Christopher	81F
Reiter	Christopher	81G
Reiter	Christopher	81H
Reiter	Christopher	81I
Thoman	Barb	76A
Thoman	Barb	76B
Thoman	Barb	76D
Thoman	Barb	76E
Thoman	Barb	76F
Thoman	Barb	76G
Thoman	Barb	76H
Thoman	Barb	76I

Golden Valley Public Hearing, May 7, 2014 – Verbal Testimony

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
6A	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	6	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	This is my statement. This is not the kind of environmental is that tells us how many trees this plan would have cut dead. It makes no mention of your intent to put LRT through 100-plus acres expanse of wildlife habitat, nor that this expanse is part of the wildlife corridor that starts on the south side of Bryn Mawr by the baseball field. This rare, quiet, inter-metro woods is only referred to as existing low-quality habitat.	Section 5.8 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) describes the preferred habitats of rare, threatened, and endangered species in the study area and the expected impacts to plants and animals and their habitat from the No-Build Alternative and the proposed METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit (BLRT) Extension project. The analysis includes all federally listed endangered and threatened species that have been documented in the area. Additionally, the Metropolitan Council (Council) reviewed the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Natural Heritage Information System (NHIS) Database, which provides information about Minnesota’s Special Concern and State Watchlist plants and animals, native plant communities, and other sensitive rare natural resource features. Species of State Special Concern and species on the State Watchlist have no specific legal protections under state endangered species law. Similarly, inventoried native plant communities have no specific legal protection. However, the proposed BLRT Extension project has been designed to minimize the impacts to forested park property; design, woodland impacts, and mitigation have been discussed with the cities of Golden Valley and Robbinsdale, the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, and the Three Rivers Park District. Mitigation would include revegetation of temporarily impacted areas; in many cases the clearing and revegetation efforts would remove invasive species.
6B	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	6	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	Tell that to the turtles living in Turtle Pond, which you’re trying to rename Grimes Pond. You say it’s in a trench. We always thought it was a valley.	Grimes Pond is the name that is shown on current mapping of the area. Impacts to turtles, especially the Blanding’s turtle (which is on the State Threatened Species list) have been evaluated and mitigation measures will be implemented. The DNR concurred with the Council’s assessment impacts to and mitigation for the Blanding’s turtle.
6C	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	6	Verbal Testimony	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Here’s a quote [from the Draft EIS] about South Halifax Park: Noise effects confined to limited areas. Like it’s entire four acres. Another: The recreational experience in this park resource may be lessened due to the effects of transitway operations. Would be lessened” is more honest.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17. Active use parks are not considered noise sensitive receptors and are not included in the noise analysis. No moderate or severe noise impacts are anticipated at South Halifax Park.
6D	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	6	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I could tell from reading this that the writers had not a clue about the social factors in South Halifax Park. We in Robbinsdale are very pleased that there’s so many neighborhood kids availing themselves of such a pretty little park. It is a crucial resource for them. On a Saturday when I have walked past it, I counted over 30 kids of all ages, and it wasn’t that warm out. Every one of those kids were black. It’s an area with exploitive rentals to black people. What would happen if those kids lost their healthy place to be outside and play basketball?	The proposed BLRT extension project would require a temporary occupancy of approximately 0.70 acre along the western border of South Halifax Park to facilitate construction activities. The portion of the park to be temporarily occupied during construction would be restored to existing conditions or better. There would be no permanent change to South Halifax Park as a result of project actions. Chapter 7 of the Final EIS presents the environmental justice (EJ) analysis for the proposed BLRT Extension project. No disproportionately high and adverse impacts to low income or minority populations with respect to parks were identified. The proposed BLRT Extension project would increase accessibility and connectivity of the park systems in Golden Valley and Robbinsdale through the enhancement of existing trails and construction of new trail connections.
6E	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	6	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	What wildlife habitat is left in Wirth would take a big hit under your plan, that’s right along the parkway there by the bridge.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #14.
6F	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	6	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	Here’s a quote about Sochacki Park: The natural setting of Sochacki Park may be somewhat diminished due to the proximity of park trails to the line at D1. The honest version: The quiet refuge that is Sochacki Park would be destroyed. Over 220 trains a day.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #15.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
6G	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	6	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	The only mention that is made of all the concerned owners of wildlife habitat to the east of the BN line is this, and I quote: There are several informal illegal crossings of the BNSF railroad corridor with parkland between 36th Avenue and Golden Valley Road. Pedestrians who cross at these unmarked locations are illegally trespassing on BNSF property. During the scoping process it was learned that residents of this area east of the park cross the BNSF railroad corridor at these illegal crossings to access the trail and Sochacki Park.	The proposed BLRT Extension project would be located within an existing active rail corridor and its construction may result in temporary modifications to roadways and/or pedestrian or bicycle facilities that may result in changes to park access patterns. The informal (unauthorized) crossings into Theodore Wirth Regional Park and Sochacki Park across the BNSF Railway (BNSF) tracks at-grade will be fenced off during construction and permanently closed once the proposed BLRT project is in operation. However, crossings at 36th Avenue, Golden Valley Road, Plymouth Avenue, and Olson Memorial Highway (Trunk Highway 55) would be maintained permanently. There may be temporary impacts to access during construction. The Council will develop a Construction Communications Plan which would be used to coordinate with emergency service providers as well as the public. See Section 4.7 – Safety and Security of the Final EIS for additional discussion on this topic.
7A	Fahey	Sean	None provided	7	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Basically, I am disappointed in the DEIS. Joe laid out his five goals, and the ecological environment is really only addressed in the last half of four and five, so I feel like there's a lot of space in the DEIS that has nothing to do with the ecological environment. A lot of it has to do with the human-built environment.	The Final EIS includes a discussion of all known environmental issues and impacts at the time of publication.
7B	Fahey	Sean	None provided	7	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	My biggest concern is the effects on wetlands. So this training will go through three different ponds – four ponds possibly, yeah. At least in Golden Valley it will go through three different ponds. We're going to have to create two new tracks to go next to the existing track, and it may even be needed that we will have to take out a track and just rebuild three new tracks going through these wetlands. So the DEIS says we will lose about ten acres of wetland. We'll have ten acres of wetland. And to me, that's unacceptable.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #16.
7C	Fahey	Sean	None provided	7	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	The only other thing I want to say is that we haven't had very much time to even read through the DEIS. We didn't get very much time to like look into it. It just came out April 1st. And for people that have jobs and they don't have a technical background, it's hard to read it, get organized, talk to their neighbors in this short amount of time.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #5.
8A	Wildung	Cathy	None provided	8	Verbal Testimony	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	But to me, my number one concern is the sound, if it's going to affect me in my house because I'm so close. It's really only a block or so away. I'd really like to see some kind of a sound barrier if they decide to do this, but I'm wondering if it's still going to affect me. I'm a very light sleeper. And, you know, the fact that these trains are going to be running early morning from 4:00 to 6:00 a.m., 20 – every 20 to 30 minutes. Rush hour probably isn't going to bother me too much. But peak periods, 6:00 to 9:00 a.m., that's pretty early, every seven and a half minutes. Late evening, 10:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m., I'm sleeping. Every 30 minutes? What if I hear those trains running? I'm going to have to move. I'm sorry. And I'm wondering how many other people feel the same way. I hope it doesn't bother me, but I'm afraid it's going to. I'm worried about the bells and the whistles on the places where the train stations are going to be because they sound like they're going to be sounded every 20 – oh, I see, the train horns will sound 20 seconds before they arrive. The crossings, wayside bells will sound a total duration of 30 seconds. I don't know. That's my main concern.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17. The noise analysis indicates that there would be no noise impacts on residences along Kyle Avenue.
8B	Wildung	Cathy	None provided	8	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	Another concern I had, of course, was the wetlands also. And I'm just wondering, that area floods. We get a lot of flooding. Especially like with the heavy rains we've had, we've had problems with that. Is that	Floodplains are addressed in Section 5.2 of the Final EIS. The Council reviewed Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year floodplains and FEMA floodways as part of the evaluation for the proposed BLRT Extension project. The floodplains and floodways were identified and evaluated based on current FEMA

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public Verbal Testimony

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							going to affect our existing water situations when they are messing with those wetlands?	Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) and ancillary information. The data in this section are based on the information in the Preliminary Floodplain Impacts and Mitigation Strategies Technical Memorandum (January 2016), or Floodplain Technical Memorandum. The Council conducted the analysis in coordination with US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), DNR, and local watershed organizations (Bassett Creek Water Management Commission, Shingle Creek Watershed Management Commission, West Mississippi Water Management Commission, and Mississippi Watershed Management Organization) as described in the Floodplain Technical Memorandum. No increase in flooding would occur as a result of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Concerning wetlands: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #16.
8C	Wildung	Cathy	None provided	8	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	And the statement – the Environmental Impact Statement was talking about how this area is over private wells and water that’s used for the residents in the city. And how is all that going to be affected? I guess I’m concerned about that.	The Final EIS addresses drinking water in Section 5.1 dealing with utilities. Private and public wells within the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor are identified and the potential effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project are described. No long term effects to the supply of drinking water are anticipated. The construction phase of the proposed BLRT Extension project will also incorporate appropriate measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts to drinking water from public and private wells.
8D	Wildung	Cathy	None provided	8	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	And the other thing is that there’s 790 recorded way sites in this preferred alternative area, BCD1, and are they going to be uncovering hazardous wastes material and what’s going to happen when they uncover that material?	The Council is aware of the previous dumping that had occurred during the 1960s in Sochacki Park/Mary Hills Nature Center/Rice Lake Park. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) has been conducted, and a Phase II ESA is being conducted, to further evaluate the presence of contamination along the entire proposed BLRT Extension project corridor and proposed areas of construction. Information gathered from the Phase I and II ESA will be incorporated into the proposed BLRT Extension project’s Response Action Plan (RAP) (which includes a Construction Contingency Plan for unidentified contamination) to properly handle, treat, store, and dispose of solid wastes, hazardous materials, petroleum products, and other regulated materials that could not be avoided during construction. Coordination with the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, cities of Robbinsdale and Golden Valley, and the Three Rivers Park District will also be arranged.
9A	Lamker	Darlene	None provided	9	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	And I guess I’d like to start out by just saying real quick that I’m very disappointed that one vote has changed our lives so, as well as the track already there and it’s the cheapest way to build this. It’s just really – it’s shocking that because of those three reasons we have to go through all this.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
9B	Lamker	Darlene	None provided	9	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	And I’d like to share the fact that I walk – I have for 20 years walked there four out of five mornings, and I still do. I was there this morning with many, many other people. And the environment in the wetland – I mean, I just can’t imagine how you can mitigate anything like that and have it anywhere near what’s necessary.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #16.
9C	Lamker	Darlene	None provided	9	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	Now, I believe in transit and I have to share with you why. I work in the Minneapolis schools and so even today I was over by the Hiawatha Line. And I’ve seen that Hiawatha Line go from the Vets to the Mall of America, with people who come in everywhere, who come to the Vets, for people who are working, or back and forth. And it’s wonderful when it’s used like that with that many people.	The Council appreciates your comment, and agrees that the Blue Line (formerly known as the Hiawatha Line) is an effective light rail transit (LRT) line that serves a wide variety of people and destinations.
9D	Lamker	Darlene	None provided	9	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Now, today, just today alone, as I’m waiting at the stoplight, the bells and whistles are – my windows are closed – as loud as can be. I rolled down the window and the train left, and I can’t tell you the noise it makes. It’s just unbelievable. So I can’t imagine taking that beautiful, wonderful place that Golden Valley has that’s so special and changing it like you are.	Noise impacts have been assessed at sensitive locations throughout the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor consistent with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) methodology and impact criteria. Where impacts have been identified, mitigation measures, consistent with Metro Transit’s noise mitigation policy, have been recommended. Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS, including a discussion of mitigation measures such as Quiet Zones, noise barriers, and the use of wayside warning devices.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								The noise analysis indicates that there would be no noise impacts on residences along Kyle Avenue.
9E	Lamker	Darlene	None provided	9	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	My alternative would be anything else. And my greatest alternative would be hopefully we can put this off for two years and the Feds won't give us the money. I'd like to see the – yeah. I'd like to see an alternative route. And the students and families in north Minneapolis are the ones that could really benefit if we did this the right way. But why can't we do something other than take out all those houses if we took the other route?	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
9F	Lamker	Darlene	None provided	9	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I just – I know the environment – I think the environmental – I haven't even read it all so – I have to say that, but I think environmentally, I can't imagine something like this would pass. I just can't imagine.	FTA and the Council have followed the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) in making informed decisions regarding the social, economic, and environmental impacts of implementing the proposed BLRT Extension project. Significant efforts have been made to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate impacts.
10A	McMahon	Kasia	None provided	10	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I just wanted to discuss that --or I just wanted to talk about how this project shares a lot of similarities with the Southwest LRT project, which if anybody has been following that disaster, it's very similar. It's using a quiet, urban neighborhood as a, you know, commuter pass-through for, you know, excerpts and that the design of that was made using Bush-era criteria for, you know, these New Star projects and under the new criteria, this type of project I don't think would ever be designed in this way.	The Council is developing the Green Line Extension (Southwest Light Rail Transit) and the proposed BLRT Extension projects in accordance with FTA's New Starts criteria, which include completion of environmental review in accordance with NEPA and MEPA. The environmental review considers all anticipated social, economic, and environmental impacts, and appropriate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures.
10B	McMahon	Kasia	None provided	10	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	And unfortunately, you know, our city didn't really stand up for the – didn't really represent Golden Valley in the way that it should have because clearly Golden Valley doesn't get anything from this project. I mean, we have two optional stations that may or may not be built. One of them may be built, and it – it serves so few people. I mean, I live extremely close to the Golden Valley Road Station – the potential station there, and it's still a half a mile walk from my house. And I can tell you that – as a, you know, a transit user, that's – that's an extreme distance to use every day. It's not very practical.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #19.
10C	McMahon	Kasia	None provided	10	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	And it's – to say that that route is comparable to D2, which would serve Broadway in Minneapolis, is completely ludicrous because I know for a fact that the 14 bus which serves Golden Valley now is -- I'm like the only person that rides it in the morning and in the evening. I actually can't imagine that that station would be used by more than a handful of people during rush hour. It's not likely. I mean, the DEIS claims that the ridership numbers between D1 and D2 are comparable, but I just honestly can't see how that is possible.	The Council used its regional travel demand forecasting model to develop the transit ridership forecasts for the proposed BLRT Extension project. The proposed BLRT Expansion project ridership modeling is discussed in Section 3.1 of the Final EIS. The Plymouth Avenue Station would have 229 riders per day, while the Golden Valley Road Station would have 905 riders per day, based on the results of the ridership model. The overall ridership forecasts are as follows: B-C-D1 – 27,000 boardings per day B-C-D2 – 26,000 boardings per day
10D	McMahon	Kasia	None provided	10	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	So I – I just would really hope that Golden Valley – representatives in Golden Valley would stand up for what makes sense for us because I don't think that necessarily is selfish at all. I think when you stand up for the people in your small local area, you're standing up for common sense on a larger scale.	Staff and elected officials from the city of Golden Valley participated in the issue resolution and public and agency involvement process throughout the development of the proposed BLRT Extension project. These processes are documented in Chapters 2 and 9 of the Final EIS. City staff and officials remain engaged in project design activities, and would do so throughout the completion of design, construction, and operation of the proposed BLRT Extension project.
11A	Coifman	Vicki	None provided	11	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	First of all, three things happened in the last week. We had the rainfall....I had not seen the golf course, the land between Golden Valley Road and Highway 55, as wet as it has been in the last week. I personally anticipate that that's going to get worse, given the report on global warming for – for people that came out a couple of days ago, and there was discussion of local Minnesota impacts of these	The new presidential Executive Order 13690 concerning floodplains is incorporated in the design of proposed infrastructure in and near mapped floodplains. Design standards in the Executive Order necessitates that infrastructure be designed to accommodate floods of 2 feet above the 100-year floodplain. This Executive Order was issued as a result of climate change studies which demonstrate that frequency

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public Verbal Testimony

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							changes. I am assuming the rainfall incidents are not going to get better. They're going to get worse. Has the impact of the LRT on the floodplain been considered from the perspective of this very new situation of the last five years maybe -- visible in the last five years, and which is getting worse? Have those -- has that impact of wilder, wetter changes in the local climate -- how is that going to impact what looks to me like a floodplain.	and intensity of storm events in the future would likely be more severe than the present.
11B	Coifman	Vicki	None provided	11	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Also, not to beat a dead horse, when we were talking about the preferred options for this line, we had two pretty crummy options in north Minneapolis: Penn Avenue and the one that is the preferred one. So I -- again, the major population who needs the LRT is where the line is not going.	Several location and mode alternatives were considered during the proposed BLRT Extension project Alternative Analysis (AA) and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) processes. The Council, Hennepin County, and the cities along the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor agreed that the proposed BLRT Extension project best meets the purpose and need. The proposed BLRT Extension project would improve the transportation system by providing more travel choices and faster travel times between residential areas, major destinations, and employment centers.
12A	Adair	Richard	None provided	12	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I came here tonight because I also lived in Golden Valley for 23 years before that, so I've lived on each side of Wirth Park for --I don't want to say how many years, but a long time. I golf in it. I swim in it. I cross-country ski in it. I look at birds in it. I do all the things that my fellow testifiers here have talked about. But you're going to hear a slightly different slant on this from me. I'm asking you to look at a 30- to 50-year time frame, rather than what happens to me today. There are 3 million people in the Twin Cities. It's projected that very soon there will be 4 million people in the Twin Cities. Our freeways are clogged. And I'm not looking for a situation -- looking forward to a situation where we have isolated pockets of poverty where people don't have access to transit, and this includes areas like the Frogtown area of St. Paul and north Minneapolis. So I'm asking you to look at the long run and to recognize that light rail transit is the key to knitting together our metropolitan area and making sure that it thrives in the future.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
12B	Adair	Richard	None provided	12	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	I also hope that you listen to every single one of the concerns that have been voiced by the speakers before me. These are very legitimate concerns. And I would say that if I were sitting in these chairs, that my job would not be to decide whether to do this or not, but how to do it in such a way as to pay the most attention to everybody who's impacted by it.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #6.
12C	Adair	Richard	None provided	12	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	And regarding putting it down Penn Avenue, we have to listen to the people who live nearby. If there's one thing we've learned from the Southwest discussions is, for heaven's sake, let's listen to the people who live nearby. And as I understand it, they do not want to remove houses on Penn in order to make room for it.	The Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) recommended Alignment D1 over Alignment D2 because Alignment D1 would result in significantly less property and neighborhood impacts, improved travel time, greater cost-effectiveness, and less disruption of roadway traffic operations. Discussion focused on the adverse impacts of Alignment D2 and that Alignment D1 better meets the proposed BLRT Extension project goals. The costs (impacts) of Alignment D2 for the people on Penn Avenue would outweigh the potential benefits.
13A	Lehman	Karen	None provided	13	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I live in Chicago most of the time. And in Chicago I don't own a car, and I am a transit -- public transit proponent. But the reason it works is that I have an express bus to Duluth outside my door. I have a train three blocks away. I have an hour car I can rent from my building. I have a rental car office four blocks away. I have a bike path next to me, and I can walk. And I can take cabs by putting a cab light on the building and the cab comes.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles utilize landscaping, lighting, and structural elements in the design and construction of light rail stations to reduce the likelihood of criminal activity. Following the CPTED philosophy not only makes Metro Transit facilities aesthetically pleasing, but also helps to provide a safer environment for all of our customers. In addition, the proposed BLRT Extension project will use urban designs to minimize crime including lighting, landscaping, and structure design.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							I use the hour car when I have to take public transit to a station that is isolated, where there aren't very many eyes on the street. And what I fear about the transit, the stops that we have in Golden Valley, is that we will have the worst of all possible worlds, where we will have isolated stops. What I don't want is an isolated station that's not – that doesn't have security staff so that I don't feel like I can use it.	
13B	Lehman	Karen	None provided	13	Verbal Testimony	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	I also have one of those houses that is hanging out over the rail line, right there at the end of Zephyr Place. I'm concerned about the noise.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17. Interior testing to determine the appropriate mitigation measure is recommended for the location of 16th Avenue North to Golden Valley Road in Golden Valley, near Zephyr Place resulting in no residual noise impacts. See Table 5.6-7 in the Final EIS for a summary of proposed mitigation measures by location.
13C	Lehman	Karen	None provided	13	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	I'm concerned about the light. It is dark, which is wonderful.	Section 4.5 of the Final EIS describes the process for determining visual impacts to natural areas. The visual impacts of the proposed BLRT Extension project were determined by evaluating the changes to existing visual resources that would occur as a result of project implementation, and assessing the anticipated viewer response to those changes. Visual impact assessment was based on direct field observation from multiple vantage points, including from neighboring properties and roadways; evaluation of existing visual character; and review of proposed BLRT Extension project plans and features. Visual impact assessment was also based on photographic documentation of existing conditions for several key views of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Adverse effects to visual quality would occur in some areas, such as areas where recreational and residential uses are located along or in the vicinity of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. At locations where adverse visual effects are anticipated, project elements added to the rail corridor may be visually screened or softened using landscaping where adequate space permits, and the loss of existing vegetation on side slopes for grading or access purposes would be replaced to the extent feasible. Several local plans address aesthetic and visual resources in the proposed BLRT Extension project area, and applicable policies include the establishment of design and landscape guidelines.
13D	Lehman	Karen	None provided	13	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	I like the fact that the animals can go wherever they want to go. So I think there are things you can do. You can really look at that wildlife corridor and take it seriously as a wildlife corridor and figure out, how are you going to protect Golden Valley? Because what I'm afraid of is the uniqueness of Golden Valley gets eroded.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #13.
13E	Lehman	Karen	None provided	13	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	The reason that people are going to have those stops there, then we're going to bring people in to use those transit stops. The parking is going to become an issue.	There is a proposed park-and-ride located at the Golden Valley Road Station that would accommodate 100 spaces. Additional information can be found in Chapter 3 (Sections 3.1, 3.3, and 3.5) of the Final EIS.
13F	Lehman	Karen	None provided	13	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Other people have been much more on point than I can be about the special quality of Golden Valley and the natural resources that it represents, but I think that those voices are hard to hear sometimes because they can't speak, so we have to speak for them.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #6.
14A	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	14	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I have not been in favor of light rail in that area and for a couple reasons. Number one, it's going to impact the environment. It's going to be dirty, dusty. You're going to cause more traffic on Golden Valley Road than is necessary.	Concerning air quality: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #11. The traffic operations analysis indicates that the Golden Valley Road/Theodore Wirth Parkway intersection would operate at a level of service E in 2040 with either the No-Build Alternative or the proposed BLRT Extension project. See Table 3.3-3 in the Final EIS.
14B	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	14	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	That remote area over by Margaret Mary Church and the fire station is a remote area for Golden Valley. If we use Golden Valley for a square, that's over in the corner. The greater population of Golden Valley over on this side, Wesley Park and some of those other parks,	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public Verbal Testimony

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							is a vaster --Golden Valley is a pretty – it's a nice community, but it's – it's not as tight over there as it is in other areas. If you were to put in a light rail and divert it from where it is and bring it into downtown where we have train tracks --just reroute this thing and put it into downtown where there is the light rail --where there is train tracks, you'll have a greater population that will be for the greater good of Golden Valley than that isolated station over there.	
14C	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	14	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	So they're not thinking straight. I mean, they're trying to railroad our community from the north and for that area and railroad it through us. And when I say "railroad," I'm not talking about the railroad. I'm talking about they're trying to boondoggle us and ride over us. I'm trying to protect Golden Valley.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
14D	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	14	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	Now, the population that's around here is concerned about the environment by Theodore Wirth Golf Course, about the wetlands and all the animals that we have running around.	Concerning Theodore Wirth Regional Park: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #14. Concerning wetlands: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #16.The proposed BLRT Extension project has an elevated LRT rail platform across Grimes Pond and ponds north of Golden Valley Road. The proposed BLRT Extension project would use a bridge to cross these ponds, which are identified notable aquatic resources. The Draft EIS design concept would have used a continuous embankment of fill, which would have caused considerably more impacts to this aquatic resource. Also, please see MASTER RESPONSE #13.
14E	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	14	Verbal Testimony		But also it's a very quiet area. Very quiet. Very peaceful. That's what I love about Golden Valley. Golden Valley. It's a golden area to live. So you're going to cause more disruption. Now, for those of us that live in the area, if we go out and grill, we go out into our yards, and we're going to hear that stuff. Things that we never heard before. It's going to cause disruption.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17. In the Golden Valley area, mitigation for noise impacts will include noise barriers or interior testing to determine the appropriate mitigation measure.
14F	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	14	Verbal Testimony		I was just talking to one of the gentlemen outside who's been involved in this whole consternation, and the – the light rail is going to bring in – every seven minutes you're going to have, during peak times, you're going to have traffic coming in. During unpeak times, if that's a good word, they're going to come by every ten minutes.	Revisions to the proposed BLRT Extension project during the Project Development phase have changed the LRT frequency from 7 minutes to 10 minutes during peak periods.
14G	Milstein	Bernie	None provided	14	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Property values are going to be dramatically affected. You have some of the best property values in Golden Valley over in Hidden Lakes and Heathbrooke. You think that people are going to want to stay in those properties when they hear noise every seven minutes and every ten minutes? What this community needs is rapid bus service, not rapid train service.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #7. The Council is developing bus rapid transit (BRT) routes within its service area; however, light rail was selected as the preferred technology for the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor.
15A	Rosenquist	Gillian	None provided	15	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	When I was reading the draft DEIS, one of the things I was really thinking about is this process seems to be a little disjointed. Having gone to the Three Rivers meeting recently and thinking about the plans that Three Rivers has for Sochacki and Mary Hills. Also being involved in the bike trails. I'm not reading about – it seems to be like this is a very focused plan and they're not thinking about how the whole metro area is envisioning using these natural areas. So I would ask that there be better coordination, looking at not just environmental impacts right now, but environmental impacts in terms of – in terms of planning uses and in terms of future. And – because I know Three Rivers has ideas and plans, and so do the neighbors, for changes to this area.	Coordination continues between the Council, FTA, Hennepin County, and the cities of Minneapolis, Golden Valley, Robbinsdale, Crystal, and Brooklyn Park as the proposed BLRT Extension project is further designed. See Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for a summary of the issue resolution process which coordinated stakeholders on issues identified from Draft EIS comments. Chapter 8 of the Final EIS describes the coordination between the cities of Golden Valley and Robbinsdale, the Three Rivers Park District, and the Council regarding coordination between LRT construction activities and improvements to Sochacki Park.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
15B	Rosenquist	Gillian	None provided	15	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	<p>So we need to think about what goes in as far as floodplain mitigation and things like that in terms of what they want to do and what we want to do with those areas too. Not just how they are right now. I mean, some of the things that I saw were that the areas they were looking for floodplain mitigation are significantly south of the stations. And as one of the other people noted, we've had a lot of rain. It's a very wet area. And our trails and usage are impacted. And if we don't have kind of that addressed on the northern end, we are going to have reduced use in those areas for recreation, for programming, things like that.</p> <p>Let's see. I mean, one of the quotes from page 20 of the floodplain replacement was the size of the floodplain mitigation is anticipated to be small, ranging from an eighth to a quarter acre, and that does seem insufficient, especially in light of the water we've had.</p>	<p>The Council reviewed FEMA 100-year floodplains and FEMA floodways as part of the evaluation for the proposed BLRT Extension project. The floodplains and floodways were identified and evaluated based on current FEMA FIRM and ancillary information.</p> <p>Section 5.2 of the Final EIS describes the existing floodplains in the study area and describes several factors that have caused floodplain impacts to change in the study area since publication of the Draft EIS. These factors include refinements to the footprint of the proposed BLRT Extension project and modifications to the mapping of the 100-year floodplain in the Bassett Creek area. This section also describes the impacts of the No-Build Alternative and the proposed BLRT Extension project on floodplains.</p> <p>The data in this section are based on the information in the Preliminary Floodplain Impacts and Mitigation Strategies Technical Memorandum (January 2016), or Floodplain Technical Memorandum. The Council conducted the analysis for this section in coordination with USACE, DNR, and local watershed organizations (Bassett Creek Water Management Commission, Shingle Creek Watershed Management Commission, West Mississippi Water Management Commission, and Mississippi Watershed Management Organization) as described in the Floodplain Technical Memorandum.</p> <p>In Golden Valley, there would be a total of 16,800 cubic yards of floodplain impact. This would be mitigated by the excavation of compensatory storage in an area north of Olson Memorial Highway and west of the BNSF rail corridor. The design of this mitigation is being coordinated with the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board to ensure a design that is in harmony with the surroundings and would avoid a reduction in recreational utility of the property.</p>
15C	Rosenquist	Gillian	None provided	15	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	<p>There also seems to be a little bit of confusion about who runs those areas. I mean, I saw Park Board. I saw Golden Valley. And they were talking about the same areas, so I think that needs to be cleared up in this plan so we know kind of who we're dealing with, and the Met Council and the county and the federal government also know who we're dealing with.</p>	<p>Please see response to Comment 15B. All appropriate agencies have been and would continue to be involved in floodplain mitigation.</p>
16A	Linder	Bill	None provided	16	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	<p>A couple of the issues that I'd like to at least get on the list here is property values. All along that corridor people live here, you've listened to it, because of its uniqueness. And people buy their homes there and they pay the prices for those homes because of its unique nature. That will ultimately change, even though we are not a noise dot on your noise map. Noise in Golden Valley is not the same thing as noise next to other facilities. This is a pristine, well-liked area.</p>	<p>Concerning property values: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #7.</p> <p>Concerning noise impacts: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #7. In the Golden Valley area, there are relatively few noise impacts; all are along the east side of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor, and the majority are along Kewanee Way. Noise mitigation for impacted properties will consist of noise barriers, or interior noise testing to determine the appropriate mitigation measure.</p>
16B	Linder	Bill	None provided	16	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	<p>Taxes. Oh, I'm sure this is going to benefit the heck out of Golden Valley, so obviously our tax rates will be increased too because of this wonderful opportunity we have to ride light rail, which in practice, won't be very helpful to our community.</p>	<p>Concerning tax increases: property tax increases are affected by a variety of market conditions. Impacts of an LRT project on association dues and taxes are difficult to assess conclusively.</p>
16C	Linder	Bill	None provided	16	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	<p>I haven't heard anything about compensation for any of these issues, okay? Who wants to pay for this? These are costs that everybody along this corridor will be paying for.</p>	<p>Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would not displace any residential properties. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minnesota Statute (Minn. Stat.) 117.</p>
16D	Linder	Bill	None provided	16	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	<p>And just ownership of the park. I have a lot of personal ownership in that park. I've lived there nearly 30 years and have picked up and cleaned up. And you go out there, show me the litter. I challenge any of you to. That's because myself and many others in the community take care of that park.</p>	<p>The Council does not anticipate that the proposed BLRT Extension project would impede the ability of concerned citizens to continue to care for parklands in the proposed BLRT Extension project area.</p>

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public Verbal Testimony

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
17A	Wall-Romana	Margaret	None provided	17	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	I'll give you a little bit of background... When we bought our house that we're now selling in south Minneapolis, our neighbor next door...built an addition to his house ten feet away from our house. Blocked all of our light; made a big, ugly expansion; completely changed the house that we had purchased, so we were never able to live in the house we purchased...I feel like the same thing is happening to us again. It's our fault that we didn't do this due diligence. But we absolutely fell in love with this house on Kyle Avenue, which is magnificent. It's so not Minneapolis. It is so special. I go out in the morning and all I hear is birdsong. And I love the birds and I love the animals. And we have half an acre that looks out to, is it Sochacki Park? It's magnificent. It's special. It should be preserved. Not just for me because I want it but because, honestly, it's not Minneapolis. It's not any of the other places around here. It is a very special, particular place that is lovely and is unique to Golden Valley.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #15.
17B	Wall-Romana	Margaret	None provided	17	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	And I do not understand why the city council of Golden Valley did not do what should have been done to protect the unique qualities of Golden Valley. I mean, there --there are other places that the line could run. Better yet, there should be better bus service, which would do much more for the entire area with far fewer impacts.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
17D	Wall-Romana	Margaret	None provided	17	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	And also I'd like to say one more thing, which is that one of the -- one of the things that really struck me in the EIR is that at some point somebody discussed a waterway as though it was a trash-strewn, you know, nothing. And I have not found that to be the case.	The Council believes that waterways are very important resources to the community. They are committed to and required by law to avoid impacts or minimize impacts to them, and mitigate for unavoidable impacts to them. Through the use of effective best management practices the Council can minimize impacts to them and in many cases improve them compared to current conditions.
18A	Steinberg	Dan	None provided	18	Verbal Testimony	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Concerning -- concerning Chapter 6-3, Table 5 of the noise mention -- of noise area with the dots, there's no mention of Kewanee Way. There is no mention of Kewanee Way on the noise -- on noise on Table 5. And I'm a little bit in shock -- in shock by that from the document that I read, considering that that street is right next to the rail line, if you've traveled down there and been down there.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17. Several noise impacts were identified on Kewanee Way in the Draft EIS (see Figures 26 and 27 in Appendix G of the Draft EIS). Impacts have been assessed in the Final EIS and appropriate mitigation has been recommended, consistent with Metro Transit's noise mitigation policy. Noise is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS. A noise barrier is proposed as a mitigation measure between the LRT and Kewanee Way. The noise barrier would eliminate the majority of noise impacts in this area; analysis indicates that one moderate and one severe impact would remain after implementation of the noise barrier.
18B	Steinberg	Dan	None provided	18	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	Around page 105 of the document it talks about the change of bus routing on there, considering a new bus route, the possibility of changes and especially to the City of Golden Valley bus system, along with rerouting of Route 14 which runs through the north Minneapolis area. So I'd like to see -- I'd like to see from Met Council representatives that are here tonight, and staff -- I see many of them in the room -- to address new bus routes --or tentative plans for bus routing going through or what their idea of a plan would be like for that draft, because it did talk it may have changes to the bus system going through, so obviously that area is going to have a lot of changes. So I do thank you for mentioning those past bus sites in there. And so those are pretty much what are my questions to that.	Chapter 3 of the Final EIS discusses transit changes that may occur as a result of implementing the proposed BLRT Project. According to the draft Bus Feeder Plan, bus routes 7 and 30 would serve the Golden Valley Road Station with drop off areas on Golden Valley Road. Network modifications are focused on providing an integrated "feeder" bus network to connect people to the proposed BLRT Extension project stations. Bus networks and transit plans will continue to be refined as the proposed BLRT Extension project progresses; final bus network changes will be subject to a robust public involvement process in accordance with Title VI requirements.
18C	Steinberg	Dan	None provided	18	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	All right. Then I think I'm around page 400. There was no mention of St. Margaret Mary as being a historic or looked at from a cultural standpoint. Yet, the Floyd -- yet, Governor Floyd Olson's statue at the corner of Penn and Olsen Highway is mentioned in there before St. Margaret Mary. I'm a little bit dismayed by whoever -- whoever decided that the statue and St. Margaret Mary do not fall into same category with that historic preservation.	The St. Margaret Mary Church and School campus has been determined not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) due to a lack of historical significance. The St. Margaret Mary Church and School campus is a good example of a large post-World War II suburban church complex. However, the church does not appear to have played any significant role in the development of Golden Valley or the Catholic Church, rather its development merely reflects a broader national trend of growth post-World War II. Also, it does not appear to be

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								either a notable or an outstanding example of this type of complex. Therefore, the campus does not have significance under NRHP Criterion A. Additionally, architecturally, the church does not embody the characteristics of Mid-Century Modern ecclesiastical architecture and so does not have significance under NRHP Criterion C.

Minneapolis Public Hearing, May 8, 2014 – Verbal Testimony

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
29A	Moore	Vicki	None provided	29	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	A lot of the discussion in the community has been around alignments and stops and change. I see this as the potential for transit development. In my neighborhood, when we talk about trying to bring people and developers in, they'll say you don't have enough people to support the business. You don't have enough amenities for our workers. So going forward, I would like to see more conversation about economic development.	The Council has been working with Hennepin County on the Station Area Planning (SAP) efforts at each station, incorporating community input into the considerations of land uses, types of development, and other strategies to address neighborhood concerns and ensure that the investments have benefits to the local communities.
29B	Moore	Vicki	None provided	29	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I really support the Penn Avenue Station and making the park a destination. I know that – I believe that if the park is a destination, there will be economic development going up Plymouth to Penn, small businesses, and that we should be growing small businesses that are community-owned businesses, and this is our opportunity to do that. I know that my neighborhood will be supporting businesses along Olson Highway.	Please see response to Comment 29A.
29C	Moore	Vicki	None provided	29	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	If we're going to do this, I think it's really important that – as we move forward that we consider equitable development standards and community benefits agreements. I think by doing so, you're engaging the community in a way that they can start to see the benefit and the potential of what's coming to us as this line moves through our neighborhood rather than just looking at change and perhaps wanting to keep things the way they are rather than looking at how things could be.	Please see response to Comment 29A.
30A	El-Amin	Arlene	None provided	30	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	Would like a roundabout considered around 8th Ave N to slow down traffic, concerned about increase in traffic as people try to avoid LRT stops.	No roundabout is proposed at the 8th Avenue North and Elwood Avenue North intersection. This is outside of the limits of disturbance for the proposed BLRT Extension project. Chapter 3 of the Final EIS discusses the reconstruction of nearby Olson Memorial Highway as part of the proposed BLRT Extension project, which lowers the posted speed limit to 35 miles per hour (mph) and improves the pedestrian and bicycle accessibility and safety.
30B	El-Amin	Arlene	None provided	30	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	Wants to see walking bridges to cross over Olson Hwy and traverse the rail line, concerned about pedestrian connections.	Chapter 3 – Transportation of the Final EIS addresses improvements to Olson Memorial Highway. Two stations would provide access to the communities along the highway: the Penn Avenue Station and the Van White Boulevard Station. While a six-lane roadway would be maintained, the lane widths would be reduced to 11 feet to accommodate pedestrian crossing length. The design speed and posted speed limit would be reduced to 35 mph. Existing sidewalks would be replaced with 6-foot-wide sidewalks on the north and south sides of the highway. Pedestrian refuges would be added in the median of the highway. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant pedestrian crossings of Olson Memorial Highway would be facilitated by proposed signalized intersections at Bryant Avenue North, Van White Boulevard, Humboldt Avenue, James Avenue, Morgan Avenue, midblock between Newton Avenue and Oliver Avenue, Penn Avenue, Russell Avenue, and Thomas Avenue. The proposed BLRT Extension project would provide space on the north side of Olson Memorial Highway for a 10-foot two-way cycle track (to be constructed by others) between Thomas Avenue and Van White Boulevard. The proposed BLRT Extension project would include a multi-use trail on the north side of the reconstructed westbound Olson Memorial Highway bridge.
31A	Wynne	Elaine	None provided	31	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	Concerned about Wirth park.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #14.
31B	Wynne	Elaine	None provided	31	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	Concerned about ridership.	The AA/Draft EIS and Final EIS processes examined numerous alignment options detailed in Chapter 2 of both documents. The proposed BLRT Extension project meets the purpose and need most efficiently and minimizes project impacts. The Council used its regional travel demand forecasting model to develop the transit

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								ridership forecasts for the proposed BLRT Extension project which is 27,000 boardings daily. Please see Section 3.1 of the Final EIS for more details.
31C	Wynne	Elaine	None provided	31	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Golden Valley stop is not close to anybody and feels like Golden Valley is being treated like a drive-through.	The Plymouth Avenue and Golden Valley Road stations are included in the proposed BLRT Extension project scope and budget. Engineering analysis and environmental review was conducted for both stations including, floodplain, wetlands, noise, cultural resources, vegetation and park land impacts, parking, costs, and ridership. Housing units, population, employment and homes within a 10 minute walk were part of the analysis. Qualitative/social factors such as access to trails and adjacent neighborhood impacts were also considered. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS presents a summary of the alternatives analysis conducted for the proposed BLRT Extension project. Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #19.
31D	Wynne	Elaine	None provided	31	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	preferred the Hwy 100 and Penn Ave alignment the best; supports LRT	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
31E	Wynne	Elaine	None provided	31	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	Concerned about the true impacts on wetlands since DEIS did not mention these cost figures.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #16.
31F	Wynne	Elaine	None provided	31	Verbal Testimony	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	How much will the owners and stockholders of BNSF Railroad be receiving for the purchase of this land needed for the light rail? And why have no agreements been negotiated – any tentative agreements at least? I know there are estimates, but do we actually know that those estimates are going to be anywhere close to what we're going to need to pay the railroad for this? And does it really in terms of cost balance out when you take that into consideration? Questions cost effectiveness when considering RR negotiations.	The Council continues discussions with BNSF for the use/purchase of 50 feet of their right-of-way. To date, BNSF has not agreed to any participation in the cost of the proposed BLRT Extension project. In accordance with NEPA and MEPA, the Council may not acquire any right-of-way until the Record of Decision has been published.
33A	Gallant	Linda	None provided	33	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I want to say that I think, first of all, I would guesstimate that the majority of people in this room today believe that this is a done deal, do not believe that there is any further consideration for being honestly and seriously given to the other routes. I think we should all focus on that. That's what people believe.	Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS summarizes the alternatives considered during the Alternatives Analysis Study and in the Draft EIS. In the AA report, 12 BRT and nine LRT alternatives were recommended for technical evaluation. The Draft EIS studied four LRT build alternatives, a BRT alternative, and a no-build alternative. Displacement is a significant impact, and the proposed BLRT Extension project has proactively avoided these impacts since the release of the Draft EIS. The evaluation of Alignments D1 and D2 from the Draft EIS considered several environmental and social issues and impact areas, and the selection of the D1 alignment for the proposed BLRT Extension project avoids impacts to the north Minneapolis neighborhood, including the large number of displacements.
33B	Gallant	Linda	None provided	33	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I think the report gives short shrift to the economic justice realities. Does not have any specifics, but how does this group that carefully avoids the population centers of North Minneapolis, carefully goes around them, how is it going to provide greater opportunities for people in my neighborhood. North Minneapolis, to get to better jobs? It says we're going to – I talked to the Metropolitan Transit person yesterday. We're going to look into that. We're going think about it. I think the time is now to be far more specific, far more focused, and far more willing to say this is what we're going to do in terms of if we're going to say this is a transit system to get people to those good jobs out in the burbs. We've got to say how we're going to do it, because right now we're not.	The study area for the EJ analysis documented 18.70 percent of the population below the poverty level and 48.40 percent of the study area population as minority groups. The proposed BLRT Extension project would benefit both EJ and non-EJ communities with reliable and higher-capacity service for transit riders, improved pedestrian and bicycle connections and access, and no residential property displacements. The full list of community benefits can be found in Chapter 7 – Environmental Justice of the Final EIS. The Council engaged members of the Blue Line Coalition during the Final EIS development phase to better understand their concerns based on this comment in the Draft EIS and also conducted public outreach to identify additional EJ populations in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. The Council will continue to work with the Blue Line Coalition and conduct direct outreach to EJ populations as design advances. The Council has been has been working with Hennepin County on the SAP efforts at each station, incorporating community input into the considerations of land uses, types of development, and other strategies to address neighborhood concerns and ensure that the investments have benefits to the local communities.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public Verbal Testimony

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
33C	Gallant	Linda	None provided	33	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	I think the report gives short shrift to the massive impact – 220 trains a day – on Theodore Wirth Park. I want more attention paid to what is going to be done to try to reduce, mitigate the impact of this 220 trains a day on the most wonderful park in the Twin Cities.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #14.
33D	Gallant	Linda	None provided	33	Verbal Testimony	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	Wants to see more about noise mitigation since DEIS does not mention	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
34A	Smithrud	Roger	None provided	34	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	Having a light rail that has set time schedules that they are posting and saying how long they will be there would make a dramatic difference for me.	The Final EIS assumes that trains would operate at 10-minute frequencies for weekday operations. Schedules would be posted online and overhead schedule systems would be at station platforms.
34B	Smithrud	Roger	None provided	34	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Favors D2 route rather than the D1 route.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
35A	Shabazz	Aasim	None provided	35	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Outreach and engagement is critical.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #6.
35B	Shabazz	Aasim	None provided	35	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Concerned about the environmental impact as far as on businesses along Olson Memorial Highway.	No businesses along Olson Memorial Highway would be displaced by the proposed BLRT Extension project. To mitigate impacts on businesses during construction, the Council will develop a Construction Mitigation Plan, a Construction Communication Plan, and a construction staging plan. These tools will help the Council notify businesses and patrons in advance about any access issues or closures. The construction staging plan will also help businesses and patrons affected by LRT construction understand when construction would occur in different areas of the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. Finally, a 24-hour construction hotline will be available for issue resolution and information about LRT construction. Chapter 3 – Transportation of the Final EIS addresses improvements to Olson Memorial Highway. Two stations would provide access to the communities along the highway: the Penn Avenue Station and the Van White Boulevard Station. While a six-lane roadway would be maintained, the lane widths would be reduced to 11 feet to accommodate pedestrian crossing length. The design speed and posted speed limit would be reduced to 35 mph. Existing sidewalks would be replaced with 6-foot-wide sidewalks on the north and south sides of the highway. Pedestrian refuges would be added in the median of the highway. ADA-compliant pedestrian crossings of Olson Memorial Highway would be facilitated by proposed signalized intersections at Bryant Avenue North, Van White Boulevard, Humboldt Avenue, James Avenue, Morgan Avenue, midblock between Newton Avenue and Oliver Avenue, Penn Avenue, Russell Avenue, and Thomas Avenue. The proposed BLRT Extension project would provide space on the north side of Olson Memorial Highway for a 10-foot two-way cycle track (to be constructed by others) between Thomas Avenue and Van White Boulevard. The proposed BLRT Extension project would include a multi-use trail on the north side of the reconstructed westbound Olson Memorial Highway bridge.
35C	Shabazz	Aasim	None provided	35	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	When we look at the impact of the station between the Plymouth – I guess we’re calling it Theodore Wirth Station – I’m not sure – and the Golden Valley Station, what is being done to look at or set correct expectations around the myths about the spacing and the lanes for the track and alternatives that are being presented right now? Because there are several arguments to say there’s not enough space, and that way they’re destroying wetlands. Are there opportunities to set that right in the near term, so in the final document, we know what the actual numbers are and what the potential damage is.	The Council used its regional travel demand forecasting model to develop the transit ridership forecasts for the proposed BLRT Extension project. The proposed BLRT Expansion project ridership modeling is discussed in Section 3.1 of the Final EIS. The Plymouth Avenue Station would have 229 riders per day, while the Golden Valley Road Station would have 905 riders per day, based on the results of the ridership model. Concerning wetlands: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #16.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
35D	Shabazz	Aasim	None provided	35	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	And the last part is the zoning around the three stops that are near North. That would be Van White, Plymouth, and then the one downtown at the interchange. When we look at that for the density, the residential, can we look at the development of the economic – the lack of economic business development opportunities that exist right now? It's heavily residential.	The Council has been working with Hennepin County on the SAP efforts at each station, incorporating community input into the considerations of land uses, types of development, and other strategies to address neighborhood concerns and ensure that the investments have benefits to the local communities. The Minneapolis Station Area Plan envisions mixed use and higher density residential near station areas along Olson Memorial Highway.
36A	Yaeger	Natalie	None provided	36	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Disappointed that the north side really hasn't been represented in the current plan for where the railway is going. LPA doesn't serve the needs of North Minneapolis residents. I'm very concerned about the bus rapid transit option for those reasons, and I would like to see a lot of investment provided for an equitable transportation system for our area. And I really feel that the light rail was that option.	The PAC recommended Alignment D1 over Alignment D2 because Alignment D1 would result in significantly less property and neighborhood impacts, improved travel time, greater cost-effectiveness, and less disruption of roadway traffic operations. Discussion focused on the adverse impacts of Alignment D2 and that Alignment D1 better meets the proposed BLRT Extension project goals. The costs (impacts) of Alignment D2 for the people on Penn Avenue would outweigh the potential benefits.
36B	Yaeger	Natalie	None provided	36	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Wants a stop in Golden Valley for North Minneapolis residents	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #19.
37A	Greene	David	ISIAAH	37	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Not enough time for the public hearing in terms of meeting length.	The Council strives to plan public hearings that allow all participants the ability to provide testimony. Your comment about the structure of public hearings has been noted; recent hearings have provided time for latecomers and those who do not initially sign up to speak. There are also alternative methods for providing comments during the comment period, such as submitting comments to the Council.
38A	Ware	Lenora	None provided	38	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Opposes the LRT if it results in the loss of residential properties and displacement of current residents. Doesn't want people to lose their homes.	Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would not displace any residential properties. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117.
38B	Ware	Lenora	None provided	38	Verbal Testimony	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	Concerned about tax money funding inequitable transit services between suburbs and the city of Minneapolis.	The proposed BLRT Extension project meets the purpose and need by effectively addressing long-term regional transit mobility and local accessibility needs while providing efficient, travel-time competitive transit service that supports economic development goals and objectives of local, regional, and statewide plans. Cost is one of a number of factors considered. Purpose and Need is discussed in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS and a financial analysis of the proposed BLRT Extension project is discussed in Chapter 10 of the Final EIS.
38C	Ware	Lenora	None provided	38	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Wants more safety, security, and a compassionate police force	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.
39A	Adams	Curtis	None provided	39	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Oppose the LRT if it results in the loss of residential properties and displacement of current residents. Doesn't want people to lose their homes.	Please see response to Comment 38A and MASTER RESPONSE #10.
40A	Lipke-Pier	Alyssa	None provided	40	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	Preference for Plymouth Avenue Station over Golden Valley Road, sited north of Plymouth Avenue to serve North Minneapolis residents. In favor of both stations if both can be funded. Having a station at Plymouth Avenue would set up Theodore Wirth as a destination park to draw from the metro along the light rail lines.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #19. The Plymouth Avenue Station would also be north of the street instead of south.
40B	Lipke-Pier	Alyssa	None provided	40	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	North Minneapolis is cut off from most of the surrounding amenities by major roads; desires pedestrian bridges into Wirth park over the train tracks and how paths that have been used generationally by residents will be impacted.	Pedestrian bridges, bicycle facilities, and sidewalks have been evaluated and resolved with local authorities and partners in the Final EIS. Pedestrian access to the Golden Valley Road Station would be from Golden Valley Road or Theodore Wirth Parkway. The trail on the Theodore Wirth Parkway bridge would be widened, and vertical circulation facilities to access the Golden Valley Road Station would be added to the Golden Valley Road bridge. A new trail would be built extending from Theodore Wirth Parkway to Sochacki Park, beneath the Golden Valley Road and Theodore Wirth Parkway bridges, connecting to the existing trail near Bonnie Lane.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public Verbal Testimony

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								A trailhead would be constructed at the eastern corner of the proposed Golden Valley Road Station park-and-ride. This trailhead would provide access to the existing Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board trail system and access to the proposed Bassett Creek Regional Trail that would be constructed by the Three Rivers Park District along Golden Valley Road. Near Plymouth Avenue, pedestrians would be able to access the station vertical circulation from Plymouth Avenue or from the Wirth Trail via a stair connection at the Plymouth Avenue bridge. Additional information can be found in Section 3.4 of the Final EIS.
41A	Bakion	Candy	None provided	41	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	I would like to make sure that you hold fast to keep a focus on keeping the light rail stations planning in the community and community focused with a lens on equity and affordable for all. And my hope is to provide economic advantages for the surrounding communities along the light rail and beautification along with that, also access in ways of for the youth, for the elders, for the middle class to be able to access the lines, providing alternative methods and support at station area planning, and to make it pretty, and to provide more resources to the powers that be to engage the community and provide some really cool swag.	Please see response to Comment 29A.

Brooklyn Park Hearing, May 13, 2014 – Verbal Testimony

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
49A	Lokken	Barbara	None provided	49	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I've got a couple of concerns certainly from where I live on what's happening. And one of them is what kind of – what will it do to the crime in the area. Brooklyn Park has so many problems with crime as it is now. And as a homeowner, I'm really concerned about what kind of crime it might bring to the area. And I know we don't have a crystal ball, and we can't predict that, but has there been any kind of a study done on that on other areas that have had light rail and how it's affected the crime in the area? So that's my first point.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.
49B	Lokken	Barbara	None provided	49	Verbal Testimony	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	My next point is that of noise. I'm just – there's a row of houses on the other side of us, and their backyards face West Broadway. And those people are going to have a lot of their backyards taken away. And I'm just really worried about the noise level that we're going to hear in the neighborhood and what's being done to help that noise level.	Concerning noise impacts: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17. The Final EIS analysis indicates that no properties along West Broadway Avenue (County State-Aid Highway 103) would experience noise impacts that would require mitigation. Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would not displace any residential properties. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117.
49C	Lokken	Barbara	None provided	49	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	And the third issue I have is that of property value. I'd like to see any kind of a study that's been done on property value and how it affects homes that are close to light rail. And how does the city respond to that? Or is it just tough luck for people who live close? You know?	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #7.
49D	Lokken	Barbara	None provided	49	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	And then I also have another question. Is there anything we can do to reverse it, maybe have that line go down not West Broadway but Highway 81? And I know they have done all kinds of studies and this and that, I'm sure. But as the people that live in Brooklyn Park, do we have any chance of reversing the current decisions on this? And if we do, how do we go about working through that process?	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
50A	Althouse	Randy	None provided	50	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I just wanted to say I read this literature, and I support the changes they're proposing. I think it's a great idea. And I like the new library idea and the light rail. I think it would be great, and I think it would help boost the property values of the homeowners in the area. That's really all I have to say.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2. Concerning property values: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #7.
51A	Ensrud	Lana	None provided	51	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	[Commenter is quoting articles about other light rail projects and wondering about effects of the BLRT Extension project] One article addresses the safety issue. This article is about the Green Line, which is launching soon. And it states that St. Paul Police are launching a safety campaign for drivers and pedestrians because trains will run as often as every 10 minutes. And the city council member in St. Paul said, quote, we got people crossing the barriers in some cases, we got motorists making left turns at times that they shouldn't or getting stuck in the middle of the intersection on the tracks in some cases, and we know that there have been accidents involving light rail.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #8.
51B	Ensrud	Lana	None provided	51	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	There's been an issue with vibrations and noise. One article talks about, for example, Minnesota Public Radio, where they say, quote, the floor is vibrating, the ceiling is shaking, the structure is making noise, and the Met Council has been forced to spend a million dollars' worth of concrete and rubber pads outside the MPR, a couple of churches in the area, and a U of M research lab.	Concerning vibration impacts: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #18. Concerning noise impacts: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
51C	Ensrud	Lana	None provided	51	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	There is an issue of how it will look, how hectic the area becomes. You know, to the southwest, residents are up in arms saying that the tranquility of those neighborhoods will be lost. The paper says they	Please see response to Comment 13C.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public Verbal Testimony

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							are worried about the aesthetics of 220 trains a day coming through their neighborhoods.	
51D	Ensrud	Lana	None provided	51	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	There's an issue with our own Brooklyn Park citizens, not just those who will lose their homes but anyone who currently drives on West Broadway or lives near it. You know, it is troubling to me that the decision on this light rail is being made by people who do not live in the neighborhoods. Our two city council members who oppose it are the only two of our city leaders who actually live in that district.	Regarding the loss of homes in Brooklyn Park, Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would not displace any residential properties. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117.
51E	Ensrud	Lana	None provided	51	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	There is article after article about light rail that raises red flags about the wisdom of putting a line right through the middle of our city, tearing up streets while it's being built, access to neighborhoods, businesses, churches after its built.	The Council expects the construction of the proposed BLRT Extension project to cause disruptions to traffic operations, including lane closures, short-term intersection and roadway closures, and detours that would cause local increases in congestion. The details of construction staging will be developed by the Council in future stages of project design. Maintenance of traffic (MOT) plans will be required to be developed during final design or construction and submitted for approval to the roadway authorities. The MOT plans will address construction phasing, maintenance of traffic, traffic signal operations, access through the construction work zone, road closures, and any traffic detours. Section 4.2 of the Final EIS discusses community facilities/community character and cohesion. For Brooklyn Park, the effects on community cohesiveness are confined to limited areas and would not present a substantial physical or social barrier affecting community cohesion. Short-term construction impacts would be mitigated by the use of deliberate construction staging or phasing, signage, and signal control requirements during construction for roads, trails, and sidewalks to maintain access to neighborhoods and community facilities throughout the construction period. Although specific mitigation plans have not yet been developed, Best Management Practices (BMPs) would include working with residents and community facility managers to provide alternative access, giving residents and community facilities adequate notice about construction plans and phasing, keeping access to bus stops open, and alerting the public to detours.
51F	Ensrud	Lana	None provided	51	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	And, you know, having said that, light rail is coming to Brooklyn Park. The only question is where that route should go. Common sense tells me it is not a wise decision for our city. You know, we've talked about this before.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
51G	Ensrud	Lana	None provided	51	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I have three questions for our city leaders I would like to hear the answers to. What is more desirable about the West Broadway route than any other option? Who will benefit specifically from this route? And why is Brooklyn Park unique from all these other suburbs who want light rail routed out of site and through unpopulated areas?	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
52A	McCarthy	John	None provided	52	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	I happen to live in a pocket neighborhood. If you do anything on West Broadway, you are going to severely hamper coming in and out of my neighborhood for all the residents in that neighborhood. I also work for the City of Minneapolis. And to this day, whenever I'm out on 26th and Hiawatha, all day long that light rail screws things up. You didn't put the money in there to sync the lights with the light rail. You still haven't fixed it. Things like that seem to be overlooked. You just want to cram the rail in and get the thing going, and it screws up the traffic wherever it goes. So syncing the lights.	Moving from an undivided configuration that allows full access into and out of every driveway along the West Broadway Avenue corridor to a divided configuration is expected to increase traffic capacity, improve traffic operations, and lower the rate of incidents (crashes). Multiple studies have documented the capacity, mobility, and safety improvements that can be achieved with this type of roadway design. By directing traffic to designated median openings, the proposed West Broadway Avenue corridor design would allow businesses and other private driveways full access to one direction of travel, with right-in/right-out access.
52B	McCarthy	John	None provided	52	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	Also, you want to widen West Broadway. Are you going to cut into the college's land as well as the residents, or are you going to do it all on one side until they get past the college and then widen it on both sides? Are you going to have a dogleg? That's going to affect you laying sewer, water, all of that.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives. Reference to West Broadway Avenue tech memos in Chapter 2 and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects of the Final EIS. The West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project would include

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								acquisition of some right-of-way from North Hennepin Community College; the college is coordinating with Hennepin County on this item. Utility reconstruction/relocation will be addressed as the design of West Broadway Avenue progresses.
52C	McCarthy	John	None provided	52	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Are you going to completely close down West Broadway as you're working on that project? And if you do so, when you do set up for the light rail for later, if you're planning on splitting it right down the middle of West Broadway, that doesn't work so good downtown. In the winter, I work nights. In the summer, I work during the day. Wherever the light rail runs downtown, even where the infrastructure is set up for it, when you can only be on this side of the tracks or this side, all you have are headaches. You have people that cannot figure it out. You're always having congestion and light issues and people trying to turn.	The West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project will include staging plans, maintenance of traffic plans, and other specifications to address maintaining traffic flow during construction. The Council will coordinate light rail construction-related activities with Hennepin County to facilitate coordinated communication to the public regarding both the West Broadway Avenue and proposed BLRT Extension projects. The proposed BLRT Extension project includes a variety of roadway modifications that would avoid new congested intersections, and, with one exception, the proposed BLRT Extension project would not worsen conditions at intersections under the No-Build Alternative in 2040. Additional information can be found in Section 3.3 of the Final EIS.
52D	McCarthy	John	None provided	52	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	Also, I don't know how the sewer system runs. When you start tearing all that up, are you going to have temporaries up for months and months and months while you refit?	Temporary service disruptions may result during construction of the proposed BLRT Extension project. Service disruptions would most likely be related to water distribution and sewer collection, although periodic temporary disruptions to local natural gas and electric service may also result. Coordination would occur with service providers (public and private) during construction and notices would be distributed to residents and business operators to alert of planned, temporary service disruptions. No long-term operational utility service changes are expected to result from the proposed BLRT Extension project.
52E	McCarthy	John	None provided	52	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	And will there be any additional assessments or levies put on us? Because you say, well, we're going to get the funding for this, and then this is going to pay for that. And then you go to do it, and, oh, gee, we're short of money, so guess who is going to take another short to pay for it.	A breakdown of funding sources is located in Table 10.1-2 of Chapter 10 –Financial Analysis of the Final EIS totaling \$1.496 billion. The Council is intending to seek Capital Investment Grant (CIG) Program funding from FTA. The Council assumes that the region will secure 49 percent of the capital cost from FTA through the New Starts fund (through the CIG Program). FTA must evaluate and rate proposed projects seeking funding from the CIG Program under a set of project justification and local financial commitment criteria specified in law. The criteria evaluate the merits of the proposed BLRT Extension project and the project sponsor's ability to build and operate it as well as the existing transit system. The other 51 percent of the proposed BLRT Extension project costs come from the State of Minnesota (10 percent), the Hennepin County Regional Rail Authority (10 percent), and the Counties Transit Improvement Board (31 percent).
53A	Ostroum	Mary	None provided	53	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	The answer to that question [replying to a question the commenter heard from city of Brooklyn Park council members about Maplebrook Estates citizen participation] is simple. We've been at work. Maplebrook Estates consists largely of working-class people, residents who basically pour every dime into improving their homes. Our homes are getting a little older. We're at the point now where we're replacing windows, putting in new furnaces, putting in new central air-conditioners. We are a group of residents who care deeply about making improvements to our townhomes and making them the best they can be, improvements, I think, that would never be compensated by the county in their purchase price of our properties. And I think, if anything, planners should be looking at decreasing speed limits on West Broadway, adding more stoplights, and respecting the fact that this is a residential neighborhood. I don't know whose advice the planners and politicians who work for this project have been taking, but I think, clearly, that it is the wrong advice for Maplebrook Estates.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue widening project. An EAW for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives. Reference to West Broadway Avenue tech memos in Chapter 2 and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects of the Final EIS. Chapter 3 of the Final EIS discusses additional design changes that are proposed for this area including reduced speed limits, new full-access signalized intersections, elimination of free right turns, and access controlled left turns. Concerning public involvement: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #6. Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would not displace any residential properties. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public Verbal Testimony

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
54A	Sutphen	Chuck	None provided	54	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	I'm one of those people who will be cut off. I won't be able to come here to meetings at the City Hall because the street will be torn up, and there's no way out of our neighborhood east – I mean west. There's no way out. So if you got West Broadway broken up, torn up, well, I won't be able to make any of the meetings.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue widening project. An EAW for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives. Reference to West Broadway Avenue tech memos in Chapter 2 and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects of the Final EIS. Mitigation measures for short-term (construction) impacts to roads and traffic would be implemented by the Council prior to and during construction through the Construction Mitigation Plan, which includes a Construction Communication Plan and a construction staging plan. The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), Hennepin County, and all municipalities affected by construction activities related to the proposed BLRT Extension project would require compliance with applicable state and local regulations related to the closing of roads and the effects of construction activities.
54B	Sutphen	Chuck	None provided	54	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	I spent seven years on the CLIC, the Citizen Long-Range Improvement Committee. And for six of those seven years, I tried to get people to fix this street, West Broadway, before some college kid gets run over, because there's no sidewalk on the west side of the street. And they keep saying, oh, we're going to have the light rail, we're going to get the light rail, we're going to get it all fixed.	Sidewalks are proposed on east side of West Broadway Avenue from 74th Avenue to 93rd Avenue park-and-ride station. Review of the LRT station locations with respect to pedestrians and bicyclists can be found in Section 3.4 of the Final EIS. Also, new or improved sidewalk crossing would be provided in final design at West Broadway Avenue. See Hennepin County's EAW on the widening of West Broadway Avenue.
54C	Sutphen	Chuck	None provided	54	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	There's a big mud puddle there at 83rd Avenue where the water won't run anywhere. In the wintertime, it's a sheet of ice. They won't fix it. They are waiting for the light rail. Well, I'm waiting for the light rail, too, to go somewhere else.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
54D	Sutphen	Chuck	None provided	54	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	I lived in New York where they have the L trains and the subways. I lived in Philadelphia where they had the L trains and subways. In the city proper, the trains were up, or they were underground. They weren't in the middle of the street. They took the trolleys out in Philadelphia and put in electric buses called trackless trams, tremendously more efficient than a train. And what about the geese who try to cross the street? They get run over by cars now. What's going to happen when the trains are coming through there, and the geese don't know to stop for the train?	See MASTER RESPONSES #13 and #20.
54E	Sutphen	Chuck	None provided	54	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	If I go to the V.A., when I go to make my left turn into the compound, the red light is on. You know how that works. That red light stays on forever. And then when it finally does turn green, the things are down, and the train comes. Then the light turns green again, and the trains come from the other way. So then the light turns red again, and you're sitting there for 10 minutes waiting to get into the V.A. Now, is that ridiculous or what?	The access to the Northwest Metro US Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Clinic would not be affected by the proposed BLRT Extension project.
54F	Sutphen	Chuck	None provided	54	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	So I would appreciate it – I mean, people need rapid transit. But the poor people who it's supposed to serve are not going to be able to get on the train because they have to take a taxi to the train station. I mean, my goodness, let's be practical. It's going to cost billions of dollars, and those dollars are not free, just like freedom isn't free.	The Final EIS includes an evaluation of the proximity of low-income populations and transit-dependent households to proposed stations as well as access to other enhanced transit options. Section 7.5 discusses how the proposed BLRT Extension project would "prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of, benefits by minority and low-income populations" and improve transit for those most dependent upon it as part of an integrated system.
54G	Sutphen	Chuck	None provided	54	Verbal Testimony	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	Freedom is not free. Your tax money, whether it's state, county, federal, it's all coming out of your pocket. And they are taking it to do some, what they call here a boondoggle. There's nobody that can ride that train for what it costs to operate it. Nobody.	A financial analysis of the proposed BLRT Extension project, including operating revenues, is discussed in Chapter 10 of the Final EIS. The funding for the operating and maintenance for the proposed BLRT Extension project comes first from the fare revenues; the remaining costs are split 50 percent state general funds and 50 percent Counties Transit Improvement Board. Minnesota Sessions Laws (2008) Section 473.4051 subd. 2 states that, after operating revenue and federal money have been used to pay for light rail operations, 50 percent of the remaining balance must be paid by the state of Minnesota (Minnesota Session Laws, 2008, Regular Session, Chapter 365 – House File No. 4072). State funding for transit operations is

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
								derived from general fund appropriations and is appropriated by the state legislature on a biennial basis.
55A	Berne	Chris	None provided	55	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I'm a light rail supporter, but I think the current plan up West Broadway is flawed. The roadway – I'll beg to differ what the Commissioner said earlier about that the road and the light rail are separate. They are integrated because the county wants to build the road now with light rail in mind, even though light rail hasn't been approved yet. So it is part and parcel of the same issue that we'll be talking about here next week.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An EAW for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives. Reference to West Broadway Avenue tech memos in Chapter 2 and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects of the Final EIS.
55B	Berne	Chris	None provided	55	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	The current plan for Broadway will dislodge 30 to 50 families out of a one-mile corridor of this road. And it will also negatively impact dozens of other families who don't necessarily butt up against the rail line but will be in very close proximity.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An EAW for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives. Reference to West Broadway Avenue tech memos in Chapter 2 and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects of the Final EIS. The West Broadway Avenue EAW disclosed that one building containing six residential units would be acquired if a signal were constructed at the West Broadway Avenue/Maplebrook Parkway intersection. No other residential displacements were identified in the EAW.
55C	Berne	Chris	None provided	55	Verbal Testimony	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	Many of these homes that will be taken are under water. Everybody that lives there is middle income or low income. Many of these are immigrant families who have come to this country to find a better way. This is their home. This is their dream. And it will be taken away from them.	Please see response to Comments 51D and 55B.
55D	Berne	Chris	None provided	55	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	In the Middlebrook Townhouse Association where I live, it's a development of 436 people – families, not people. Excuse me. Families. It is slated to lose dozens of homes. The cost to purchase these homes is multiplied because most of these units are either quads or six-plexes. So if you take one, you need to take four. Now, when you buy the home, you have not bought the land. The land is owned by the common interest community of Maplebrook Townhouse Association. That land will need to be purchased. Furthermore, with the loss of eight to ten percent of our homes in that community, there will be an ongoing, permanent loss of revenue for our community that will need to be part of this discussion.	Please see response to Comments 51D and 55B.
55E	Berne	Chris	None provided	55	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I have an alternative plan that I would like the engineers to take a look at. I've discussed it now with some of the city council members of Brooklyn Park and have gotten positive response. I'm a business owner, so I know what I'm going to be saying here may not sit well with business people. But I think what we need – what it needs to do is come in south of Fleet Farm along 83rd, go north up Wyoming, doglegging into Winnetka, across 610 where Winnetka used to go across. It is all public right-of-way. It is all roadway. There is not a single home that will be taken. There is not a single business that will need to be disrupted. There will be access issues, as there are access issues along Broadway. I get that. I understand that. But I think it deserves this consideration, and I think it needs to be looked at.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1. Also please see response to Comment 55A.
55F	Berne	Chris	None provided	55	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	If the light rail were to go there, one of the issues is the community college will not be directly served. They will be within three blocks. If you've ever lived in Minneapolis, taken public transport, walking three blocks to your bus stop is nothing. Once you get downtown, you might have to walk three, four, five, six blocks to get to where you're going. Three blocks to serve the community college is not an issue as far as I'm concerned.	The walkshed for stations is considered approximately one-half mile surrounding stations. Section 3.4 of the Final EIS summarizes pedestrian and bicycle improvements as part of the proposed BLRT Extension project

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public Verbal Testimony

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
55G	Berne	Chris	None provided	55	Verbal Testimony		We don't want another Southwest Light Rail debate here. Let's get this done right on the front side rather than spending tens of millions of dollars afterwards to fix a problem that wasn't done right initially.	The Council appreciates your concerns about the development of the proposed BLRT Extension project.
56A	Couture	Daniel	None provided	56	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	And my issue with the Draft Environmental Impact Study is the fact that it's incomplete and inaccurate. I'm going to just ask everyone in the room. If you own a home between – along West Broadway between 78th Avenue North and 93rd Avenue North, please raise your hand. Hold them up, please. I want everybody to see.	The Draft EIS discusses numerous alternatives that were analyzed as a part of the environmental review process. Key issues or changes to the locally preferred alternative (LPA) occurring since publication of the Alternatives Analysis were identified and analyzed in the Draft EIS and are summarized Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. The process included a public comment period which provided the public a forum to raise concerns with respect to environmental issues.
56B	Couture	Daniel	None provided	56	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	The folks who are raising their hands right now are not reflected in this Draft Environmental Impact Statement, because the properties between 78th Avenue and 93rd Avenue aren't included in any of the statistics that were considered when you were evaluating Option A to go through Maple Grove or Option B to go through Brooklyn Park.	The Policy Advisory Committee recommended Alignment B over Alignment A because Alignment B would provide better service to people who depend on transit and to key civic and educational destinations, and access to greater numbers of new jobs and development. Please see also MASTER RESPONSE #1.
56C	Couture	Daniel	None provided	56	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	Is anyone here to talk about wetlands, saving wetlands, or are we basically here to save our homes, maintain our property values, to enjoy the peace and quiet that we presently enjoy along West Broadway? We don't want light rail trains coming 500 times a day every 10 minutes, 21 hours a day, from 4:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. clanging their bells all along West Broadway.	Concerning wetlands: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #16. Concerning property values: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #7. Concerning noise impacts: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
56D	Couture	Daniel	None provided	56	Verbal Testimony	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	The issue that I have – a cynical person would say that the reason why the West Broadway reconstruction project was broken out from the light rail Bottineau Transitway was to separate and to hide the impact of these people's homes on the project, because, currently, you're only showing that you have to take eight homes along segment B, when, in fact, the true number is closer to 60. And the number of homes impacted is closer to 100, not the 30 that are listed. That's what we're here about. We're not here to save wetlands or trails. We're not asking you to dig tunnels. We want you to put this somewhere else. Keep it along 81. Take it up through the granite quarry and head it towards Maple Grove. These folks want to hang onto their homes. They want to maintain their property values. People want to live near transit. They don't want to live on transit.	Concerning the assessment of residential impacts along West Broadway Avenue, please see response to Comment 51D. The PAC recommended Alignment B over Alignment A because Alignment B would provide better service to people who depend on transit and to key civic and educational destinations, and access to greater numbers of new jobs and development. Concerning property values, please see MASTER RESPONSE #7.
56E	Couture	Daniel	None provided	56	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	I think everyone who has seen this is familiar with this document. It's a scorecard that they use to evaluate all the options. On here it says, if any area, any one area of an alternative is considered poor, the entire alternative is graded poor. I think the fact that we're going to be losing 60 homes along West Broadway and impacting another 100 homes that we're taking property from is going to grade the adverse impacts for the BCD1 option poor, which then makes the Maple Grove option the only non-poor option remaining.	While the acquisition of homes along West Broadway Avenue has been analyzed as part of the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project and not in the proposed BLRT Extension project, it should be noted that the total residential displacements along West Broadway Avenue as a result of both projects is one building containing six residential units. The Policy Advisory Committee recommended Alignment B over Alignment A because Alignment B would provide better service to people who depend on transit and to key civic and educational destinations, and access to greater numbers of new jobs and development.
57A	Hanson	Thomas Alfred	None provided	57	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I've lived in Brooklyn Park all my life. And I'm glad to see light rail coming up. My folks sold their house on 94 and Lyndale right where the fire station is, where an on-ramp – I bet everybody has drove up 94 and got on the on-ramp there from the farmer's market there at one time. And the freeway didn't actually end until 1979. My dad died before he ever had an opportunity to use it.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
57B	Hanson	Thomas Alfred	None provided	57	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	And you can't stop progress. Yeah, you can change it. You can alter it. But I do believe it's one of the best things that can possibly happen for Brooklyn Park. We have a lot of industry up there. We have the college. We have a new library coming. People who complain now are	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							probably not good for anybody in 20 or 30 years when it becomes a valuable asset, and there will be more traffic than there is today on 94, 81, 252. I know everybody loves sitting in traffic. Where you can sit on a train and fly down to downtown, and it's just like the trunk, the tree, little limbs coming into the main trunk and they zip you downtown. Three dollars to go from here to the airport, Mall of America, St. Paul or Southwest is a phenomenal idea.	
57C	Hanson	Thomas Alfred	None provided	57	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	Yeah, it's going to impact people. Impacted my folks. We moved to Brooklyn Park. I live close to it. I'm for it 100 percent. Yeah, there's maybe an alternative going up the railroad tracks all the way to Monticello, but that's not what we're here for. So I like the E555 alternative, BCD1 myself. And I think over a period of time, when we're all gone and we look back, it will be just like Chicago's L that's like riding a boxcar compared to light rail that goes down to the mall right now. And I'm glad to see the county and the city look ahead and say let's check Broadway before we decide to not build West Broadway and then turn around and tear it up a couple of months later or a couple of years later because all of a sudden it's going to go through no matter what. So I'm glad they're thinking ahead and working together as a team instead of everybody always saying they're spending my tax money, they should have done this before, they should have done this.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
57D	Hanson	Thomas Alfred	None provided	57	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	Well, everybody is commenting, and that's my comment. We've lost a lot of wetlands. We lose them all the time. And just take a drive out pheasant hunting in Montevideo, Minnesota. You can see drain tiling everywhere. I mean, you're worried about wetlands on West Broadway? Give me a break. There's drain tiling that just does not quit. And then they wonder why the rivers flood after the ground thaws and the drain tiles rip up.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #16.
58A	Kidd	Jean	None provided	58	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	My issue is with the Met Council, that this is going to switch over to their control so that your elected officials are no longer in the loop of decision making. And this body that will govern over this project is not elected. And that's my issue with this entire project is that a group of individuals that are hand-picked, hand-selected, and not involved in the election process where we as members of a democracy get to participate are going to be making decisions about all of us.	The Council is acting as the lead local project sponsor for the proposed BLRT Extension project. Several advisory committees including a community advisory committee, business advisory committee, technical project advisory committee, corridor management committee, and issue resolution teams have been formed. The advisory committees are made up of citizens, local elected officials, city and parks staff, and regional elected officials. Chapter 9 of the Final EIS provides a summary of public involvement and advisory committees.
58B	Kidd	Jean	None provided	58	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	When it comes to the wetlands, I don't know how they're going to navigate or where they're proposing multiple stations right outside my door. And it's interesting that two bridges, one on Golden Valley Road and then one on Plymouth, were just recently redone. Their tracks would not fit underneath that. So you're talking about draining the wetlands down there. And I find it interesting that they want to propose a station on Plymouth Avenue when in fact I was part of a process when the bus company wanted to stop having bus service on Plymouth Avenue because they said we don't have the ridership to support it anymore. Then, lo and behold, we're going to put a station there.	Concerning wetlands: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #16. The bridges that span the BNSF rail corridor at Plymouth Avenue, Theodore Wirth Parkway and Golden Valley Road are being reconstructed. These reconstruction efforts are factored into the wetlands mitigation analysis in Section 5.3 of the Final EIS. Section 3.1 of the Final EIS reports ridership forecasts for boarding and alighting data by station. The Plymouth Avenue Station forecasts 229 daily boardings for the station. The station would be served by route 7.
58C	Kidd	Jean	None provided	58	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	I am for light rail. What I'm looking for, though, is transparency in the process. And that, to me, does not exist. I don't know what's gone on from what I saw originally in 2008 what was proposed and what's looking – what I'm looking at now. It wasn't even remotely similar. And where did that happen? Because I've been involved. And it was like all of a sudden we've got a completely different project. And no one will – everybody always says, oh, well, I wasn't involved in the	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #6.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public Verbal Testimony

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							project back then. I don't know what happened. I'm not there. It's where is the accountability? Who does know? Linda Higgins probably knows. I know. The members of my community know. But like everybody here, they tend to take that path of least resistance where they think they can put things through and no one will show up. I'm so happy everybody showed up here. So I'm looking for transparency, and I want the Met Council to be a voted-on body, not people that just get to be put on there to make decisions and the elected officials are no longer in that process and then we say, oh, the Met Council did it. That's not fair. That's not why we live in America.	
59A	Greenman	Scott	None provided	59	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I've lived in Brooklyn Park for 13 years. I grew up in San Francisco and in and around San Francisco, one of the only cities to keep their rail system. I've lived in Chicago. I spent a summer in New York. I know what rail does, and I'm for this project.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
59B	Greenman	Scott	None provided	59	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I live at 7575 Louisiana Avenue North, which is an impacted property, right across from Cub and Target. Those homes – those twin homes are impacted. And it looks like they're going to go from what it says – what the map says.	Section 4.3 of the Final EIS discloses temporary and permanent acquisitions and displacements of residences and businesses. The Draft EIS identified four residential properties on the west side of West Broadway Avenue just south of 76th Avenue as total acquisitions. The additional engineering and environmental analysis conducted as part of the Final EIS process indicates that those four residential properties would no longer be total acquisitions; partial acquisition of the westernmost portion of those properties would be necessary, but the residences would remain in place. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117.
59C	Greenman	Scott	None provided	59	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I think this project, and especially the alignment going up Broadway, is basically going to connect Target to Target, Minneapolis to Brooklyn Park North. And I think there are better ways to do it. We have a rail line that goes to Monticello, goes right into Maple Grove. Why not use that? Maple Grove probably doesn't want it. What do you think? I think they don't.	The Policy Advisory Committee recommended Alignment B over Alignment A because Alignment B would provide better service to people who depend on transit and to key civic and educational destinations, and access to greater numbers of new jobs and development.
59D	Greenman	Scott	None provided	59	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	I'm going to be impacted, like I said. I'm for the project. It's – I don't see any of my neighbors here. Does anyone live in that area? Anyone? Anyone? No? It's a big thing. Literally, my view is Cub and Target. And I'm – I don't know. I'm nervous. I'm concerned. And I'm trying to lend my voice to what's going on. And I'll be at all the other meetings, and I will keep an eye on what's going on.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #6.
60A	Jones	Steve	None provided	60	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	I just found out about this shortly before the last meeting. And the lack of transparency around this is really concerning to me, as several other people have said. And now I'm just getting involved in it. I think we just need to look at it a little more. What's coming out in spades here is that what we're building here is a conduit to Target for low cost labor for them, and we're ruining my neighborhood for them, and I don't like it.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #6.
61A	Kuehn	Harry	None provided	61	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	I just have a few comments. One of the council members at the last meeting said where have you been. He goes, where have you been? It's been in the papers. Yes, we all know that. Don't treat us like an idiot. We know it's coming. But the impact is not known. For example, if you want a new house, you have to be 50 feet at least minimum from the roadway. Now they are going to put that thing 20 feet from my deck. That's okay. We're going to grandfather you in. Thank you. You know? It's nuts. And I guess the city council members, were you going to put your face on the side of this train going down the road?	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An EAW for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives. Reference to West Broadway Avenue tech memos in Chapter 2 and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects of the Final EIS.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Comment	Official Response
							Because that will be your legacy. And would any of you want this thing to run 20 feet from your house? I don't think anybody would.	
62A	Kroll	George	None provided	62	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	I think we've heard a lot of good comments so far. And it seems like the people here realize that light rail is probably going to come. The question is what's it around. I think there's a lot of people in the community who aren't represented here tonight. And I just want to urge everyone to take one of these Bottineau Transitway forms and take them home. It says, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement." They were in that room out there. Get a copy. Circulate them to your neighbors. Make sure that your neighbors and that you yourselves send in your comments to the Hennepin County Housing, Community Works, and Transit so that your voices can be heard. We all need to rally our community members who aren't here so that their opinions can be heard.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #6.
62B	Kroll	George	None provided	62	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	And I'm thinking the majority opinion here is that we don't want light rail coming down West Broadway. I think people realize that light rail will come, but there are better alternatives. And we need to make sure the people who aren't represented here in our community have their voices heard and these forms get into our decision makers. So I'm just urging everyone to do that.	Please see MASTER RESPONSES #1 and #6.

Crystal Public Hearing, May 14, 2014 – Verbal Testimony

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Issue	Comment	Official Response
75A	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	75	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	1	Eliminating BRT as an option is unacceptable. If you do, you will only increase opposition to LRT. You have planned a good BRT grid on the north side. If you ran BRT down 81, you would have enough money to add an east-west route that connects 81 with Lowry. A lot of the public speakers at the May 7 public hearing spoke in support of Bus Rapid Transit. I would have, too, but my comments were cut off at three minutes. So this is the kind of Draft EIS you get when it's written to achieve one thing. LRT down the BN line is manipulative. 560 million for BRT. It's full of vague, rambling statements such as, Other elements of the project are established formally during subsequent engineering based on additional information, including openly near travel demand forecasts.	Please see response to Comment 33A.
75B	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	75	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	3	Indeed, elements of the project are established, but they are not divulged. No map of the wetlands you intend to fill in, though you say you plan to fill in six acres with D1.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #16.
75C	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	75	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	10	No boring test results, which are of interest to property owners.	Chapter 5 (Section 5.4) of the Final EIS discusses poor or substandard soils. Detailed geotechnical analysis, including boring tests, has been conducted and the findings from those analyses are reflected in the Final EIS and project design. Chapter 5 (Section 5.5) of the Final EIS discusses hazardous and contaminated materials.
75D	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	75	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	4	No map of staging areas, though Robbinsdale is already prepping your way into one in Sochacki Park.	Staging areas a shown on the Engineering Drawings found in Appendix E of the Final EIS. Also, please see MASTER RESPONSE #15.
75E	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	75	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	5	You could have more accurately designated traction power stations.	A discussion of the traction power substations (TPSSs) can be found in Section 2.5.2.3 of the Final EIS. Currently, there are 17 TPSSs being proposed. TPSS sites would be about 4,000 square feet and able to accommodate a single-story building about 40 feet by 20 feet. Further design refinements would be completed as the proposed BLRT Extension project moves into the design phase. Locations for TPSSs are shown in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS.
75F	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	75	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	3	You came up with so many maps that did not include Turtle Pond and other wetlands.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #16. Turtle Pond is designated as Grimes Pond in the mapping that has been obtained by the Council.
75G	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	75	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	2	People wonder if you are so reticent with information because you're trying to minimize the window of opportunity we have to repel your plans.	Concern about the timing of public involvement has been noted. The Council strives to alert community members to upcoming events and opportunities for public input regarding the proposed BLRT Extension project. Events are usually advertised at least two weeks prior to their occurrence. Council staff are available to follow up individually with any community member that requests additional information or is unable to attend an open house or other event.
75H	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	75	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	1	We wonder if you were even at the step to do a Draft EIS, it lacks so much information.	The Draft EIS was prepared and published in accordance with NEPA and MEPA requirements. The level of information disclosed in the Draft EIS was consistent with other documents prepared for other LRT projects throughout the country.
75I	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	75	Verbal Testimony	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	4	And then back to the quote. Other elements of the project are established formally during subsequent engineering. Does this include the social engineering you do to get this LRT built? All those it's happening in articles in newspapers when Bot No! has never gotten state matching funds? The social engineering with these public hearings is unimpressive also.	The Council is unaware of "social engineering" as a component of the proposed BLRT Extension project. The proposed BLRT Extension project has been developed in accordance with general transportation and transit planning/engineering practices. A breakdown of funding sources is located in Table 10.1-2 of Chapter 10 – Financial Analysis of the Final EIS totaling \$1.496 billion. The Council is intending to seek CIG Program funding from FTA for one or more of the alternatives examined in this NEPA document. The Council assumes that the region will secure 49 percent of the capital cost from FTA through the New Starts fund (through the CIG Program). FTA

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Issue	Comment	Official Response
									must evaluate and rate proposed projects seeking funding from the CIG Program under a set of project justification and local financial commitment criteria specified in law. The criteria evaluate the merits of the proposed BLRT Extension project and the proposed BLRT Extension project sponsor's ability to build and operate it as well as the existing transit system. The other 51 percent of funding for the proposed BLRT Extension project would be provided by the State of Minnesota (10 percent), the Hennepin County Regional Rail Authority (10 percent), and the Counties Transit Improvement Board (31 percent).
75J	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	75	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	13	The BCD1 plan would go through St. Mary Hills Park on its eastern border, Sochacki on its eastern border, Wirth on its eastern and sometimes western borders, South Halifax Park on its western border, and St. Mary Hills Nature Area is very close to that. That's five parks.	The Final EIS and Amended Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation address the effects of the proposed BLRT Extension project on parklands and recreational properties and determine whether there are reasonable or prudent alternatives for avoiding the identified park impacts. This evaluation was accomplished in coordination with Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, the Three Rivers Park District, municipalities, and other governmental entities. These efforts included consideration of project sequencing (avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures) to minimize harm to Section 4(f)/6(f) resources.
75K	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	75	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	4	The number one reason people give for their opposition is protecting the woods...I have listened to many owners of wildlife habitat that abuts the BN line or park wildlife habitat. This Draft EIS gives us no reason to trust you with our woods.	Section 5.8 of the Final EIS describes the preferred habitats of rare, threatened, and endangered species in the study area and the expected impacts to plants and animals and their habitat from the No-Build Alternative and the proposed BLRT Extension project. The analysis includes all federally listed endangered and threatened species that have been documented in the area. Additionally, the Council reviewed the DNR NHIS Database, which provides information about Minnesota's Special Concern and State Watchlist plants and animals, native plant communities, and other sensitive rare natural resource features. Species of State Special Concern and species on the State Watchlist have no specific legal protections under state endangered species law. Similarly, inventoried native plant communities have no specific legal protection. The proposed BLRT Extension project has been designed to minimize the impacts to forested park property; design, woodland impacts, and mitigation have been discussed with the cities of Golden Valley and Robbinsdale, the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, and the Three Rivers Park District. Mitigation would include revegetation of temporarily impacted areas; in many cases the clearing and revegetation efforts would remove invasive species.
75L	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	75	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	1	I can say with assurance that the true and localized you can get preference is no build.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
75M	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	75	Verbal Testimony	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	1	We do not understand your aversion to Bus Rapid Transit down Bottineau Boulevard, also known as Highway 81, the originally planned route. Your \$56 million estimated cost for Bus Rapid Transit would probably make it the most expensive BRT per mile project in the country. You achieve this poor economic showing for Bus Rapid Transit by calculating the cost of it going down a railroad track...BRT down 81 is very popular. It keeps LRT out of our woods, it's closer to more densely populated areas, and it's cheaper. It's the mass transit of the 21st Century. A state-of-the-art BRT system in the Northwest Metro would be a fine legacy for Met Council and Hennepin County planners to provide transit users. Eliminating BRT as an option, as you're trying to do with this Draft EIS, is unacceptable. If you do, you will only increase opposition.	Please see response to Comment 33A.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public Verbal Testimony

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Issue	Comment	Official Response
								More than half of the speakers at the May 7 public hearing spoke in favor of Bus Rapid Transit. And I would have, too, but my comments were cut off at three minutes.	
75N	Bonniwell	Constance	None provided	75	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	8	Your environmental report never mentions that zero emission natural gas buses are available.	Presumably the commenter is referring to low emission natural gas powered buses. Natural-gas-powered buses would have a combustion engine that emits air pollutants, so they are not a “zero-emission” mode of transportation.
76A	Thoman	Barb	Transit for Livable Communities	76	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	6	Transit for Livable Communities has a number of members with disabilities who cannot drive and/or afford a vehicle	Metro Transit continually evaluates the needs of transit riders, including the introduction of mobility zones to areas where they may be useful. This analysis would be done as part of evaluating final service plans prior to the start of proposed BLRT Extension project revenue operations.
76B	Thoman	Barb	Transit for Livable Communities	76	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	1	The Bottineau Project is a really important link in an expanded transit system. The project, along with 2 arterial rapid bus, more express bus service, more local service, and additional rail lines are greatly needed in this region.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
76D	Thoman	Barb	Transit for Livable Communities	76	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	3	Line is important because it will connect people to jobs and parks since a lot of people who cannot get to parks because currently there is a lack of transit to parks.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
76E	Thoman	Barb	Transit for Livable Communities	76	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	13	Important to provide access to parks.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #19. Two stations, at Golden Valley Road and Plymouth Avenue, are adjacent to Theodore Wirth Regional Park and are included in the Final EIS; see Chapter 2.
76F	Thoman	Barb	Transit for Livable Communities	76	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	4	Parking is a problem at parks in the region that could be addressed by light rail access to parks.	Chapter 3 of the Final EIS discusses ridership by station and by mode: walk/bike, drive, and transit. Theodore Wirth Regional Park would be accessible by users of the proposed BLRT Extension project from the Plymouth Avenue and Golden Valley Road stations.
76G	Thoman	Barb	Transit for Livable Communities	76	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	8	LRT reduces emissions.	Comment noted.
76H	Thoman	Barb	Transit for Livable Communities	76	Verbal Testimony	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	2	LRT is very cost efficient and has the lowest subsidy per passenger because of frequency and capacity.	A financial analysis of the proposed BLRT Extension project is discussed in Chapter 10 of the Final EIS. The purpose and need for the proposed BLRT Extension project is discussed in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS.
76I	Thoman	Barb	Transit for Livable Communities	76	Verbal Testimony	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	4	Need more funding in the region for transit projects and wants people to support the Move Minnesota effort to increase funding for public transit, walking, biking, and road repair.	A breakdown of funding sources is located in Table 10.1-2 of Chapter 10 – Financial Analysis of the Final EIS totaling \$1.496 billion. The Council is intending to seek CIG Program funding from FTA for one or more of the alternatives examined in this NEPA document. The Council assumes that the region will secure 49 percent of the capital cost from FTA through the New Starts fund (through the CIG Program). FTA must evaluate and rate proposed projects seeking funding from the CIG Program under a set of project justification and local financial commitment criteria specified in law. The criteria evaluate the merits of the proposed BLRT Extension project and the proposed BLRT Extension project sponsor’s ability to build and operate it as well as the existing transit system.
77A	Nieman	Scott	None provided	77	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	1	And one of the observations that I have, there’s no one here from the City of Minneapolis, the city council. And I do want to make a statement that, first of all, I’m very much in favor of the Bottineau Transitway, but I do think it’s under serving North Minneapolis in its current preferred option.	The Council appreciates your support for the proposed BLRT Extension project. The PAC recommended Alignment D1 over Alignment D2 because Alignment D1 would result in significantly less property and neighborhood impacts, improved travel time, greater cost-effectiveness, and less disruption of roadway traffic operations. Discussion focused on the adverse impacts of Alignment D2 and that Alignment D1 better meets the proposed BLRT Extension project goals. The costs (impacts) of Alignment D2 for the people on Penn Avenue would outweigh the potential benefits.
77B	Nieman	Scott	None provided	77	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	2	Section 2.6, there’s a statement on the least damage to the environment. It contradicts the statements in the summary of Table 5.21, which shows that there was over 18,000 cubic yards of flood plain impact. That is not the least damage. I	As the agency tasked with regulating compliance with the Clean Water Act, USACE reviews documents related to the planning and design of infrastructure projects. They review all potential impacts of all alternatives proposed. Impacts include social impacts, environmental impacts and economic impacts. Some proposed

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Issue	Comment	Official Response
								think most people know that the Theodore Wirth Parkway, the D1-7 wetland floods every single year. That concerns me significantly because of what would be planned for mitigation of that would probably be dredging or some other means to divert water which is in the floodplain.	alternatives may have high social impacts and other alternatives may have high environmental impacts. USACE is required to consider all impacts and must decide which alternative is the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA). Thus, the LEDPA is a "best balance" alternative. The proposed BLRT Extension project, as described in the Final EIS, proposes 17,000 cubic yards of floodplain fill. However, mitigation for this fill would be required and would counteract the effects of the fill.
77C	Nieman	Scott	None provided	77	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	1	I really think that the D2 alternative was not adequately looked at. I do not see any evidence of a subway option being investigated to go underneath West Broadway and have a substation at where the old Burger King resided. An escalator going down and having a subway under Penn Avenue, which would have reduced impact to land acquisitions, would have lower, long-term maintenance cost.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #20.
77D	Nieman	Scott	None provided	77	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	4	It [a D2 subway alternative] would have really no impact to vehicle traffic except during construction.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #20.
77E	Nieman	Scott	None provided	77	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	7	And it [a D2 subway alternative] would have improved safety risks for pedestrians and vehicles. Similar – you know, we've had lots of accidents on Hiawatha. We don't want anymore, especially in this area.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #20.
77F	Nieman	Scott	None provided	77	Verbal Testimony	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	2	I do think that placing a substation [assume that the commenter meant an LRT station] at Penn and Broadway provides incredible economic development opportunities in an area that's been long trying to have an arts district serving the Capri Theater and other venues in the 5 Corners [sic] development effort. That has just basically failed. So – done?	The proposed BLRT Extension project is expected to have positive effects on the commercial and residential areas along the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor. It is anticipated that the proposed BLRT Extension project would contribute economic benefits by encouraging and supporting higher-density residential and commercial land uses around transit stations, including those in EJ neighborhoods consistent with local planning efforts. Increased mobility to both residents and business patrons within the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor is expected to support existing businesses and allow for their future growth. New transportation facilities could also create competitive advantages for businesses located in the proposed BLRT Extension project corridor.
78A	Nelson	Jolene	None provided	78	Verbal Testimony	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	1	The line runs right behind my house, so the railroad is right behind my house. And my main concern with this is with the track moving, it's going to move closer to my home causing – the railroad track itself, causing more noise and vibration...and the highway noise from County Road 81, in addition to the light rail running, it's going to cause more noise there and vibration as well...Is there going to be any kind of noise mitigation, whether that be trees planted in place of what's taken down? Is there going to be a new wall to minimize the amount of noise and vibration that would happen?	Concerning noise impacts: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17. Concerning vibration impacts: Please see MASTER RESPONSE #18. The commenter's home is on Hampshire Avenue; the Final EIS discloses that there would be no noise or vibration impacts to homes on Hampshire Avenue.
78B	Nelson	Jolene	None provided	78	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	4	And currently, there's trees that have grown up around there and in my backyard where my son plays. So my concern would be those trees are going to be removed, and I'm not going to see the train right away.	Much of the forested area in the proposed BLRT Extension project area is severely degraded from infestation of European buckthorn. Dense growth of European buckthorn limits regeneration of desirable tree species and with time eliminates any native herbaceous cover. Some of the areas disturbed from construction that lie outside of the trackage would be revegetated with a diverse compliment of tree and herbaceous species. In certain areas of the proposed BLRT Extension project area, fencing may be considered to provide visual screening.
78C	Nelson	Jolene	None provided	78	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	1	And so my concern is how fast the speeds are going to be.	The proposed BLRT Extension project is being designed to operate at speeds up to 55 mph.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public Verbal Testimony

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Issue	Comment	Official Response
79A	Fischer	Bob	None provided	79	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	1	A couple of points. I certainly won't take my three minutes. I've lived in a city, in D.C., that had the Metro. So I know the advantages of that. So I'm 100 percent supportive of this. And I'm also supportive that it's going in my backyard.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #2.
79B	Fischer	Bob	None provided	79	Verbal Testimony	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	1	To Jolene's point, there needs to be some type of a barrier established. Whether it's natural or if it's a wall or if it's a wall with sound board, there certainly needs to be something, because it's disappointing to see the goals and not – there could be as easy a sixth goal of protecting the people that will be involved in this.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17. No noise impacts were identified at the homes along Hampshire Avenue, therefore no noise barriers would be implemented at this location. However, visual screening options will be explored as the proposed BLRT Extension project design process continues.
79D	Fischer	Bob	None provided	79	Verbal Testimony	8 – Transportation System Effects	6	I think there's a better opportunity to involve more people, because I work with developmentally disabled adults and senior populations. This just opens up a whole new world for them. So I applaud that.	Metro Transit continually evaluates the needs of transit riders, including the introduction of mobility zones to areas where they may be useful. This analysis would be done as part of evaluating final service plans prior to the start of proposed BLRT Extension project revenue operations.
79C	Fischer	Bob	None provided	79	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	2	I've lived in my house for three years. I've not gotten one piece of mail telling me that this was going to happen in my backyard. So I don't think that's asking for too much, because I know our neighbors up and down Hampshire Avenue would all take the same position as I have. I accidentally found out about this. And I know you've met your obligations by posting this how you need to, and it's on the public forum. But I think a piece of snail mail in three years would have been appropriate. So I'm very disappointed in that lack of communication.	Concern about the timing of public involvement has been noted. Chapter 9 of the Final EIS provides a summary of public involvement for the Final EIS, including a summary of open houses held during Final EIS preparation. The Council strives to alert community members to upcoming events and opportunities for public input regarding the proposed BLRT Extension project. Events are usually advertised at least two weeks prior to their occurrence. Council staff are available to follow up individually with any community member that requests additional information or is unable to attend an open house or other event.
80A	Couture	Daniel	None provided	80	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	1	I'm not against light rail. I understand the need for transit basically to support, you know, the growing population needs and disperse populations. However, I am coming here tonight to basically speak out against the locally preferred options known as BCD1 in favor of ACD1 primarily because – and it's unfortunate that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement doesn't accurately reflect the impact to the properties along West Broadway between 78th Avenue and 93rd Avenue to the north.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1. Also please see response to Comment 51D about acquisitions and displacements.
80B	Couture	Daniel	None provided	80	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	5	Because of a concurrent county project, which is barely referenced in the 800 pages – it's one paragraph out of the 800 pages where it talks about this project. Because of it, there's 100 homes that are going to be impacted, property that's going to be taken. About half those homes, at least 50 of them, the families are going to be displaced.	Please see response to Comment 51D about acquisitions and displacements.
80C	Couture	Daniel	None provided	80	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	15	And they're probably the lucky ones, because it's probably going to be financially devastating to the ones that are left behind. The ones that are going to be stuck with homes that could be as little as 50 feet away from the transit line, that are going to be virtually unsellable	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #7.
80D	Couture	Daniel	None provided	80	Verbal Testimony	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	5	[Homes along West Broadway Avenue] would not be the kind of place, I think, anybody would want to live because these trains run 21 hours a day every 10 minutes, and they have very loud bells that clang anywhere near a station. And 85th Avenue would be a station.	Please see MASTER RESPONSES #17 and #21.
80E	Couture	Daniel	None provided	80	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	1	These are modest homes. This is a working-class neighborhood. Folks who live there are – there's a large number of seniors, a large minority population. A lot of the	The Council engages and will continue to engage the public in the preliminary engineering process and into construction. The Council will be key in notifying businesses and residents of construction plans, road closures and bus re-routes as

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Issue	Comment	Official Response
								folks can't make it to meetings like here tonight because they're still at work or they are having dinner with – sitting down to dinner with their families.	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.
80F	Couture	Daniel	None provided	80	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	2	I think, unfortunately, if the folks who are evaluating those various alternatives knew about these additional 100 homes that are going to be impacted, if they knew about the additional 50 families that would need to be displaced, I think it would definitely have affected the community cohesion score that the B segment would have received. I think that would have made it easier for folks to vote in favor of the Option A for the locally preferred option.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1. Please see response to Comment 51D about acquisitions and displacements.
80G	Couture	Daniel	None provided	80	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	3	The benefits – the price tags for the A versus B are the same. Both a billion dollars. Both have similar ridership of about 27,000 average riders a day. They both have a college as a destination. They both have major employers as well as residents at the tail end of the property. But the one thing that Maple Grove has that Brooklyn Park doesn't offer is a major regional retail center. So for that reason, I hope that it's not too late that the commissioners involved with making a final decision on what route is chosen could reconsider their option to go down West Broadway and vote in favor of ACD1.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
81A	Reiter	Christopher	None provided	81	Verbal Testimony	3 – NEPA Process and Public Involvement	2	First off, which by the way, we've had hearings – public hearings in Minneapolis, Brooklyn Park, Crystal, and one more – Golden Valley. But there hasn't been one for Robbinsdale, which I don't think is very fair. I think there should be one set up.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #6. The Council has hosted numerous events for public input in the City of Robbinsdale. Open houses, public hearings, and city council work sessions have all been organized to provide information about the proposed BLRT Extension project and to solicit feedback from community members. The outreach team also attends community events and presents to local organizations.
81B	Reiter	Christopher	None provided	81	Verbal Testimony	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	1	There's a lot of homeowners that are going to be impacted, many severely, according to the noise portion of this analysis, including myself...I do see – I'm reviewing the impact statement here that they plan on putting up – there's a plan to put up some barriers, but it doesn't say how high they are.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
81C	Reiter	Christopher	None provided	81	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	5	My tool and lawn shed and my fence will be impacted. The power line pole and probably a few 20 trees and numerous shrubberies that block that whole sight line towards the railroad tracks would have to be removed.	Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would not displace any residential properties. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117.
81D	Reiter	Christopher	None provided	81	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	1	And with these scheduled to go by every 10 minutes, I can envision the value of my property plummeting to about probably maybe 70 percent of what it's worth right now if this goes through. And that's pretty optimistic, in my opinion.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #7.
81E	Reiter	Christopher	None provided	81	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	8	I honestly think that either the line should run on Highway 81 and then Bottineau Boulevard. I don't think it should not only [sic] be going through all those houses that are impacted in Crystal and many in Robbinsdale, but if it's going to go to the – if it has to go in as opposed to buses – I know Connie mentioned the natural gas buses, which I think would be a great alternative. We could use existing infrastructure for that. It wouldn't have not only the impact of all the light rails going by every 10 minutes, but the construction. So I think that it should – the whole line should run along there. And as	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1. Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS summarizes the alternatives considered during the Alternatives Analysis Study and in the Draft EIS. In the AA report, 12 BRT and nine LRT alternatives were recommended for technical evaluation. The Draft EIS studied four LRT build alternatives, a BRT alternative, and a no-build alternative.

METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit Extension Project – Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS – General Public Verbal Testimony

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Issue	Comment	Official Response
								opposed to the 42nd Avenue Station by the police department there, they should just have a station down at the corner of 42nd and Bottineau Boulevard. And right now, there's quite a good section of Bottineau that already has a major median running down the middle of it, which could be expanded out a little bit to accommodate the light rail.	
81F	Reiter	Christopher	None provided	81	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	1	But I just – I don't see the benefit of this program to anybody that happens to be severely impacted or even marginally impacted by this line. And I know we've had some other hearings, and I've been to one or two other hearings previously. And I just don't understand why with all this major impact to homeowners who – like in my case, this is my first house.	Section 4.3 of the Final EIS summarizes acquisitions and displacements. The proposed BLRT Extension project would not displace any residential properties. Loss of private residential property would be mitigated by payment of fair market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Minn. Stat. 117.
81G	Reiter	Christopher	None provided	81	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	3	And I don't really have the means to relocate right now, although I would like to because I know, like I said, just as soon as the work starts, the value of my property – the ability to sell it is going to – it's going to be hard to even sell at that point. And I don't know – I don't know how I'm possibly going to sleep at night with trains going by every 10 minutes	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #7.
81H	Reiter	Christopher	None provided	81	Verbal Testimony	6 – Noise and Vibration Effects	3	And I don't know – I don't know how I'm possibly going to sleep at night with trains going by every 10 minutes and get up for work at Hennepin County.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #17.
81I	Reiter	Christopher	None provided	81	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	5	I really wish you would take a close look at reexamining the whole line that runs off of already existing thoroughfares.	Please see MASTER RESPONSE #1.
82A	Berne	Chris	None provided	82	Verbal Testimony	5 – Environmental Effects	15	The issue for us up in Brooklyn Park, as Dan Couture talked about a little bit earlier, is the final terminus route of this project up through the West Broadway corridor in Brooklyn Park. We are on an extremely fast track up there because the county in its wisdom is going to be rebuilding West Broadway. And what they want to do is make assumptions at this point in time that the rail line is going to go through, and they want to build the road with that in mind. The problem is it's going to take 30 to 50 homes with the idea that this might come through, and they want to do it starting this fall. So we're very concerned about that.	Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project. An EAW for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS discloses this information in Chapter 2 – Alternatives. Reference to West Broadway Avenue tech memos in Chapter 2 and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects of the Final EIS. The West Broadway Avenue EAW disclosed that one building containing six residential units would be acquired if a signal were constructed at the West Broadway Avenue/Maplebrook Parkway intersection. No other residential displacements were identified in the EAW. Please see response to Comment 51D.
82B	Berne	Chris	None provided	82	Verbal Testimony	4 – Social and Economic Effects	5	Most of these homes are modest income, low income. There's a lot of minorities. The other thing that we have in Brooklyn Park is a lot of immigrants. And a lot of immigrant families who have come to this country with the great old American dream of home ownership are now going to be told you have to leave your home. That's not the message that we as Americans want to send to those that come to our country.	Please see response to Comment 33B.
82D	Berne	Chris	None provided	82	Verbal Testimony	7 – Alternatives, Engineering and Design	1	But we have also offered an alternative pathway just three blocks adjacent to West Broadway that does not require taking any homes. It does not require any industrial buildings to be taken or any businesses in any way to be taken. The Brooklyn Park City Council is now going to be taking a look at that. And so there may be some delays on this project because they want to take a look at what's happening up there. So I just wanted to make sure that everybody is aware of that. What's going on the north end hasn't been talked	West Broadway Avenue is the main through street in the immediate area, other streets within three blocks do not continuously connect and an alignment along them would result in property acquisition. Hennepin County is developing the West Broadway Avenue Reconstruction project in Brooklyn Park from 78th Avenue to just north of 93rd Avenue. This project includes a continuous four-lane urban road, which would include storm drainage instead of ditches, center median, and constructing a paved multi-use trail along both sides of the roadway. An EAW for the roadway project was completed and a Negative Declaration finding issued. The Final EIS references the West Broadway Avenue tech memo in Chapter 2 and in Chapter 6 – Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects of the Final EIS.

Comment ID	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Communication Number	Comment Type	Theme	Issue	Comment	Official Response
								about too much here tonight, but that is part and parcel of this project.	
82E	Berne	Chris	None provided	82	Verbal Testimony	2 – Fiscal Effects and Schedule	2	None of us want to have a repeat of the Southwest Light Rail Project nightmare. There’s already too much rancor. There’s already too much delay, too many tens of millions of dollars that are being wasted. And we would like to see this done in a better manner on this one. And hopefully, some cooler heads will prevail.	The Council hired an independent consultant to do a Technical Capacity Review of the Southwest Project Office and make recommendations; those lessons learned are being used to help inform future projects.