



**Table 1. Agency/Organization Comments on the Notice of Preparation (Published October 2022 in the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board) and Notice of Intent (Published August 2023 in the National Archives Federal Register)**

ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-1	Kopec	Brett	USGS	E-mail	The USGS has no comment at this time. Thank you.	No response necessary.
AO-2-1	Applegate	Kelly	Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe	Letter	First, regarding the future development plans within the City of Minneapolis which can potentially impact 55 of our Tribal citizens directly, in response to the routing of the Metro Blue Line LRT Extension Project. Within the City of Minneapolis, the project has proposed the routing of the Metro Blue Line on either the east side of I-94 or on the west side of I-94, between Target Field and West Broadway Avenue/North 21st Avenue. If the City of Minneapolis is wanting immediate ridership to relieve congestion, then the route on the west side of I-94 should be sought. However, if the City of Minneapolis has future plans to aggressively develop along the transit corridor for a transit-oriented development, then the proposed route on the east side of I-94 is recommended. Metropolitan Council must consult with the City of Minneapolis to ascertain their future development plans so that the most appropriate routing can be selected.	The Council appreciates the perspective provided by the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe on the METRO Blue Line LRT Extension. The Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) evaluated the West of I-94 and East of I-94 options, and the Council continues to coordinate closely with the City of Minneapolis regarding existing and potential future land use.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-2-2	Applegate	Kelly	Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe	Letter	<p>Second, similar to the City of Minneapolis, the current plans for the Metro Blue Line through Robbinsdale and Crystal are to be routing along Bottineau Boulevard (County Road 81), potentially impacting 40 of our Tribal citizens directly. If the Cities of Robbinsdale and Crystal are not making plans for corridor development and encouraging their residents for immediate use of this transit, then the Blue Line should instead be routed onto West Broadway Avenue (County Highway 8), which is currently not an alternative that has been explored. But if the Cities of Robbinsdale and Crystal have future plans to aggressively develop along the transit corridor for a transit-oriented development, then the proposed routing along Bottineau Boulevard (County Highway 81) is the most appropriate. Regardless of the routing, Metropolitan Council should consider a future expansion with an addition infill station either at 47th Avenue North or at Corvallis Avenue North. Metropolitan Council must consult with the Cities of Robbinsdale and Crystal to ascertain their future development plans so that the most appropriate routing can be selected.</p>	<p>The Cities of Robbinsdale and Crystal, with the support of Hennepin County and the Council, have undertaken station area planning efforts to understand the development and re-development opportunities at and adjacent to their respective stations on the CR 81 alignment.</p> <p>Regarding possible infill station options, the Council evaluates stations from both the perspective of ridership potential at a given station location and the perspective of overall Project travel time and ridership. The Council recommends the most fitting station locations in the SDEIS that will optimize service to travelers along the corridor as well as maximize competitiveness in FTA's Capital Investment Grant (i.e., federal funding) program.</p>



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-2-3	Applegate	Kelly	Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe	Letter	Lastly, regarding the proposed Metro Blue Line segment within the City [of] Brooklyn Park where the Metro Blue Line turns off of Bottineau Boulevard and onto West Broadway Avenue on the east side of Bottineau Boulevard, which potentially impacts 3 of our Tribal citizens directly. The current plans for the Metro Blue Line to make this transition instead at where West Broadway Avenue crosses Bottineau Boulevard with an additional infill station at that site. As for the currently planned stations within Brooklyn Park, once the Metro Blue Line extension is open to the public, Metropolitan Council should consider rerouting Metro Transit bus lines with more east-west connectivity to better extend the reach of the new Metro Blue Line within the City of Brooklyn Park, while allowing residents of Osseo and Maple Grove to also have direct access to the Metro Blue Line.	The Council will review the bus service in the Project area and will adjust service to better integrate with the METRO Blue Line LRT Extension and to maximize service and ridership.
AO-3	Marsh	Dawn	USFWS - MN/WI Ecological Field Services Office	E-mail	The Minnesota-Wisconsin Ecological Services Field Office reviewed this NOI (ER22/0449). We have no comments.	No response necessary.
AO-4	Sanders	Donna	West Broadway Business and Area Coalition (WBC)	E-mail	The businesses I spoke to directly [14 businesses] from Lyndale-Irving unanimously want the LRT to run down 21st Avenue, both directions, not West Broadway.  I spoke directly to businesses in between Irving to Penn, listed below [16 businesses].	The Project includes LRT on 21st Avenue as part of the Build Alternative.  The Project includes reconstruction of West Broadway Avenue between about Knox Avenue and 4th



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
					<p>[T]heir concerns include: (The [14] businesses above have the same concerns)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The revmoal of on street parking.</li> <li>2. Reducing the traffic lanes, both West and East, from 2 lanes to 1 lane. If you add turn lanes and buses it will create a[n] ongoing traffic jam along West Broadway.</li> <li>3. Security of station stopes and trains. There [are] problems with safe and secure LRT station stops on both the Hiawatha line and Green Line/University. Drug dealers use certain stops to deal drugs. Gunfire and shootings [are] not unheard of. No one along WB will use this train if they do not feel safe.</li> <li>4. Last of all, why [are] there only two transit stops: Emerson and Penn. If you remove the buses along West Broadway, will the pedestrians have to walk in between the stops?</li> </ol> <p>If there are safety concerns, poor traffic flow and no on and off street parking, our revitalization plans for West Broadway will be derailed.</p>	<p>Street in conjunction with the construction of the LRT on 21st Avenue. Traffic analysis of vehicle needs will inform the configuration of West Broadway Avenue and will be presented in the Supplemental Final EIS (SFEIS).</p> <p>The Council has developed and started implementing a Safety &amp; Security Action Plan to address illegal activity and unsafe conditions on the Metro Transit system; initial results are positive with a notable reduction in incidents.</p> <p>The Build Alternative includes two stations on 21st Avenue between Knox Avenue and I-94, one near James Avenue and one near Lyndale Avenue.</p> <p>The Project will explore multimodal transportation improvements for the entirety of the West Broadway Avenue/21st Avenue corridor.</p>



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-5	NA	NA	Golden Valley City Council	Letter	<p>While the proposed route modification moves the line out of Golden Valley, the City believes certain aspects of the project have the potential to adversely impact existing infrastructure in the vicinity of Golden Valley Road and Theodore Wirth Parkway.</p> <p>The previous Project Development phase of work...incorporated traffic signals as well as the implementation of a section of the proposed Bassett Creek Regional Trail[.] Without the inclusion of these improvements as part of the Project, the City remains concerned that individuals passing through this area might be unnecessarily be put at risk.</p> <p>Specifically, the City continues to support an intersection design that removes the free right turns currently in place, as well as provide safe and accommodating pedestrian and bicycle movement into and out of Minneapolis and the future LRT station and Emerson-Fremont Avenue, as was planned with the previous alignment...Crash data already demonstrates an incident level that suggests that the additional of vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians due to proximity to LRT would only heighten the dangerous conditions present in the current intersection design.</p> <p>The City of Golden Valley respectfully request that these concerns be considered and become a part of the public record associated with the Supplemental EIS.</p>	<p>Hennepin County is committed to working directly with the City of Golden Valley and other partners that may have a shared interest in this matter to identify the path forward and address these concerns.</p>



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-6	Sutter	John	City of Crystal	E-mail	<p>The paragraph titled “Bottineau Boulevard (County Road 81) / Southern Brooklyn Park and Crystal” does not at all mention that the number of lanes will be evaluated. The attached City Council resolutions express the city’s consistent concerns regarding the number of lanes, and this is at least as great a matter of concern to the city as the question about whether the Bass Lake Road intersection should be grade separated. For this reason, the number of lanes should also be mentioned in this paragraph in addition to the Bass Lake Road intersection.</p> <p>The city requests the following changes to this paragraph describing the scope, with strikeouts indicating deletions and underlining indicates additions:</p> <p><b><i>Bottineau Boulevard (County Road 81) / Southern Brooklyn Park and Crystal</i></b></p> <p>A change in LRT alignment to run within the median on Bottineau Boulevard will be evaluated. Stations at 63rd Avenue and Bass Lake Road remain at similar locations as the 2016 preferred route; however, they are moved from the BNSF corridor to the median of Bottineau Boulevard, with corresponding changes in station access and design. The Supplemental EIS will also evaluate changes to Bottineau Boulevard needed to accommodate the LRT, including a conventional intersection at Bass Lake Road with a pedestrian bridge,</p>	<p>Discussion and analysis of at-grade and interchange options has been included in the SDEIS, as well as lane configuration. See SDEIS Chapter 2 and Appendix A-2 for discussion of how the Build Alternative was developed, and other options that were considered and evaluated.</p> <p>Additionally, the Council has worked, and will continue to work, with the City of Crystal to address these concerns throughout the development and publication of the SFEIS.</p>



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
					<p><u>and or</u> an elevated structure carrying Bottineau Boulevard over Bass Lake Road; <u>and the number of lanes necessary to accommodate existing and forecast vehicular traffic volumes in the corridor.</u></p>	
AO-7	NA	NA	City of Crystal Resolution 2022-63	Resolution	<p><b>NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED</b> that, in addition to the alternatives shown in the conceptual layouts previously provided to the City and described in the Route Modification Report, the City Council requests inclusion and analysis of the following alternatives in the Environmental Review for the Project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Build alternative reflecting maintenance of existing conditions.</li> <li>2. Six Lanes, At-Grade alternative maintaining three travel lanes in each direction from the Trunk Highway 100 ramps through a reconstructed at-grade Bass Lake Road intersection to the vicinity of Airport Road.</li> <li>3. Six Lanes, Interchange alternative maintaining three travel lanes in each direction from the Trunk Highway 100 ramps to the southerly ramps of a new interchange at Bass Lake Road.</li> </ol> <p>BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that inclusion of these alternatives in the Environmental Review is essential for the City Council to consider an affirmative Municipal Consent vote on the Project.</p>	<p>The Council and FTA are required to evaluate the No-Build Alternative under the National Environmental Policy Act. The Council has included discussion and analysis of at-grade and interchange options in the SDEIS. Appendix A-2 includes evaluation of various lane options.</p>



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-8	Anderson Keliher and Brennan	Margaret and Andrea	City of Minneapolis	Letter	<p>The extension of the existing METRO Blue Line through North Minneapolis presents a tremendous opportunity for improving fast and reliable transit service, making progress toward citywide climate goals, extending development opportunities, and better connecting neighborhoods to regional destinations and employment centers.</p> <p>The City is in support of the scope of the Supplemental EIS as drafted, specifically exploring the impacts of the identified route options in the Minneapolis sections of the Blue Line Light Rail Extension.</p> <p>The City of Minneapolis looks forward to the continued strong partnership with Hennepin County and the Metropolitan Council as we move the region forward on goals of equity, livability, improving the environment, and expanding multimodal transportation options in Minneapolis.</p>	The Council likewise looks forward to continuing the strong partnership with the City of Minneapolis as this Project advances.
AO-9	Perez	Ricardo	Blue Line Coalition	Letter	<p>The SEIS is an opportunity to ensure that our collective efforts between the project team, elected officials, and community to address anti-displacement before, during, and after construction become a reality.</p> <p>To that end, the scope of the study must be expanded to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understands the social and community impact that the development of the train will have across the corridor before, during</li> </ul>	The Council appreciates the emphasis the Blue Line Coalition places on anti-displacement efforts and how they should be addressed throughout the LRT project development process. The SDEIS analyzes impacts and benefits to environmental justice populations, and what avoidance or mitigation strategies could be implemented





ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
					<p>and after construction - specifically looking at the impacts of the global pandemic of COLVID-19 and the civil unrest that impacted the corridor in 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cover the mitigation of previous harms made by the route modification - such as impacts to the Harrison Neighborhood, the Heritage Park Neighborhoods - by the design of the blue line extension project.</li> <li>• Studies the business, housing and cultural displacement as a result of the construction, design of the blue line extension project; and mitigation strategies that can be applied before, during and after construction such as technical assistance and forgivable grants</li> <li>• Includes mitigation strategies that invest in neighborhoods that have been historically underinvested and disproportionately impacted by racing planning processes and policies; not deconcentrating areas of poverty.</li> </ul>	to avoid or offset those impacts. Furthermore, Executive Order 14096 (signed by President Biden in April 2023) requires federal agencies to consider past harms as part of the environmental justice analysis process.
AO-10-1	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	Traffic issues associated with removal of one turn lane on County Road 81 (CR81) to westbound County Road 9 (CR9)	Traffic impact analyses are included in SDEIS Chapter 3.
AO-10-2	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	The (potential) elimination of two southbound access points to boat ramp areas	Boat ramp access impacts are assessed in terms of safe traffic/LRT operations and potential Section 4(f) effects in the SDEIS.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-10-3	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	The (potential) removal of southbound slip lanes	Changes in access are accounted for in traffic impact analyses as appropriate.
AO-10-4	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	The (potential) removal of the ramp entry on northbound CR81 from northbound Highway 100	Changes in access are accounted for in traffic impact analyses as appropriate.
AO-10-5	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	Impacts on other existing turn lanes at intersections along CR81 through the City	Traffic impact analyses are included in SDEIS Chapter 3.
AO-10-6	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	Impacts of proposed park and ride (unknown size and location)	Traffic, visual, and physical impacts of the park-and-ride are assessed in the SDEIS.
AO-10-7	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	Additional trip generation through the City, to include potential impact on local roads and intersections	Additional trip generation is accounted for in traffic impact analyses as appropriate.
AO-10-8	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	Impact of reducing the speed limit on CR81 to 35mph in terms of capacity of the road and intersections; and need for right turn lanes	Changes in speed limits are accounted for in traffic impact analyses as appropriate.
AO-10-9	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	Impact of closing frontage roads and slip lanes in terms of loading additional vehicle trips into major intersections and affected local streets with West Broadway of particular concern	Changes in access are accounted for in traffic impact analyses as appropriate.
AO-10-10	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	Impact of potential grade changes on the eastern side of intersections along the corridor, particularly at 41st Avenue for impacts on pedestrian accessibility and vehicle traction during winter	Grades at intersections are being designed in accordance with applicable design standards.
AO-10-11	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	Pedestrian access and safety across the proposed tracks, including impacts to mobility impaired members of the community. More specifically, whether these issues would be ameliorated by the LRT being elevated through sections of the City	Pedestrian access is being designed in accordance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and LRT/pedestrian design best practices.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-10-12	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	Broad environmental impacts due to the destruction of the existing landscaped median including the additional runoff impacts	Aesthetic elements are being considered during the design of the METRO Blue Line LRT Extension; stormwater treatment facilities are being designed to meet current regulatory standards.
AO-10-13	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	Impact on infrastructure within the corridor, including crossings and significantly sized routes that run parallel to the proposed guideway under the existing eastside curb	Identification, avoidance, and/or relocation of utilities is discussed in the SDEIS and will be part of the METRO Blue Line LRT Extension design.
AO-10-14	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	Impact beyond current curbs to existing homes, businesses (including access & parking), wetlands, and parks	Impacts to homes, businesses, wetlands, and parks are identified and appropriate mitigation is discussed in the SDEIS.
AO-10-15	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	Net loss of commercial space within the City along the corridor	Potential full acquisitions of commercial property are disclosed in the SDEIS.
AO-10-16	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	Tax capacity implications, including – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing commercial areas</li> <li>• Potential commercial with high density residential</li> <li>• Existing residential</li> <li>• Potential residential (including potential mitigation)</li> <li>• Significant parking loss and reduction/constriction of commercial site access.</li> </ul>	Details such as potential loss of income tax revenue will be addressed in the environmental review process; specifics regarding these impacts may not be available until the SFEIS phase.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-10-17	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	Commercial impacts of transit riders	No response necessary.
AO-10-18	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	All displaced commercial uses	Potential full acquisitions of commercial property are disclosed in the SDEIS.
AO-10-19	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	Impacts to the intersection functions, frontage roads and loss of access and parking, the option of grade separation or elevating the light rail and station platform(s) need to be considered for the 40th, 41st and 42nd Ave. N. intersections.	The Project will continue to evaluate the transportation system functions on and adjacent to CR 81 in Robbinsdale and how an at-grade LRT system would affect those functions.
AO-10-20	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	Impacts of increased congestion caused by introducing the bus/transit hub and a parking ramp to the 40th, 41st and 42nd Ave. N. intersections and frontage roads.	Traffic generation and flow in the area of the parking ramp is being evaluated in the design process.
AO-10-21	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	<p>FD and PD staff will need to be trained on how to respond to a handle a derailment. This may require an increase in staffing (and potential change in staffing models) to both Police and Fire Departments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently, 50% of Paid on Call Firefighters live on the east side of Highway 81 which would be problematic in response time for half the department in a derailment situation any response to a light rail emergency</li> <li>• Metropolitan Council, or agencies otherwise, would need to cooperate with Robbinsdale Police and Fire Departments to coordinate surrounding/assisting Police and Fire Departments to ensure proper training</li> </ul>	The effects of the Project on local emergency management planning would be identified as the Project progresses, including scenario planning for the operations phase.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
					has occurred and proper equipment has been acquired	
AO-10-22	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	<p>Robbinsdale Fire Department and Robbinsdale Police Department personnel will need to be trained on how to handle a situation with any electrical issues that may arise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Metropolitan Council, or agencies otherwise, would need to cooperate with Robbinsdale Police and Fire Departments to coordinate surrounding/assisting Police Fire Departments to ensure proper training has occurred and proper equipment has been acquired</li> </ul>	The effects of the Project on local emergency management planning would be identified as the Project progresses, including scenario planning for the operations phase.
AO-10-23	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	On occasion, Robbinsdale Public Safety Personnel have been required to close County Road 81 in the case of emergencies; for similar, agencies will be required to coordinate emergency management, including Light Rail operations	The effects of the Project on local emergency management planning would be identified as the Project progresses, including scenario planning for the operations phase.
AO-10-24	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	There has been limited clarification on expectations of Robbinsdale Public Safety regarding emergency management specific to a Light Rail system (for example: high voltage power lines, high voltage controls, and failure of the catenary system)	The effects of the Project on local emergency management planning would be identified as the Project progresses, including scenario planning for the operations phase.
AO-10-25	Sandvik	Tim	City of Robbinsdale	Letter	Limited response has been provided as to the responsibilities/expectations of Metro Transit Police along the corridor entirely, and specific to Robbinsdale	The effects of the Project on local emergency management planning would be identified as the Project progresses, including scenario planning for the operations phase.

<sup>1</sup> AO = Agency/Organization



**Table 2. Agency/Organization Comments on the NOI**

ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-12-1	Anderson Keliher and Hansen	Margaret and Erik	City of Minneapolis	Letter	<p><b>Bottineau Boulevard (County Road 81)/ Robbinsdale</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend the language of the proposed station at Lowry Avenue to reflect the redesign of the currently proposed elevated station and flyover design of the track alignment over County Road 81 due to the City’s concern about access for Minneapolis constituents and parkland impacts.</li> </ul>	The SDEIS evaluates an at-grade station at Lowry Avenue, and the Council will continue to coordinate with the City of Minneapolis, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, and other stakeholders regarding the design of Lowry Station.
AO-12-2	Anderson Keliher and Hansen	Margaret and Erik	City of Minneapolis	Letter	<p><b>West Broadway or 21st Avenue/Minneapolis</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add language on the proposed station at Penn Ave North.</li> <li>Explore additional stations including at 29th Avenue North, which follows the similar format of how stations are described in the northern portions of the project.</li> <li>Add language about the proposed stations at James and Lyndale Avenues North.</li> </ul>	The Project is including the Penn Avenue Station in the SDEIS, as well as stations at James and Lyndale Avenues. The 29th Avenue Station is not evaluated in the SDEIS, but coordination with the City of Minneapolis regarding additional stations will continue.
AO-12-3	Anderson Keliher and Hansen	Margaret and Erik	City of Minneapolis	Letter	<p><b>Lyndale Avenue or I-94/Minneapolis</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add language about proposed station near Plymouth Avenue.</li> <li>Explore additional stations and locations including near 21st/West Broadway and Washington Avenue.</li> <li>The current description of the east of I-94 alignment option doesn’t clearly describe the Washington Ave N at grade sub-option. Please clarify the alignment options for the</li> </ul>	The proposed Plymouth Avenue Station is included in the SDEIS. At this time, no additional stations have been incorporated into the Washington Avenue alignment between 21st Avenue and 10th Avenue. Both East of I-94 options are discussed in the SDEIS.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
					east side of I-94 to ensure that language clearly distinguishes the sub-options of Washington Ave and the alignment immediately adjacent along the east of I-94.	
AO-12-4	Anderson Keliher and Hansen	Margaret and Erik	City of Minneapolis	Letter	[Close attention should be given to:] <b>Environmental Justice</b> – Documentation of impacts of the project and its relationship to improving the health of the community and the environment.	The Project is preparing a robust environmental justice analysis not only in accordance with Executive Order (EO) 12898 and USDOT policy regarding the implementation of that EO, but also in consideration of the April 2023 EO 14096 (Revitalizing our Nation’s Commitment to Environmental Justice for All).
AO-12-5	Anderson Keliher and Hansen	Margaret and Erik	City of Minneapolis	Letter	[Close attention should be given to:] <b>Business Impacts</b> – Identification of opportunities to address construction impacts to support access of patrons, visitors, and neighbors to businesses along the corridor.	The SDEIS includes analysis of both short-term (construction) and long-term (LRT operations) impacts to businesses along the corridor, including access to businesses.
AO-12-6	Anderson Keliher and Hansen	Margaret and Erik	City of Minneapolis	Letter	[Close attention should be given to:] <b>Transportation Impacts</b> – Provide qualitative and quantitative data to understand parking demand and utilization along the corridor to support strategies for access, loading, and delivery needs; an analysis along West Broadway is particularly relevant.	The SDEIS includes parking impact analysis and preliminary discussion of mitigation strategies. Mitigation commitments will be made in the SFEIS/Amended ROD phase of the Project.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-12-7	Anderson Keliher and Hansen	Margaret and Erik	City of Minneapolis	Letter	[Close attention should be given to:] <b>Anti-displacement</b> – Identify clear timelines, deliverables, and funding commitments resulting from the Anti-displacement Work Group and the County’s Disparity Reduction work that responds to documented community concerns prior to municipal consent.	Hennepin County is leading the advancement of the anti-displacement work, and the SDEIS includes discussion of these efforts. Coordination is ongoing to determine Project-specific commitments.
AO-13-1	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Explain how community input from the May 2022 public comment period was incorporated into the Route Modification Report, thus informing route alternatives and station locations;	Community input from engagement activities and public comment periods is summarized in SDEIS Chapter 9 (Consultation and Coordination).
AO-13-2	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Discuss whether the proposed project still meets the original project purpose and need. In particular, discuss whether the original termini will best serve the diverse communities in Hennepin County given the termini were selected over ten years ago. In particular, consider any changes in regional growth forecasts, whether ridership needs have changed, locations of planned stations should be reconsidered, and whether community development goals have changed post-COVID	The purpose of and need for the Project has not changed, and the Project termini remain logical choices to serve the communities in Hennepin County. The southern terminus is necessary to allow the METRO Blue Line LRT Extension to connect to the rest of the METRO system, thereby greatly improving transit service to the community. SDEIS Chapter 1 (Purpose and Need) has been updated to reflect current demographics, and ridership analyses have been conducted to understand the effects of the pandemic on transit usage.





ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-13-3	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Provide clear explanation for elimination of and/or ranking of route options	SDEIS Chapter 2 (Alternatives) and supporting documentation explain how the modified route was selected.
AO-13-4	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Discuss advantages and disadvantages of each route. Consider easy access for users / ride & share lots versus displacements or acquisition of right-of-way	The SDEIS describes the impacts and benefits of the various route options, including access, park-and-ride options, and right-of-way acquisition.
AO-13-5	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Discuss whether the proposed project aligns with Hennepin County transportation planning, given plans may have been revised since original DEIS and FEIS were released	Hennepin County is an active partner and local funding agency for the Project; the County has instilled its transportation planning priorities into the Project planning process.
AO-13-6	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Explain impacts to traffic using the project area during construction. Discuss whether traffic will be re-routed, whether alternate route(s) can handle additional vehicles, expected vehicle levels of service on alternative routes, and additional impacts (e.g., increased air and noise impacts) along alternate routes.	Traffic detours have been discussed in the appropriate level of detail in the SDEIS and may be discussed in greater detail in the SFEIS/Amended ROD.
AO-13-7	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Identify and discuss whether the presence of low-income and/or minority communities within the project areas that could experience impacts from the proposed project(s) has changed since the Record of Decision was signed in 2016. For initial screening, use EPA's EJSCREEN mapping tool. Use census-tract-level information to initially help locate communities with EJ concerns	The Council has updated the socioeconomic analysis for the Project with current U.S. Census and local data to identify EJ populations. Furthermore, the Council, in coordination with Hennepin County, has undertaken a robust public engagement process; part of that effort is focused on



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
						identifying, reaching out to, and understanding the concerns of EJ populations.
AO-13-8	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Evaluate the impacts (adverse and beneficial) of project proposals on low-income and/or minority communities and sensitive populations (e.g., children, people with asthma, elderly communities, etc.)	The EJ analysis for the Project includes this evaluation.
AO-13-9	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Compare project impacts on low-income and minority populations with an appropriate reference community to determine whether there may be disproportionate impacts (e.g., consider risk of exposure to hazardous/toxic materials associated with the project construction, and noise impacts)	The EJ analysis uses demographic data and engagement results to determine if impacts will be disproportionately borne by EJ populations.
AO-13-10	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Identify measures to: 1) ensure meaningful community engagement; 2) minimize adverse community impacts; and 3) avoid disproportionate impacts to communities with EJ concerns	The Council, in coordination with Hennepin County, has undertaken a robust public engagement process; part of that effort is focused on identifying, reaching out to, and understanding the concerns of EJ populations. This process will enhance the Project's minimization and avoidance strategy regarding disproportionate impacts to EJ populations.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-13-11	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Compare the demographics of residents adjacent to the proposed routes with the expanded demographics of the individuals (e.g., highway users, business owners, etc.) who would benefit from the proposed project to assist in considering the potential for disproportionate impacts. Include demographic data for Hennepin County as well as the State of Minnesota	The EJ analysis for the Project includes a comparison of demographic data for the corridor to comparison geographies.
AO-13-12	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Discuss whether the CEF incorporates the latest EJ resources to appropriately engage in meaningful, targeted, community outreach, analyze impacts, and advance environmental justice through NEPA implementation. Resources to aid agencies when conducting EJ analyses include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Federal Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice’s Promising Practices for EJ Methodologies in NEPA Reviews; and</li> <li>• Executive Order 13985 requiring agencies to take a heightened focus on justice and equity issues</li> </ul>	The Council appreciates EPA sharing these resources. The Council and its partner agency, Hennepin County, have evaluated the latest guidance and direction regarding implementation of EJ, including EO 13985 and EO 14096 (Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All), and have integrated these factors into the Project's community engagement approach.
AO-13-13	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Discuss future plans to engage minority/low-income populations, and the surrounding communities in the environmental review and planning phase, and, if the project commences, during construction. FTA may find the Community Guide to EJ and NEPA Methods useful when designing methods to engage in meaningful, targeted, community outreach, analyze impacts, and advance	The Council and its partner agency, Hennepin County, have implemented a variety of methods to specifically connect with EJ populations (such as the community engagement cohort, which consists of community and cultural organizations that serve corridor residents and stakeholders) and will continue



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
					environmental justice through NEPA implementation	to implement methods like these throughout the course of the Project.
AO-13-14	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Discuss the cumulative impacts from climate change on public health for communities in the project area. Studies have shown that communities with EJ concerns may have less adaptive capacity and are thus more prone to disproportional impacts from climate change. See EPA's report "Analyses of the Effects of Global Change on Human Health and Welfare and Human Systems"	The Council has included analysis of climate change and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the Project in the SDEIS. The Council anticipates that the Project would help reduce GHG emissions by increasing the transit share of trips in the Project area and the region overall. The Council notes that the LRT system runs on electricity and that GHG emissions associated with electricity generation are trending downward as well.
AO-13-15	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Include analyses and conclusions regarding whether the Proposed Action may have disproportionately high and adverse impacts on low income or minority communities, as specified in CEQ's Environmental Justice Guidance	The Council will include the analyses and conclusions regarding whether or not the Project would result in disproportionately high and adverse impacts on EJ populations in the SFEIS.
AO-13-16	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Describe measures that will be taken to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts any disproportionate impacts to communities with EJ concerns and impacts to other sensitive populations	The SDEIS includes discussion of avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures, and the SFEIS will as well.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-13-17	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Use conclusions on the potential for disproportionate impacts to inform project decisions, including mitigation	The SDEIS includes an EJ analysis that includes identification of disproportionate impacts and a discussion of avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures.
AO-13-18	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	If unavoidable relocations will occur, discuss whether fair market value will be assessed at the highest point of value to protect owner wealth	Compensation for relocated property owners and tenants will follow the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act.
AO-13-19	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Clearly indicate benefits and impacts that would be realized by communities living in the project area (e.g., construction and operational air pollution and noise) while project benefits would be experienced by a larger population who live and work outside the project area but use the corridor	The Project's EJ analysis includes a consideration of impacts and benefits for communities in the Project area specifically.
AO-13-20	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Indicate how the proposed project incorporates Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks, which directs each Federal agency to make it a high priority to identify and assess environmental health and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children and ensure that policies, programs, activities, and standards address these risks.	Executive Order 13045 and related Project consequences are discussed in SDEIS Chapter 7.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-13-21	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Commit to a construction traffic management plan to ensure that trucks hauling materials and heavy machinery avoid areas where children congregate, when possible. Construction traffic should be routed away from schools, daycare facilities, and parks; crossing guards should be used when such areas cannot be avoided. In addition to air quality benefits, careful routing may protect children from vehicle-pedestrian accidents	The Council anticipates that construction traffic would be directed to avoid residential areas, parks, and schools, and will work to identify other areas where children congregate so they can be avoided.
AO-13-22	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Discuss current air quality in Hennepin County, and how it has changed since publication of the FEIS and ROD	The air quality analysis in the SDEIS has been updated with current data. Notable changes in major point source emitters in the Project area, to the extent practicable, will be documented.
AO-13-23	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Identify and discuss construction and operation air quality impacts that could result from the proposed project. We recommend quantifying estimates of construction emissions and identifying sensitive receptors (residences, schools, etc.) that would be impacted	The SDEIS includes analysis of construction emissions in relation to sensitive receptors.
AO-13-24	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Commit to applicable measures from the enclosed Construction Emission Control Checklist to minimize exposure	The Council has reviewed the checklist provided by EPA and observes that it has implemented several of the measures identified on past Projects. The Council will adopt applicable measures where practicable.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-13-25	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Per Executive Order 13045 on Children’s Health, pay particular attention to worksite proximity to places where children live, learn, and play, such as homes, schools, and playgrounds. Construction emission reduction measures should be strictly implemented near these locations to be protective of children’s health.	Executive Order 13045 and related Project consequences are discussed in SDEIS Chapter 7.
AO-13-26	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Require completion of a construction traffic management plan that ensures trucks hauling materials and heavy machinery avoid areas where children congregate within adjacent neighborhoods, when possible. Route construction truck traffic away from schools, daycare facilities, and parks, if applicable, and use crossing guards when such areas cannot be avoided. In addition to air quality benefits, careful routing may protect children from vehicle-pedestrian accidents.	See response to Comment AO-13-21.
AO-13-27	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Fully quantify and disclose emissions from the proposed action. Consider the following when analyzing emissions: [multiple items cited, including EO 14008, US Global Change Research Program’s National Climate Assessment, and CEQ NEPA Guidance on Consideration of GHG and Climate Change]	See response to Comment AO-13-14.
AO-13-28	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Estimate and disclose the social cost of greenhouse gases (SC-GHG) from the proposed action. Consider the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Estimates of the social cost of greenhouse gases (SC-GHG14) are informative for assessing the impacts of GHG emissions. SC-GHG estimates monetize the societal</li> </ul>	As noted in the response to Comment AO-13-14, it is anticipated that the Project will result in a net decrease in GHG emissions.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
					<p>value of changes in GHG emissions from actions that have small, or marginal, impacts on cumulative global emissions. Estimates of the social cost of carbon (SC-CO<sub>2</sub>) and other greenhouse gases (e.g., social cost of methane (SC-CH<sub>4</sub>)) have been used for over a decade in Federal government analyses. Quantification of anticipated GHG releases and associated SC-GHG comparisons among all alternatives (including the No Action Alternative) within the Draft SEIS can inform project decision-making and provide support for implementing all practicable measures to minimize GHG emissions.</p>	
AO-13-29	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	<p>Quantify reasonably-foreseeable direct (e.g., construction) and indirect (e.g., off-site material hauling and disposal) GHG emissions.</p>	<p>The SDEIS includes discussion of the direct and indirect GHG emissions.</p>
AO-13-30	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	<p>Use SC-GHG estimates to consider the climate damages from net changes in direct and indirect emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> and other GHGs from the proposed project. To do so, EPA recommends a breakdown of estimated net GHG emission changes by individual gas, rather than relying on CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) estimates, followed by monetizing the climate impacts associated with each GHG using the corresponding social cost estimate (i.e., monetize CH<sub>4</sub> emissions changes expected to occur with the social cost of methane (SC-CH<sub>4</sub>) estimate for emissions). When applying SC-GHG estimates, just as with tools to quantify emissions, disclose assumptions (e.g., discount</p>	<p>See response to Comment AO-13-28.</p>





ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
					rates) and uncertainties associated with such analysis and the need for updates over time to reflect evolving science and economics of climate impacts	
AO-13-31	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Compare and disclose GHG emissions and SC-GHG across alternatives to inform decision-making.	The SDEIS evaluates GHGs (expressed as carbon dioxide equivalent [CO <sub>2</sub> e]) for the No-Build Alternative and the Build Alternative.
AO-13-32	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Describe changing climate conditions (i.e., temperatures and frequency and severity of storm events) and assess how such changes could impact the proposed project and the environmental impacts of the proposed project and alternatives. Consider increases in frequency and severity of storm events, flooding, and periods of high heat (e.g., more severe/frequent flooding). Discuss how stormwater infrastructure could be designed to help ensure public health and safety in addition to decreasing impacts to aquatic resources (e.g., capture and filtration of runoff). We strongly encourage committing to on-site green stormwater management via use of bioswales, permeable pavement, rain gardens, retention ponds, and/or over-sized culverts or bridges, as applicable, in the Draft SEIS	EPA's recommendations will be considered when designing stormwater management facilities; additional details on stormwater management will be provided in the SFEIS.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-13-33	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Consider climate-resilient solutions based on equity and inclusivity to reduce vulnerability for everyone. Consider solutions that boost resilience while improving livelihoods, accessibility, and social and economic well-being. Solutions could include adding green spaces in urban areas and investing in low-carbon transportation networks. Such solutions can also promote other local benefits by mitigating the effects of urban heat islands, reducing air pollution, and strengthening community interaction	The Project is a low-carbon transportation solution. Green space would be incorporated into the Project in certain circumstances in coordination with the communities that the Project serves.
AO-13-34	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Describe climate resilience and adaption considerations for 1) construction plans; 2) emergency planning; 3) stormwater management; and 4) maintenance and monitoring of the transit line.	These commitments will be considered in the SFEIS.
AO-13-35	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Identify practices to reduce and mitigate GHG emissions. Some chronic medical conditions can increase an individual’s risk of illness and death when facing climate change-related impacts, particularly exposure to heat and poor air quality.	See response to Comment AO-13-14.
AO-13-36	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Consider ways to reduce heat island effects from increased pavement (e.g., increase tree canopy, include vegetated barriers to reduce air and noise impacts)	The Project is being designed to minimize additional impervious surfaces, and vegetation and landscaping will be considered during final design.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-13-37	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Analyze best available control strategies, while considering low-income and minority populations, and sensitive environmental and health receptors, such as children	Best available control strategies will be implemented to minimize emissions of particulate matter, carbon monoxide, and mobile-source air toxics during construction. As noted in responses to other comments, the Project would result in a net decrease in GHG emissions.
AO-13-38	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Engage people with diverse backgrounds and experiences as well as non-English speakers to make effective use of the community's experience to expand on climate-related considerations that can inform NEPA decisions.	The Project has implemented an engagement strategy to facilitate identification of EJ populations (including non-English speaking populations) and understand their concerns. Any expressed concerns specific to climate change will be noted. As mentioned in responses to other comments, the Project would result in a net decrease in GHG emissions.
AO-13-39	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Identify residences and other sensitive receptors that would potentially be impacted by construction noise and vibration. Include residences, cultural and religious gathering spots, schools, day care centers, senior housing, community centers, medical facilities, and offices, among others. Assess how the project would impact such receptors.	A complete noise and vibration analysis has been completed for the Project, including both construction and operating phase impacts. The analysis has been conducted in accordance with FTA guidelines, which have established noise and vibration receptor categories that cover a variety of property types/uses.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-13-40	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Assess whether low-income and minority residences could experience disproportionate noise and vibration impacts during construction, and if so, whether mitigation is justified. For mitigation, if any residences are particularly close to pile driving or other highly impactful activities during construction, consider whether the option for temporary housing may be warranted or limiting time windows when certain equipment can be used	The EJ analysis includes assessment of all socioeconomic and environmental resource areas, including noise and vibration. SDEIS Chapter 7 provides more discussion on EJ.
AO-13-41	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Provide a plan for giving residents sufficient warning of noise and vibration-intensive activities.	The Council implements a robust construction communication plan for all its projects that includes making residents and businesses aware of the timing and duration of construction activities and how those activities may affect people in the area.
AO-13-42	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Include exhibits showing the location of proposed staging areas.	The Council generally directs contractors to use areas within the environmentally cleared limits of disturbance for staging, with appropriate limitations to avoid impacts to neighboring properties and resources. Where unique conditions require the identification of specific staging areas during the environmental documentation phase, those areas will be evaluated in the SFEIS.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-13-43	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Show locations of proposed access roads and associated impacts. We recommend the least amount of habitat disturbance (e.g., tree removal). A discussion concerning mitigation – voluntary or permitted – associated with access and staging should also be included.	The Project is largely within developed urban land, so access will generally be from existing roadways. Habitat disturbance solely from construction access will be minimal.
AO-13-44	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Discuss the transport of necessary materials, anticipated number of transport vehicles traveling to the construction area each day, etc.	The Council would not mandate means and methods for construction contractors and, therefore, would not be able to make a reasonable estimate of the rate of use of transport vehicles.
AO-13-45	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Include best management practices typically employed to minimize construction impacts to air quality, water resources, soil (e.g., sediment and erosion control methods), and other regulated resources during this type of project	The SFEIS/Amended ROD will include construction phase best management practices, if available, for all resource areas where a construction phase impact has been identified.
AO-13-46	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Include a spill management plan.	The requirement for spill management measures will be noted in the SFEIS. It is generally the construction contractor's responsibility to develop a spill management plan to be approved by the Council.
AO-13-47	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Discuss the potential for reuse and/or recycling of existing pavement (to the extent applicable), which can preserve valuable landfill capacity.	It is common practice in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area to recycle removed pavement into aggregate, which is often reused on the project where it was generated or other projects as appropriate.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-13-48	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Discuss the potential for replacing carbon-intensive Portland Cement in concrete.	This commitment would be explored in the SFEIS and final design.
AO-13-49	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Consider practices applicable from EPA's Sustainable Management of Construction and Demolition Materials webpage and Large-Scale Residential Demolition webpage. Use these resources to help identify environmentally sensitive activities associated with road construction and develop contract language for bid packages with specific technical requirements to improve environmental results.	This commitment would be explored in the SFEIS and final design.
AO-13-50	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Include a factsheet of all protective measures required for project construction (e.g., idling time limits, speed limits for construction trucks, and dust suppression). Include a telephone number residents can call if contractors are not following required practices and distribute the factsheet to the surrounding communities.	The Council does not expect that these details will be available at the time of the publication of the SFEIS/Amended ROD. Such information is routinely included in construction phase public engagement/communication efforts.
AO-13-51	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Discuss results of consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act to determine if the project area and any proposed staging areas contain historical or archaeological resources, including properties that are listed on the National Register of Historic Properties or eligible for listing	The Project is being developed in a manner compliant with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, which includes identifying an Area of Potential Effect, identifying properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, and determining effects to those properties. Each step of this process is done in consultation with the Minnesota



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
						State Historic Preservation Office.
AO-13-52	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Determine potential impacts, if any, to historic properties within the project area.	See response to Comment AO-13-51.
AO-13-53	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Include exhibits showing natural habitats that would be temporarily or permanently disturbed as a result of each alternative.	Natural habitats impacted by the Project (primarily at the north end of the corridor) are identified in SDEIS Chapter 5.
AO-13-54	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Disclose estimated acreage of terrestrial impacts for each alternative.	Areas of terrestrial impact are identified in SDEIS Chapter 5.
AO-13-55	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Consider voluntary tree mitigation on a one-to-one basis for native trees removed during construction. Consultation with the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MnDNR) or local park districts would likely provide options for tree planting.	Tree and vegetation removals would be minimized as much as is feasible, and replacement commitments would be identified in the SFEIS.
AO-13-56	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Disclose the results obtained from using U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) project planning tool (iPAC) to streamline the environmental review process.	USFWS coordination/consultation are disclosed in the SDEIS, including results from the IPaC tool.
AO-13-57	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Provide a summary of regulated water resources within the project boundary and include the wetland delineation undertaken for the project	Water resources in the Project area are identified in the SDEIS, including documentation of wetland delineation.
AO-13-58	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Provide exhibits illustrating the location of nearby wetlands, streams, and floodplain, as applicable, for each alternative	The SDEIS for the Project includes exhibits identifying the location of wetlands, streams, and floodplains.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-13-59	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Discuss existing conditions and determine the extent of water resource impacts expected to occur to these resources for each alternative.	The SDEIS for the Project discusses existing water resources and anticipated impacts to those resources. Detailed discussion is provided in SDEIS Chapter 5.
AO-13-60	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Describe both direct (e.g., permanent fill), indirect (e.g., changes in hydrology), and temporary (e.g., temporary construction impacts) impacts to both wetlands and streams for each alternative	A discussion of areas of wetland/stream impact is included in SDEIS Chapter 5. Details such as permanent and temporary impacts will likely not be available until the SFEIS/Amended ROD.
AO-13-61	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	In addition to identifying aquatic resources and potential impacts, apply sequencing established by the Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, namely, avoidance first, followed by demonstration of impact minimization, and mitigation for unavoidable impacts. The CWA Section 404 (b)(1) guidelines call for the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) to be selected to address impacts to wetlands, streams, and other waters of the United States. Include a discussion of proposed mitigation for unavoidable, minimized stream or aquatic impacts	The CWA sequencing approach was used during development of the 2016 FEIS and ROD, as well as the associated Section 404 Individual Permit that was issued by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in 2018. The EIS process that culminated in the 2016 Final EIS and ROD was conducted under the NEPA/Section 404 Merger process; during that process, USACE concurred that the then-preferred alternative was the LEDPA. Since that time, the Council has had to undertake a route modification process, and the route/route options that are now part of the current SEIS





ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
						process will result in less wetland impact that was identified in the 2016 Final EIS and ROD. Recent coordination with USACE indicates that they are comfortable with the approach being taken by the Council.
AO-13-62	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Disclose and analyze potential permanent, temporary, direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to all aquatic resources.	The SDEIS for the Project discloses identified permanent, temporary, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to aquatic resources, to the extent that such impacts would occur.
AO-13-63	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Include information concerning water quality within the project area based on the MnDNR’s Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list of impaired waterbodies. For each waterbody listed on the 303(d) list, discuss what impairments are precluding the meeting of water quality standards and analyze how the proposed project could potentially affect the waterbody’s listing (both positively and negatively)	The SDEIS for the Project includes a discussion of impaired waters and discloses how the Project may affect those waters. Implementation of current stormwater best management practices may result in positive effects to impaired waters.
AO-13-64	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Disclose best practices for protecting water quality during project construction (e.g., spill plans, etc.).	The SDEIS for the Project includes discussion of mitigation for construction phase impacts to water quality.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-13-65	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Include information on drainage design, including information on stormwater management, which may consist of stormwater basins for water quality treatment and rate control. Consider recent storm events (e.g., past 10-20 years) which may be greater than current regulatory requirements to account for changes in precipitation due to climate change	The SDEIS summarizes available drainage design information, focusing primarily on how stormwater would be managed to meet federal, state, and local requirements. Note that local agencies (such as watershed districts/watershed management organizations) have adopted stormwater management requirements that are more stringent than those in place when the 2016 Final EIS and ROD were published. Many of these new requirements were developed in response to precipitation changes due to climate change.
AO-13-66	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Provide exhibits illustrating the potential locations of stormwater basins.	SDEIS exhibits show anticipated stormwater basin locations. Further details would be included in the SFEIS/Amended ROD.
AO-13-67	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Summarize corridor development (e.g., proposed improvements to Highway 252 and Interstate 94 in Brooklyn Park, Brooklyn Center, and North Minneapolis) in the project corridor.	The indirect and cumulative analysis for the Project summarizes proposed development in the Project corridor; the Hwy 252/I-94 project has already been identified as a significant planned improvement.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-13-68	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Disclose and analyze potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to resources in the project areas, considering that highway and transit development in the project area have a lengthy history.	Indirect and cumulative impacts are discussed in SDEIS Chapter 6. Direct impacts are disclosed in other chapters focused on transportation, socioeconomic, and environmental resources in the Project area.
AO-13-69	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Consider cumulative disproportionate environmental burdens faced by residents living near the project area when deciding on appropriate project mitigation measures, including accounting for and minimizing further displacement.	Hennepin County, with the support of the Council, is facilitating an anti-displacement planning effort; applicable mitigation strategies will be included in the SFEIS.
AO-13-70	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Consider the community's history of cumulative and disproportionate impacts. In particular, additional pavement and a changing climate with above-average hot days can increase ground ozone formation, exacerbating incidences of asthma for those with a history of exposure to air pollution.	The history of the community, especially in the southern portion of the corridor, has been identified as an additional need for the Project: investment in the community through a well-implemented transit project, coupled with a robust anti-displacement effort, will facilitate wealth-building amongst the citizens and business owners current living and working in the corridor. A transit solution is intended to help mitigate the effects of climate change, when coupled with other initiatives in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-13-71	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Consider reasonably-foreseeable impacts as a result of induced growth along or adjacent to the project area (e.g., near stations). Regional or county-wide smart growth or land use plans should inform the discussion of induced growth and cumulative impacts.	The indirect impacts associated with induced development in the corridor is documented in the SDEIS. Station area planning efforts have been completed or are in progress to create an orderly development process and limit speculative development that can affect property values and rental rates.
AO-13-72	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Summarize coordination with relevant Federal and state agencies.	The SDEIS includes a summary of agency coordination.
AO-13-73	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Include a list of all Federal, state, and local permits that will be required to undertake the preferred alternative. For all environmental impact categories requiring coordination with other Federal or state agencies, EPA recommends copies of both your letters to those agencies, as well as the responses from those agencies, be provided as appendices to the Draft SEIS.	The SDEIS includes a list of anticipated permits and approvals that would be required to implement the Project. Relevant correspondence with federal, state, and local agencies is included in the SDEIS appendices.
AO-13-74	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Incorporate relevant analyses from the Draft and Final EIS by reference or as an appendix.	Where still relevant, information from the 2014 Draft EIS and/or 2016 Final EIS and ROD is incorporated into the SDEIS.
AO-13-75	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	Include an explanation of all technical terms and utilize plain language.	The SDEIS contains an abbreviations list and glossary to define and explain the terms used in the SDEIS in plain language.



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-13-76	McClain	Krystle	USEPA	Letter	<p>Demonstrate and document how FTA and the Council used the following databases to obtain environmental information related to the project area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EnviroMapper: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/waterdata/waters-watershed-assessment-tracking-environmental-results-system">https://www.epa.gov/waterdata/waters-watershed-assessment-tracking-environmental-results-system</a></li> <li>• Envirofacts: <a href="https://www3.epa.gov/enviro/facts/multisystem.html">https://www3.epa.gov/enviro/facts/multisystem.html</a></li> <li>• EJSCEEN: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/ejscreen">https://www.epa.gov/ejscreen</a></li> <li>• NEPAassist: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/nepa/nepassist">https://www.epa.gov/nepa/nepassist</a></li> <li>• 303(d) Listed Impaired Waters: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/exposure-assessment-models/303d-listed-impaired-waters">https://www.epa.gov/exposure-assessment-models/303d-listed-impaired-waters</a></li> <li>• National Ambient Air Quality Standards status: <a href="http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dapc/general/naaqs.aspx">http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dapc/general/naaqs.aspx</a></li> </ul>	<p>The SDEIS includes citations for sources and includes methodology sections that discloses which databases or other resources were used to develop impact analyses and mitigation strategies.</p>



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
AO-14-1	Ohms	Rene	NPS	Letter	Regarding the Section 6(f) conversion of Sochacki Park, please continue to consult with the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources office that manages the LWCF program in Minnesota. The LWCF Coordinator/Grant Specialist for local projects is Ms. Audrey Mularie: <a href="mailto:audrey.mularie@state.mn.us">audrey.mularie@state.mn.us</a> or (651) 259-5549.	Thank you for the comment, direction, and contact information. The Council will continue coordinating with DNR regarding Section 6(f) as needed.
AO-14-2	Ohms	Rene	NPS	Letter	If additional Section 4(f) resources will be impacted and an amended Section 4(f) evaluation will be prepared, the NPS looks forward to the opportunity to review the evaluation. Under the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, the NPS has authority to review and provide concurrence on Section 4(f) evaluations.	A supplemental draft Section 4(f) Evaluation is included as a parallel document to the SDEIS; this published version reflects coordination with NPS.
AO-15-1	Marsh	Dawn	USFWS	E-mail	The Minnesota-Wisconsin Ecological Services Field Office reviewed this NOI (ER23/0341). We have no comments.	No response necessary.
AO-16-1	Gordon	Alison	USGS	E-mail	The USGS has no comment at this time. Thank you.	No response necessary.

<sup>1</sup> AO = Agency/Organization



**Table 3. Public Comments**

Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-1	N/A	N/A	<p>I strongly encourage Hennepin County and Metro Transit/Met Council to do a side-by-side ridership study of bus rapid transit and the Blue Line Extension as currently proposed. If BRT is comparable, it should be considered as a better solution than the LRT project. BRT is more cost-effective, scalable, and flexible than LRT and can be built and deployed more quickly.</p> <p>Suggestion: LRT ride tour for seniors to show safety and access</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>A comparison study was completed for this corridor to analyze the most efficient way of transit among BRT, arterial BRT, dedicated guideway BRT, and LRT. Based on the ridership and opportunities for transit-based development in the region, the LRT was chosen as the preferred mode of transportation in agreement with the cities along the Project corridor. Therefore, this is an LRT project. The ridership is gradually rising after the pandemic levels and will continue to rise, justifying the use of LRT in this corridor.</p> <p>Thank you for this suggestion. Your suggestion about the LRT ride tour will be considered after the infrastructure is built and the LRT is ready for operation.</p>
P-2	Grellson	Mona	<p>There are so many thoughts regarding why this route - or even having another line in the city - is not appropriate. Timing - right now there is no one I know that would take this line from north of the city to downtown because of safety. Cost - you are pursuing a project that has a high cost using dollars that are desperately needed in more appropriate areas. Ridership - you have not yet seriously determined how many riders you would most likely have</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>In the SDEIS, please see Chapter 2 (Alternatives) for the concern regarding the selection of this route. Please see Chapter 3 (Transportation) for the concerns related to station</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>in the first 2 years. Route - beside going through a dangerous area (or 2), you are going through Robbinsdale which is known for it's 'small town historic' feel. Stations - at present, anytime I've asked members of this Light Rail project about stations, it seems to be a non-chalant up-in-the-air situation. You are considering 40th &amp; 81. That is a residential area, and would not be a place that anyone would use to get on or off. 41st &amp; 81 would be common sense. So just this type of lack of reasoning has become serious to our neighborhood and others. At this point, regarding city transport needs, this isn't a project that should be having money &amp; time poured into it. It's already been shown with other lines that the budget has missed, and ridership is not equal to the need. I live on the west shore of Crystal Lake. It would affect much / most of our neighborhood.</p>	<p>placements, Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis) for the concern about safety, and Chapter 10 (Financial Analysis) for the concerns about the costs and funding.</p>
P-3	Harris	Julianne	<p>I am opposed to the route of the Blue Line, specifically going down Bottineau Blvd, due to the negative impact to our roadways/thoroughfares, adjacent properties and neighborhoods. I'm very concerned about vibrations from the train in such close proximity to Crystal Lake, where our neighborhood is already plagued with house foundation issues due to the sandy nature of this habitat. Not to mention the wildlife disruption this would cause. I'm also aware of low ridership and poor stats from other train lines and even buses in the metro due to our post pandemic society. The percent of our population now working from home is likely here to stay. Expanding the transit line does not seem a prudent use of public funding at this time.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>In the SDEIS, please see Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis) and Appendix A-5 for the concern regarding noise and vibration, and impact to wildlife. Please see Chapter 3 (Transportation) for the concerns related to ridership.</p>
P-4	N/A	N/A	<p>This light rail is a very bad idea! By the time it gets built new technology will be better and cheaper. Do not spend this money please!</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p>





Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-5	N/A	N/A	<p>Regarding “appropriate lighting”: From space it’s clear the Earth is lit up pretty well already. Also, firefly populations are rapidly declining world-wide. Please make sure lighting is pointed downward, and we’re not lighting up the skies, and please consider orange tinted lighting for the benefit of wildlife.</p> <p>If the environmental review finds that some natural place will have to be destroyed in the construction process, please offer local municipalities compensation for improvements for their natural places. Much work is already needed in this regard already.</p> <p>At the park and rides: Please ensure EV charging availability. Level 2 charging should be enough.</p> <p>Please provide trash, recycling, and organics recycling at park and rides.</p> <p>Solar panels, please! Along the route will decrease loss of electronics due to distance.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and suggestions. Your suggestions will be taken into consideration during future station design. For more information on natural resources that might be impacted due to the Project and exploration of mitigation options, please see SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis). The final mitigation commitments will be presented in the SFEIS, which will be published in 2025.</p>
P-6	N/A	N/A	<p>Is there currently federal funding available to reduce the cost, locally?</p>	<p>Thank you for your question. For funding source discussion, please see SDEIS Chapter 10 (Financial Analysis).</p>
P-7	N/A	N/A	<p>I have a hard time visualizing the concept designs via the images provided, due to a brain injury. Would it be possible to actually bring these concept designs to the existing places? Like a bus tour?</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your question. Yes, the Project team has prepared some video animations to present the portions of potential design more effectively. These animations have been shown in several public workshops and meetings. Additionally, one of our Cohort partners, JuxtaPosition Arts, has created 3-D models of the route</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				design that show the surrounding one-block area with buildings and other features. These models have been displayed in several public meetings held by the Council. To access these animations and models, please contact our Outreach department with the Project office at <a href="mailto:Nkongo.Cigolo@metrotransit.org">Nkongo.Cigolo@metrotransit.org</a> .
P-8	B	Cassie	I have concerns about the impact on HEALTH North Mpls already has some of the highest rates of ASTHMA, and I believe the construction of the train close neighborhoods on the Lyndale route would jeopardize health. I'm also concerned with the amount of TREES that would be cut down which help to clean our air, they also provide a sense of privacy for the residents on Lyndale Avenue. It remains my desire to see the train take a different route and not cut through a neighborhood/community that overwhelmingly does NOT want the Lyndale route. I support the train for the Northside, and understand the long term economical opportunities it can bring but the route is NOT ideal. Please engage more with other stakeholders for an alternative route.	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street. Lyndale Avenue is not a part of the recommended Project Alignment.</p> <p>For air pollution concerns during the construction phase and possible mitigation options, please see SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis).</p>
P-9	Medina	Nestor Vicuna	I feel the added congestion that the rail line would bring to this area will negatively impact my safety when arriving at and leaving the place where I work. I work at a business on 10 <sup>th</sup> Ave at 5 <sup>th</sup> St and struggle now with accessing the limited free parking the company provides for us. 10 <sup>th</sup> is a	Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. Please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis) for the concern and



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			very busy street already and I oppose the addition of the rail line in this area.	the Council’s proposed actions regarding safety.
P-10	N/A	N/A	<p>Lyndale Avenue is the best option. While the community needs to have their feedback listened to, as someone who lived next to a light rail for a year in Los Angeles, I know that a lot of the concerns to crime and traffic take care of itself. I believe that the bike lane should be moved so that less property taking is needed on Lyndale, but if people are concerned about pedestrian safety, then the Lyndale alignment will make the area safer. It will increase property values and benefit those who are worried about losing property value. If LRT is meant to be used, then we should allow for as much redevelopment as possible.</p> <p>The lyndale alignment will help people near the Fremont area access the train and walkshed so much more than I-94 East. Do what’s right for not just the next 5 years, but the next 50-100 years.</p>	Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7 <sup>th</sup> Street. Lyndale Avenue is not a part of the recommended Project Alignment.
P-11	N/A	N/A	Fix route canceling	Thank you for submitting your comments.
P-12	Young	Eva	<p>Please include the following issues in your Environmental Impact Study and when comparing the routes from Target Field to Broadway:</p> <p>Safety: The Blue Line Extension route from Lyndale to West Broadway will pose safety threats to the immediate and surrounding neighborhoods. Lyndale Ave is used by emergency vehicles services, cars, buses, pedestrians and bikers. It is not wide enough to safely accommodate these transportations and will negatively impact. Another reason it is not safe because there is only two access streets from Lyndale Ave into the Lyn Park neighborhoods, 14<sup>th</sup> &amp; 18<sup>th</sup>. In both cases these are</p>	Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7 <sup>th</sup> Street. Lyndale Avenue is not a part of the recommended Project Alignment.



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>streets are the only access into the North and South sides of the neighborhood respectively.</p> <p>Noise and Vibration: The noise and vibration impact could greatly affect the homes that would border the line. Many property owners would face having the line as apart of their back yards. Lyn Park homes were not built and located to handle a light rail train 10-15 feet away from their residential structures.</p> <p>Loss of trees and vegetation, loss of carbon sink: Please study the impact of removing many trees, vegetation, and bushes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As they affect the habitats of the species living in the area. (Birds, eagles, owls, egrets, and many other small mammals.)</li> <li>• Effect on storm water runoff.</li> <li>• Net gain or loss of Greenhouse Gas emissions.</li> </ul>	<p>For environmental concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis). For transportation/traffic concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 3 (Transportation).</p>
P-13	Jackson	Tameika	<p>The one thing that worries me is the amount of drug trafficking that this will allow to come directly to the Broadway/Lyndale area that is already overly populated right in the bus shelters. This will allow more and more criminal activity to have faster distribution to this area which WE DO NOT NEED. The fact that we have news of Pedofiles using public transportation to be in areas of our young is also concerning</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7<sup>th</sup> Street. The guideway will not be on West Broadway Avenue or Lyndale Avenue.</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				For safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).
P-14	Brown	Thomia	Through Lyndale Avenue creates many challenges for the Lyn Park Community we already have water sewage backup in the cul da sec. Limited street parking due to the MPHA building that only has 10 car parking lot so all the cars park on our streets. The air quality would be a huge risk for us between the 94 interstate and Lyndale Ave and we have a lot of homeowners with adults and children that have Asthma. The safety for our children that have to currently Public school buses on the corner of Lyndale Ave will no be safe with the LRT being there with limited access with their routes. Not having an emergency lane in Lyndale for the ambulance and fire trucks will be very dangerous and unsafe for us homeowners need emergency attention. The crime rate is at a all time high and having the light rail on Lyndale will bring the crimes and drug traffic into Lyn Park community which we currently don't see in our neighborhood.	Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street. Lyndale Avenue is not a part of the recommended Project Alignment.
P-15	Tesfaye	Heidi	I have concerns about the location of the extension effecting the community school Twin Cities International Schools. I am concerned for safety of the students, as well as how it will impact their parking for families and staff. It has raised concern that the line will take away their playground space. This seems to be taking away the right of children to play and have a space to do this without worrying about space to do this and pollution or noise.	Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-16	Tesyfaye	Mike	<p>I don't think your routes are fairly drawn and it obviously only impacts communities low income. I also noticed you will be planning to build a station next to a school? Who in their right mind thinks this is a great idea? Who is going to pay for the extra security? Where are the kids supposed to take their recess (in the station?). Who is going to protect the teachers that leave late at night and come in early in the morning? Have you guys considered building the station near the more affluent communities in Northeast or Northloop? If not please ask yourselves why not? Since you're building it over a school why not build it over the Amazon offices down the street? We all know what highway I-94 did to marginalized communities so it is shocking to see that you are blatantly trying to repeat history just for the sake of bribing jobs to downtown by sacrificing even more communities of color and low income. I'm ashamed to be associated with a state that is even considering this plan to begin with.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p>
P-17	Roney	Lisa	<p>The lightrail going on Lyndale will have an impact on the safety and enrollment of 4 schools, Franklyn,Acension, Hall and North high. This lightrail brings high crime, and it will make student walk miles around during its construction in the dark of the morning. Emergency vehicles will be cut off from getting to this neighborhood. A traffic study was not done to look at traffic flow for school busses and parent drop off. AGAIN , leadship was not looking at those directly effected and who has the most to lose.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street. Lyndale Avenue is not a part of the recommended Project Alignment.</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-18	Durham	Dacia	As a homeowner that would be impacted by the Blue Line near Lyndale, I'm concerned primarily for crime at the proposed stations. I've seen drug use at downtown light rail stations without any regard for others. I'm worried about traffic with the senior apartment building with them constantly crossing Lyndale to get to Cub. The noise and traffic issues from construction is also worrisome since there is only one entrance onto 18 <sup>th</sup> Ave. And I understand that a stop would line along 94 on either side. I am requesting that if that stop comes to fruition that it be placed on the northbound side by the Holiday gas station. My townhome property butts up against the southbound side and I fear for my property value declining. Put the route down Washington Ave as putting down Lyndale would disrupt many homeowners quality of life and our property.	Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street. Lyndale Avenue is not a part of the recommended Project Alignment.
P-19	Brown	Thomia	The water and sewage back up when it rains causing flooding in the streets in Lyn Park in the cul-da sec. Also there is a lot of congested parking on Lyn Park Ave from the MPHA building if the light rail is on Lyndale it will cause more congestion for homeowners getting in and out. The better option is the Pink Line not Lyndale	Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street. Lyndale Avenue is not a part of the recommended Project Alignment.



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-20	Neitzke	Kathy	<p>What impact does having a LTR on Lyndale affect the backyards of residents that live along that stretch? Many residents spend and use their backyards for leisure, recreational activities like bar b queing, outdoor games, and gardening. How does have a light rail running 15 feet from backyards affect the residents quality of life? Most are used to the traffic noises not a train running every 10 minutes. What will happen to the residents privacy and enjoying their green spaces? I estimate 20-30 matures trees will be replace dwith “baby ya ya” size trees. How will people enjoy and relax in their own back yards with a light rail so close? Place the line in a business and growth area, it won’t disturb people’s relaxing and enjoying their outdoor spaces.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street. Lyndale Avenue is not a part of the recommended Project Alignment.</p>
P-21-1	Neitzke	Kathy	<p>What environmental impact will there be on all the birds and small animals that live in the trees and bushes that line Lyndale Avenue? There are many birds like eagles, egrets, and tons of ducks that fly over probably from the Mississippi River or Theodore Worth Park. What is going to happen to those creatures that will loose their habit due to the proposed Light Rail with bushes, berry trees, and huge mature mature trees?</p> <p>Related to that impact what is the result to the residents that live there with no mature trees or vegetation? It has been studied the value of trees and vegetations on improving air quality. North Minneapolis has recorded high number when it comes to pollution already. Why would you take down the mature trees that help combat poor air quality and add greatly to people’s lively hood of enjoying a park like setting for their homes. We want mature trees and beautiful green spaces in our “ Suburb within a city” Lyn Park....(continued in P-21-2)</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street. Lyndale Avenue is not a part of the recommended Project Alignment.</p>





Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-21-2	Neitzke	Kathy	<p>Another concerning impact is that of safety to the community with a Lyndale rail route. How is there going to be room for all who would use that road be safe when it isn't wide enough to safely accommodate all that use it: cars, buses, walkers, bikers, and emergency vehicles? How can you safely coordinate all of this into one road, Lyndale? Is it safe to place when we have 3 schools in the immediate area and a senior high rise? What is the safety plan for kids and seniors to cross Lyndale? I guess the plan would include using many residents backyards and property to make the street wide enough and safe.</p> <p>Another area is safety regarding the traffic that would be backed up because of the trains running. Plymouth and Lyndale intersection was a high crash area. When it was changed to one lane in each direction has helped cut down on accidents. Now with a train it will be backed up and unsafe driving maneuvers will grow in numbers. Car traffic will be slowed and drivers may react and cause accidents like running more and more red lights because a train is approaching.</p> <p>What is the impact of increased foot traffic in the residential neighborhood located near the proposed station? Crime has been on the increase and that action will only increase the number of whom, some could cause safety concerns.</p> <p>A residential street is not the place to place a rail line. Place the line in an area that has more potential business growth and development, not disrupting a residential area 24/7.... (continued in P-21-3)</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street. Lyndale Avenue is not a part of the recommended Project Alignment.</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-21-3	Neitzke	Kathy	<p>Another vital question is what is the impact of having a cul de sac design with access only on 14 and 18th into Lyn Park East? What is the access plan for the construction Period? How are people going to maneuver in and out with construction? What about the most important routes for emergency vehicles entering the east side of Lyn Park. There is only one way access on 14th and 18th. How are those residents going to travel in and out of their neighborhood? This summer a street project needed Police patrols to insure safety for the neighborhood during the week of that street work. What is the plan for years of construction? Will you have the police protecting that work too?</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street. Lyndale Avenue is not a part of the recommended Project Alignment.</p>
P-21-4	Neitzke	Kathy	<p>Lastly, when the neighborhood of Lyn Park was designed and built it did not plan for a train to run in a backyard or so close to the resident's structures. Most are at least 25 year old places. The design was not considering a LTR that runs around 19 hours a day. How can someone in their homes 15 feet away not be damaged by construction work of noise and vibration? What about the noise level to those living near the construction site? What is the effect of all that dust and small particles that will be added to an already high pollution levels? Related to the Lyn Park Design there is a flooding issue that occurs with lots of rain downpours on Lyndale. On the East Side of Lyndale some of the low cul de sacs will temporarily flood. The hill begins around the Ascension Church and goes downhill from there. How is that going to impact a LTR that will be safe during heavy rains and not cause more temporary flooding in the neighborhood. Maybe not the place to build a LTR with that complicated underground work.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street. Lyndale Avenue is not a part of the recommended Project Alignment.</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-22	Polich	Dylan	<p>Due to the lack of resistances and workplaces over on Plymouth avenue the extension onto the blue line is unnecessary. 10<sup>th</sup> Ave and I-94 route would suffice and not have an effect on the students and faculty at TCIS. That being said in recent studies done by americanexperiment.org found that the light rail in the twin cities is one of the most dangerous metro transits across the country. With children ages 5 all the way through 14 years old being next to this transit makes it extremely unsafe for all of the students attending this charter school. Further more with the increased construction and pollution surrounding the area at which the city is planning on putting this extension will affect all of these students learning and prevent the teachers from having a safe and secure classroom. The amount of money it would cost to go the 10<sup>th</sup> Ave I-94 route would be sufficient rather than affecting the TCIS's students from what all kids want to do, learn. Overall the light rail extension is not in the best interest for the students and faculty at TCIS and will effect the school and the surrounding area in a negative way.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-23	Cate	Neziah	<p>This is will have a negative impact on a school (Twin Cities International School) this line will be next too. There is already limited space for important and necessary outdoor time. Noise pollution from construction affects learning. Increased foot traffic means increased safety concerns. The buses parking stalls will be blocked. Teachers and staff will lose parking areas.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				<p>operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p>
P-24	Smith	Chanin	<p>I am a teacher at Twin Cities International School and I am concerned about the propose<sup>d</sup> route (10th Ave/I-94 route and Plymouth Ave transit station) for these reasons: 1. Noise and pollution: construction dust and noise will affect learning for students. 2. Neighborhood safety: the new station will bring lots of foot traffic which could be unsafe for our students outside. 3. Bus traffic and parking: the tracks will block our bus route and use our parking areas. 4. Playground space: we'll lose green space and two playgrounds. Please consider alternate options for this route and station. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis). For air pollution, and noise and vibration concerns, please</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				see SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis).
P-25	Walls	Merissa	I am a teacher at Twin Cities International School and I am concerned about the propose <sup>d</sup> route (10th Ave/I-94 route and Plymouth Ave transit station) for these reasons: 1. Noise and pollution: construction dust and noise will affect learning. 2. Neighborhood safety: the new station will bring lots of foot traffic. 3. Bus traffic and parking: the tracks will block our bus route and use our parking areas. 4. Playground space: we'll lose green space and two playgrounds. Please consider alternate options for this route and station. Thank you for your consideration.	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis). For air pollution, and noise and vibration concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis).</p>
P-26	Aden	Mariah	I am an instructional coach at Twin Cities International School, and I am concerned about the propose <sup>d</sup> route (10th Ave/I-94 route and Plymouth Ave transit station) for these reasons: 1. Noise and pollution: construction dust and noise will affect learning. 2. Neighborhood safety: the	Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N,



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>new station will bring lots of foot traffic. 3. Bus traffic and parking: the tracks will block our bus route and use our parking areas. 4. Playground space: we'll lose green space and two playgrounds. Please consider alternate options for this route and station. I appreciate your consideration. Thank you!</p>	<p>over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis). For air pollution, and noise and vibration concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis).</p>
P-27	Strand	Jessie	<p>I am a teacher at Twin Cities International School and I am concerned about the propose<sup>d</sup> route (10th Ave/I-94 route and Plymouth Ave transit station) for these reasons: 1. Noise and pollution: construction dust and noise will affect learning. 2. Neighborhood safety: the new station will bring lots of foot traffic. 3. Bus traffic and parking: the tracks will block our bus route and use our parking areas. 4. Playground space: we'll lose green space and two playgrounds. Please consider alternate options for this route and station. Thank you for your consideration</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				<p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis). For air pollution, and noise and vibration concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis).</p>
P-28	N/A	N/A	Security is already an issue, with increased foot traffic, security will become more of an issue.	Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. For safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).
P-29	N/A	N/A	Comment time to give by November 7 is too short.	Thank you for submitting your comment. The Preparation Notice was released in the <i>EQB Monitor</i> on October 20, 2022. The standard comment period for this notice is 20 calendar days as outlined by Minnesota Statute 4410.2100 Subp 4.A. Following this guidance, the comment period ended 20 calendar days after the notice publication, on November 7, 2022. Generally, the Council is always open to accepting input. Input received over an extended period of time through multiple outreach opportunities has



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				played a vital role in guiding the Project Alignment.
P-30	N/A	N/A	School playground is close, it impacts: recess for kids, pollution, construction for children, attract traffic, students exposed to drug people in the area, community should be involved	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p>
P-31	N/A	N/A	The crime rates in Minneapolis will continue to rise if this project happens. Brooklyn Park is known for its horrible crime rate and imagine connecting the two cities.	Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. For safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).
P-32	Mawbi	Lypran	My name is Lypran Mawbi. I am a teacher at TCIS and a board member. My suggestion is please use the Lyndale option but still make plans to boost safety and plans to ease traffic along Plymouth Avenue.	Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue,





Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				<p>ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p>
P-33	N/A	N/A	<p>It's not good for the safety of the children. The train makes noise and the other way. When you build the train station it is going to effect the safety of the students.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis). For noise and vibration</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				<p>concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis).</p>
P-34	N/A	N/A	<p>I think one of the impacts that this might have will include the safety. There are kids that go to this school and there are a lot of people using the Blue Line so it might effect them. Please reconsider again and look for the safety of small kids that go to this school Twin Cities International.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-35	N/A	N/A	<p>I have deep concerns surrounding the Blue Line east I-94 option. I am concerned for safety - putting a station so close to the school will bring more traffic and crime. The light rail will take away parking for parents and staff. It also will take away property space for recess and busing. The school serves a marginalized community and it seems like this is only affecting teh school community more!</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>How will students learn when there is construction noise, or safety concerns or lack of space to feel safe to play at recess. Or where will staff park? Please consider changing routes!</p>	<p>southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-36	N/A	N/A	<p>Serious safety concerns with the Blue Line effecting Twin Citie International Schools. It will effect student safety and ability to learn in a space free of construction noise, train noise every 10-15 minutes. Where will staff park? Students play ground will be ruined and not have a place to play. It will effect busing and students having access to the school. It will bring an uptick in crime to an already vulnerable community! Please consider mvoing the route to a different location or the station location.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				<p>stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-37	N/A	N/A	<p>As a parent of children at the Twin Cities International Schools I have concerns for my child's safety and being safe at school.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-38	N/A	N/A	<p>Parents of students at TCIS I don't want it by the school. There will be no parking, no place to play. I have concerns about safety for kids and staff. Not safe for the school and the kids future. It scares me as a parent. There is pollution that will effect learning. Pleae don't build it.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis). For parking concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 3 (Transportation).</p>
P-39	N/A	N/A	<p>As a parent of the kids at Twin Cities International Schools I don't want the line impacting my kid's safety or how they will do in school. The busing and staff will be effected.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue,</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				<p>ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-40	N/A	N/A	<p>I am a parent of students at TCIS. I am worried about safety, cost and how it will hurt my kid's learning. We do not want the line at all! It is not fair to the community. The pollution will hurt our kids. The teachers won't come to teach. It is not okay to build by any school. These kids are our future.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				<p>stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-41	N/A	N/A	Do not build. Safety, pollution, no playground. These are my kids it effects	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis). For air pollution concerns, please see DSEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis).</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-42	N/A	N/A	<p>I have a kid at TCIS I am worried for their safety. I am worried for where the stop is, who will come and bring crime. IT will hurt our kids learning, community, and businesses. It will take our palyground, it will take away teachers to teach our kids. The safety of taking away bus parking and over crowding the small space. Please DO NOT build this line here. It is not fair to the community that lives, work, and sends our kids here every day.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-43	N/A	N/A	<p>Parent of kids at the local school Twin Cities School, community member, I have seen this built by my house and it is unsafe by my house. Now by where my kids go ot school, I do not think it's safe or fair that you build by a school of kids that already feed vulnerable. We know facts of other areas, brings concern of cost for the school, and drive, and where we will park. Construction affects learning and testing. Ruin the new building and the community all around.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently</p>





Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				<p>operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-44	N/A	N/A	<p>I am a parent of kids at TCIS. No student should have to worry about the safety concerns. I have seen the impact by Cedar Riverside. It has only hurt our community and this will make even our kids school day unsafe. No teachers, pollution and crime. No build option is my vote.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).
P-45	N/A	N/A	I am a parent of children at Twin Cities Schools. I don't want the line. The safety of my kids and the community.	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-46	N/A	N/A	Crime rates in Minneapolis will continue to rise if this project happens. Brooklyn Park is known for its horrible crime rate and imagine connecting the two cities.	Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. For safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).
P-47	N/A	N/A	Elementary school parent - Concerned about school safety, propose no build option, lastly, Lyndale Route option if we have to build.	Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				<p>identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-48	N/A	N/A	We need more time.	Thank you for submitting your comment. Generally, the Council is always open to accepting input. Input received over a period of time through multiple outreach opportunities has played a role in guiding the recommended Project Alignment.



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-49	N/A	N/A	<p>Putting a light rail in a neighborhood on schools areas is wrongdoing for the community. Air quality and safety near station locations will only grow in negative numbers. This fits for both Lyndale route and East 94 location.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p> <p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis). For air pollution concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis).</p>
P-50	N/A	N/A	<p>Yes, as per the school's position, we would rather not have the 94 west option as this will impact in the school's west side. The tracks construction will disrupt hearing, students playing, and buses coming to school. Avoid the school if possible - east 94, avoid the Plymouth station, Avoid 10th and the back of the school, consider the Lyndale option - 7th St to Lyndale.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				<p>southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p>
P-51	N/A	N/A	<p>I am a parent and I don't want the blue line. It effects safety and buses and whre my kids play. Do not build this near the school or in the community. It will create crime just like by my house.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns. The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS routes the LRT in Minneapolis from 21st Avenue N, over I-94, turning south on Washington Avenue N, then turning southwest on 10th Avenue, ultimately connecting to the currently operating METRO Blue Line Target Field Station using 7th Street.</p> <p>Based on public input and to serve more people, the recommended Project Alignment includes guideway on Washington Avenue and 10th Avenue, avoiding guideway and stations adjacent to the Twin Cities International School.</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				<p>For other safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-52-1	Willging	Joseph	<p>This proposal should be rescoped based on significant changes to commuter and other user transit requirements. The project as envisioned utilizes user data that is no longer current and is based on projections that don't adequately consider changed circumstances. Alternative modes of transit that that can be flexibly sized and scoped to meet changing transit needs (e.g. reduced emission bus service, rideshare) should be evaluated. The Purpose and Need statement in the project Scoping Booklet states that the project is needed because: "Access to jobs in Minneapolis, St. Paul, the University of Minnesota, and growing suburbs is crucial. Traffic congestion is expected to intensify in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area through 2030 and beyond. Current transit service in the Bottineau Transitway project area offers a limited number of travel-time competitive alternatives to personal vehicles. Without major transit investments, it will be difficult to effectively meet the transportation needs of people and businesses in the corridor, manage highway traffic congestion in the project area, and achieve the region's goal of doubling transit ridership by 2030." Scoping Booklet Bottineau Transitway at 2. Further, the Project Profile available on the Federal Transit Administration website provides that: "The Project is intended to improve access to employment and activity centers outside of downtown Minneapolis, which has nearly 140,000 jobs and a growing population....(continued in P-52-2)</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The ridership is gradually rising after the pandemic levels and will continue to rise, justifying the use of LRT in this corridor.</p> <p>This information is available on the Metro Transit website here: <a href="https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline">https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline</a></p> <p>This Project is an investment for several decades to come. The operation of this Project will not only provide alternate means to redistribute the growing traffic load on the roads but will also serve numerous community members throughout this corridor who do not own personal vehicles.</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-52-2	Willging	Joseph	<p>Key destinations in the Project corridor include North Hennepin Community College and a large, growing Target corporate campus near the northern end of the line in Brooklyn Park. Additionally, the Project is expected to improve transit service for residents in the corridor, who are generally more dependent on transit and lower-income than the overall population in the Twin Cities region. Finally, the Project provides through service along the existing METRO Blue Line to the Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport and Mall of America, with connections in downtown Minneapolis to the University of Minnesota campus and downtown St. Paul via the METRO Green Line." METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT) Project Profile: FY 2023 Annual Report. This Project Profile is unchanged from the Project Profile for Fiscal Year 2019. METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT) Project Profile: FY 2019. The purpose and need statement and the information on which it relies is out of date, failing to acknowledge transit ridership trends beginning before the fall off of ridership occasioned by the Covid 19 pandemic. Nor does it seem to consider whether transit ridership will ever recover to pre-pandemic levels, and if it does not, whether the Blue Line extension will still be necessary or whether other transit alternatives (such as bus) would be better approaches to transit needs. Prior to the precipitous drop in transit ridership occasioned by the pandemic, ridership was already decreasing on Twin Cities public transit. Estimates suggest that between 2014 and 2019 ridership had decreased by 4.8 percent, indicating that projections for significant future increases may be unreliable. Randal O’Toole, Transit: The Urban Parasite (CATO Institute), Table 1 at 4....(continued in P-52-3)</p>	



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-52-3	Willging	Joseph	<p>Further, experience of other metro areas does not necessarily suggest that rail transit will reverse that trend. Id. at 9. Since the disruptions of the pandemic, ridership has been slow to return to pre-pandemic levels. According to local press accounts, Metro Transit ridership was only at 52% of pre-pandemic levels as of May 2022, with nothing more than a “hope” that it will rise to perhaps 75% of pre-pandemic levels sometime in 2023. Gray, Callan, “Metro Transit ridership starting to rebound after significant drop during pandemic.” KSTP.com (May 21, 2022). However, it is not clear that ridership will ever return to pre-pandemic levels, since the long-term changes in transit needs after Covid are not well understood. It is not clear how many lost passengers will ever return, or how much of a need for public transit will continue to exist. See Erdahl, Kent, KARE11.com (Oct. 20, 2020 “Twin Cities traffic is back, but work isn’t the main reason” (“And with fewer people traveling solely for work, it’s meant fewer people taking public transportation. Metro Transit Ridership has climbed near a two year high this fall, but remains about half of what it was in 2019.”). Until those things are reasonably considered, it is impossible to determine either what type of transit will best serve the changed requirements or how it should be sized. For example, it appears that with Covid came alternative work arrangements...work from home, hybrid work, etc., how many of these arrangements may continue as a permanent feature of the Twin Cities work experience? Additionally, will other types of non-work travel also be reduced. Examples of these include telemedicine as opposed to in office visits and increase in the use of distance learning technologies and video conferencing for work and other purposes. These are</p>	





Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			all changes that may be with us for the long-term and will reduce the burden on transportation resources.	
P-53	Popousek	Robert	The project in total is a waste of taxpayer money, to build it and then to operate it. The ridership demand is not there. The Met council is the only real supporter. It also will not fit physically down route 81 and it does not belong on hwy 81.	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The ridership is gradually rising after the pandemic levels and will continue to rise, justifying the use of LRT in this corridor.</p> <p>This information is available on the Metro Transit website here: <a href="https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline">https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline</a></p> <p>This Project is an investment for several decades to come. The operation of this Project will not only provide alternate means to redistribute the growing traffic load on the roads but will also serve numerous community members throughout this corridor who do not own personal vehicles. For the financial concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 10 (Financial Analysis).</p>
P-54	Robins	David	Irrespective of environment - this projects costs are massive and you've done nothing to establish the genuine need for light rail in a post-pandemic economy - especially when other, cheaper and SCALABLE options exist! Please show some humility and concern. When you only give people a choice of A or B, for example, why are they not able to express, "Neither!" Please consider other options to light rail and the Blue Line	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The ridership is gradually rising after the pandemic levels and will continue to rise, justifying the use of LRT in this corridor.</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				<p>This information is available on the Metro Transit website here: <a href="https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline">https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline</a></p> <p>This Project is an investment for several decades to come. The operation of this Project will not only provide alternate means to redistribute the growing traffic load on the roads but will also serve numerous community members throughout this corridor who do not own personal vehicles. For the financial concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 10 (Financial Analysis).</p>
P-55	Wade	Girard	<p>This route is entirely ineffective in serving as a form of transit. The trains will not travel at a speed of more than 15 miles an hour and will be not be flexible enough to be easily changed to meet service needs as they change. As for safety, statistically 1 to 2 people will be killed by this train every year and there will be at least 1 accident every 1-3 months.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>This Project is being built for the purpose and need factors described in SDEIS Chapter 1 (Purpose and Need). To fulfill the Project purpose, the Project will need to cater to the topics described in the need factors. To achieve the most efficient Project, there will be trade-offs to achieve optimal design while causing least feasible environmental, social, and economic impacts and maximizing benefits to the overall corridor. For safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				Analysis). For travel time comparisons, please see SDEIS Chapter 3 (Transportation).
P-56	Strauch	Missy	<p>Blue Line information is from pre-pandemic surveys and this info has not been updated. \$2 Billion to build. The line would not travel on the existing railroad tracks that travel through the impacted communities, but rather tracks would be added down the middle of existing thoroughfares. These tracks would be within 100 yards from my back yard and I do not want that. There is no mobility upside with the Blue Line. For comparison purposes, the Green Line, which runs down University Ave in Mpls/St. Paul, moves people at 16-17 MPH. The Blue Line would move people at 10-15 MPH. The NorthStar line lost 90% of its riders during the pandemic and is on the verge of closure. One of the goals of the light rail for the Met Council is to 'urbanize the suburbs'. This comes through Transit Oriented Development, which is the term for the redevelopment that would occur along the rail line, most notably building apartments/condos and parking. Along that note, there is a sizable transit center at 694 and ct rd 81 which has closed due to 'underutilization'. So the answer of "WHY" build this is not clear and certainly does not seem to serve the people well for affected communities. I do not want our community to be "urbanized" in this way. The trains would run every 10 minutes, which means every 5 minutes since they are bidirectional. This would cause too much noise too close to my house. The new light rail line would remove tax paying properties in Robbinsdale and replace it with non-tax generating parking lots/ramps</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The ridership is gradually rising after the pandemic levels and will continue to rise, justifying the use of LRT in this corridor.</p> <p>This information is available on the Metro Transit website here: <a href="https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline">https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline</a></p> <p>This Project is an investment for several decades to come. The operation of this Project will not only provide alternate means to redistribute the growing traffic load on the roads but will also serve numerous community members throughout this corridor who do not own personal vehicles. For the financial concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 10 (Financial Analysis). For noise and vibration concerns and information on the data collection/analysis, please see SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis). For property impact information, please see SDEIS</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).
P-57	Enneking	Andrea	Too expensive and disruptive.	Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.
P-58	Groetken	Christine	Far too expensive for technology that is showing not to be useful, too noisy, too many trains, too slow, will cause horrible traffic issues in areas, not necessary urbanization of communities, too much additional hardscape, no end point with Northstar utilization non-existent	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The ridership is gradually rising after the pandemic levels and will continue to rise, justifying the use of LRT in this corridor.</p> <p>This information is available on the Metro Transit website here: <a href="https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline">https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline</a></p> <p>This Project is an investment for several decades to come. The operation of this Project will not only provide alternate means to redistribute the growing traffic load on the roads but will also serve numerous community members throughout this corridor who do not own personal vehicles.</p> <p>For safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p> <p>For traffic concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 3 (Transportation). For noise and vibration concerns and</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				information on the data collection/analysis, please see SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis).
P-59	Murphy	Regan	Yes. Study and present alternative modes. Particularly BRT or Ride share. Ridership data is outdated and we can not justify the expense of LRT system that won't provide timely service to desired locations. Post COVID data must be used. How will crime be handled differently than it is now on current LRT system?	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>A comparison study was completed for this corridor to analyze the most efficient way of transit among BRT, arterial BRT, dedicated guideway BRT, and LRT. Based on the ridership and opportunities for transit-based development in the region, the LRT was chosen as the preferred mode of transportation in agreement with the cities along the Project corridor. Therefore, this is an LRT project. The ridership is gradually rising after the pandemic levels and will continue to rise, justifying the use of LRT in this corridor.</p> <p>This information is available on the Metro Transit website here: <a href="https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline">https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline</a></p> <p>This Project is an investment for several decades to come. The operation of this Project will not only provide alternate means to redistribute the growing traffic load on the roads but will also serve</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				<p>numerous community members throughout this corridor who do not own personal vehicles.</p> <p>For safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-60	Sutton	Brad	<p>Yes - I am STRONGLY opposed to conducting any further work on this project until another research can be done now that we are post-pandemic. It seems the project is relying on data from a pre-pandemic research report. It is obvious to see that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ridership has changed dramatically since 2019 yet unemployment has remained the same (3.6% nationally and even better in MN)</li> <li>2. It is highly likely that ridership has changed for 3 main reasons               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. The nature of how we work has changed dramatically 25% of all professional jobs are remote/hybrid. 16% of companies have gone completely remote.</li> <li>B. Lightrail safety is far below the national average (we are more dangerous here than the national average) C. The way we shop for clothes, groceries, food, etc. continues to move towards Amazon and apps like GrubHub, UberEats, Etc.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>I think it would be hugely irresponsible to press forward on this project until A. Crime can be controled and we can align our Light Rail safety numbers with the national average. B. Once we can get control of crime, then we need to look again at ridership data. Assuming we see an uptick in ridership due to safer trains then C. Evaluate</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The ridership is gradually rising after the pandemic levels and will continue to rise, justifying the use of LRT in this corridor.</p> <p>This information is available on the Metro Transit website here: <a href="https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline">https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline</a></p> <p>This Project is an investment for several decades to come. The operation of this Project will not only provide alternate means to redistribute the growing traffic load on the roads but will also serve numerous community members throughout this corridor who do not own personal vehicles.</p> <p>For safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			core drivers for ridership. Is it work, school, shopping, travel, etc? D. THEN compare ridership today to the pre-pandemic report	
P-61	Habkey	Libby	I really think this is overpriced and will disrupt our town.	Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.
P-62	Olson	Derek	yes	Incomplete comment. This comment cannot be responded to due to its incomplete nature.
P-63	Schneider	Scott A.	Carbon footprint during this extensive project will be overwhelming. Have you looked into the environmental impact of just the production of cement, let alone the impact of putting it in place? This whole project is too expensive, too disruptive and unnecessary. Have you done a post Covid ridership study? If so, and probably not done, what are the revised numbers?	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The ridership is gradually rising after the pandemic levels and will continue to rise, justifying the use of LRT in this corridor.</p> <p>This information is available on the Metro Transit website here: <a href="https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline">https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline</a></p> <p>This Project is an investment for several decades to come. The operation of this Project will not only provide alternate means to redistribute the growing traffic load on the roads but will also serve numerous community members throughout this corridor who do not own personal vehicles.</p> <p>The environmental impact analysis studies the direct and cumulative effects of the Project on the natural</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				<p>environment and the social and economic aspects of the communities along the corridor. Please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis), Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis), and Chapter 6 (Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects) for the concerns expressed in the comment.</p>
P-63	Ganz	Cantry	<p>The project does not align with the views, wants or needs of the actual people living in the vicinity of the proposed (or any) light rail route, those who would be most negatively affected. Rather, it is being bulldozed through by those at the Met Council and a handful of politicians deaf to the opinions of the people and spearheading what equates to a vanity project so they can say ‘look what I did’. Get over yourselves, listen to the people - both the affected citizens in the vicinity of the route and the 90% who stopped using public transit either because of worries over rider safety or the novelty wore off and it doesn’t get people to where they need to be in a timely manner, consider the \$100s of millions I’m sure already wasted on research as sunk costs and shelf the project. We live in the suburbs, stop trying to urbanize an area created as an alternative option to the urban city. No one wants it, no one will use it, it brings crime, not people to the suburbs. But let’s be honest, someone or some group high enough up has already decided it’s happening and you’re just humoring the good people with a feedback survey that will fall on deaf ears. Please feel to print or use my opinion in opposition to the project.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and concerns.</p> <p>This Project is an investment for several decades to come. Operation of this Project will not only provide alternate means to redistribute the growing traffic load on the roads but will also serve numerous community members throughout this corridor who do not own personal vehicles.</p> <p>For safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis). For cost concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 10 (Financial Analysis).</p>





Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-64	Brauer	A	<p>With the issues re: the Southwest Light Rail, crime rate in the area, and lack of ridership on other transit areas, I believe this Blue Line Light Rail needs to be tabled. Perhaps the money can be used for other more pertinent issues. Doesn't the North Metro already have the North Star? I've lived in Boston &amp; loved their rail system...used it all the time, but it had also been there for many, many years...Bostonians grew up with the T -System. We are not there yet. If people aren't safe or don't feel safe, they aren't going to use the system. Low ridership doesn't make a profit. What other infrastructure can we use the money for? Perhaps more bike trails would be more advantageous.</p>	<p>The ridership is gradually rising after the pandemic levels and will continue to rise, justifying the use of LRT in this corridor.</p> <p>This information is available on the Metro Transit website here: <a href="https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline">https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline</a></p> <p>This Project is an investment for several decades to come. The operation of this Project will not only provide alternate means to redistribute the growing traffic load on the roads but will also serve numerous community members throughout this corridor who do not own personal vehicles.</p> <p>North Star serves northern suburbs and beyond. The METRO Blue Line LRT Extension would serve suburbs in the northwest portion of the metro, and would provide a one-seat ride from Brooklyn Park to the Minneapolis Airport and multiple destinations in between. This Project has junctions where riders can move between multiple METRO projects to reach different destinations.</p>
P-65	Quinn	Mike	Yes	Incomplete comment. This comment cannot be responded to due to its incomplete nature.



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-66	Hotvedt	Craig	<p>Thanks for holding the open house on 10/25 in Robbinsdale. My comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I suggest locating the Rdale station just north of 40th Avenue North.</li> <li>2. Place the park and ride on the WEST side of Bottineau in the USBank parking lot. When people park on the west side of Bottineau, they will be more likely to walk-to/support Rdale retail district. If the ramp is on the east side of Bottineau, people will be less likely to cross the busy highway to visit Rdale businesses. They will be more likely to get in their car and drive away.</li> <li>3. The North Memorial station needs designated parking space (even if it is small.) People will end up parking in residential neighborhoods without it.</li> <li>4. I was surprised at the rail/station elevation at North. Any options for putting the station at-/below-ground and connect with the North tunnel system? This would help with accessibility issues.</li> </ol>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and suggestions.</p> <p>SDEIS Chapter 2 discusses features under the recommended Project Alignment, including station placement and park-and-ride locations in each city in detail.</p>
P-67	Opheim	Josh	<p>I would like to know how it is considered that there are no major concerns with pedestrian, light rail and vehicular traffic along the West Broadway corridor. Has anyone driven along the Hiawatha Light Rail and what a pain that has been since it started up? I imagine this alignment being a twin to that. Many people have concerns about pedestrian traffic and vehicular traffic impacts, specifically in Robbinsdale, but apparently those are not valid? Also, has a study been done to see the volume of traffic accidents on CR-81 through Robbinsdale and how many street lights and trees get taken out along this stretch of roadway yearly? I do not see how putting in a light rail will help remedy this. How will the light rail be constructed to</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The guideway and station placement considers important factors like pedestrian crossing, vehicular traffic, and bike crossing and routes, and also adheres to Americans with Disabilities Act requirements. Please see SDEIS Chapter 3 (Transportation), which discusses potential effects of the Project on these topics. Chapter 3 also discusses mitigation options to</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			prevent collisions with vehicles between intersections, and will it look pleasing?	mitigate the impacts caused by the Project. Please also see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis) for the visual/aesthetic analysis.
P-68	Cohen	Heidi Vesterinen	Yes - the planned path through Downtown Robbinsdale is through a street that is already very busy but has residential buildings right next to it. The plans should incorporate some sound & visual barriers to the road to improve both safety and comfortability of the neighborhood.	<p>Thank you for your comments and suggestions.</p> <p>These suggestions would be considered as the design moves forward. The SDEIS discusses only the potential mitigation options. The mitigation commitments are typically made through the SFEIS. Please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis) for more discussion and data analysis on the concerns regarding aesthetic and visual impacts and SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis) regarding the concern on noise.</p>
P-69-1	Dirkers	David	I was very disappointed to see the updated plans for downtown Robbinsdale at the 10/25/22 meeting at Elim Church. I was a supporter of the line originally, but it think that the impact to Robbinsdale becomes worse and worse with every new rendering that is released. I think the LRT station would only make sense at 41st if the entire station/track was elevated (at least, from before 40th past 42nd). Therefore I am not in favor of a station at 41st as rendered. ESPECIALLY with a park and ride garage right in downtown Robbinsdale at the site of the current roadway pizza. This will harm the town for generations to come, and create a dead zone of commerce + greatly	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The recommended Project Alignment identified in the SDEIS explores potential station locations and park-and-ride locations in each city in SDEIS Chapter 2. For traffic concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 3 (Transportation). For economic concerns due to the Project, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>increase the presence of cars in the core area of town. This is a HORRIBLE idea and a mistake. Robbinsdale doesn't need a park and ride in the center of its small town, there are other park and ride options along the line that are more suburban. If the line does need to run at grade.. I would propose the station at the 42nd ave intersection, on the north... (Continued in P-69-2)</p>	<p>Social Analysis). For noise and vibration concerns and to see the noise data collection and analysis, please see SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis).</p>
P-69-2	Dirkers	David	<p>This would essentially be a better version of the original 40th street station rendering. It would lessen the entirety of the impact to the downtown Robbinsdale core. I think this line is being designed for the benefit of North Minneapolis.. and there really isn't a true amount of care devoted to how this line will impact the historic small town of Robbinsdale, and its concerning. My personal attitudes toward this project are changing greatly, more negatively as a result of each public session. Its clear that Robbinsdale is a byproduct to the line, not a focus of it. My support is waning, and I feel a true tough negotiator needs to be re approaching the railroad, on a revised plan that maybe runs town W. Broadway in North Mpls; then Golden Valley Road to the existing railroad infrastructure &amp; then through Robbinsdale. Also this line will bring more noise &amp; impact to the natural areas in an around Crystal Lake. I care deeply about Robbinsdale, &amp; its long term viability &amp; prosperity. I believe the way the proposed construction in Robbinsdale will be a mistake, and a rushed approach to this project design which cant be undone in the future.</p>	



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-70	Furlong	Joanne	The LRT will ruin the small town atmosphere of Robbinsdale. It is not needed nor wanted and will disrupt the small amount of green space we have and add to congestion already on hywy 81. Your ridership numbers are totally off. People work from home. There is no need for LRT here !!!	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>For the concerns regarding green space and visual character, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis). For concerns regarding traffic, please see Chapter 3 (Transportation).</p> <p>The ridership is gradually rising after the pandemic levels and will continue to rise, justifying the use of LRT in this corridor.</p> <p>This information is available on the Metro Transit website here:  <a href="https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline">https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline</a></p> <p>This Project is an investment for several decades to come. The operation of this Project will not only provide alternate means to redistribute the growing traffic load on the roads but will also serve numerous community members throughout this corridor who do not own personal vehicles.</p>
P-71	Not Provided	Jen	I want transit that is efficient and effective, and that is a good fit for our transit users and our community. Taking the proposed LRT line through Robbinsdale lacks in all these areas and will have negative social, economic, and environmental impacts. The design will physically split our	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>For pedestrian crossing and traffic concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 3</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>town and make it harder for both pedestrians and those using other modes of transportation to get around. In some places along CR 81 the LRT will be very close to homes and with horns blazing at the downtown Robbinsdale stop, it will be heard across our entire community multiple times each hour (added noise pollution). The construction will bring significant disruption to of our community (the other LRT projects have taken years to complete, and some still are not finished and are over budget). It will also have a negative economic impact. The construction disruption will make it difficult to get to places of business easily will cause some business to go out of business. This has happened along the University and SW LRT lines. I have found it hard to find people that would want or need to ride the proposed Blue Line on a regular basis. Aside from sporting events, this route doesn't go anywhere that people need to get to or connect to anything else once you're out in Brooklyn Park. Other modes of transportation are less destructive and disruptive to our community, offer more options and flexibility to riders, and cost less.</p>	<p>(Transportation). For concerns regarding economic impacts due to the Project, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p> <p>Additionally, numerous topics are addressed in SDEIS Chapters 3, 4, 5, and 6 for potential short-term (construction phase) and long-term (operating phase) impacts and mitigation options.</p>
P-72	Shull	Karen	<p>Several concerns            Cost            Ridership way down            Safety issues            Dividing Robbinsdale by going down middle of Bottineau Blvd            Bus Trandit better solution</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>For safety and community impact concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p> <p>The ridership is gradually rising after the pandemic levels and will continue to rise, justifying the use of LRT in this corridor.</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				<p>This information is available on the Metro Transit website here: <a href="https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline">https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline</a></p> <p>This Project is an investment for several decades to come. The operation of this Project will not only provide alternate means to redistribute the growing traffic load on the roads but will also serve numerous community members throughout this corridor who do not own personal vehicles.</p>
P-73	Owens	Robyn	<p>Please please please rethink spending this much money on a project that is going to take away from the small town feel of Robbinsdale. I've enjoyed living in Robbinsdale for over 25 years after growing up in a small town. I put roots here because I felt safe and it felt like a community. It reminded me of home. The light rail has been shown to be dangerous, offer opportunities to people to show up in our town with less than great intentions. Please keep our town safe and for our community to feel special. PLEASE rethink this.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>For safety and community impact concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-74	Shull	Robert	<p>Should not go down the middle of 81 Bottineau in Robbinsdale, light rail has been proven not to be safe. More people working remote. Cost, Cost. How is that Southwest line to Eden Prairie</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>For safety and community impact concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-75	Berger	Valerie	If this was going along the railroad tracks, outside of the main road through Robbinsdale, that would be a better option. To go through the main road through Robbinsdale is NOT a solution when spending that much money. PLEASE, don't ruin Robbinsdale with adding this through our community.	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>As specified in SDEIS Chapter 1 (Purpose and Need) and Chapter 2 (Alternatives), negotiations with the rail company to use the freight rail right-of-way were unsuccessful, which led to the modified route for this portion of the corridor.</p>
P-76	Ambrose	Lou	I oppose the Bottineau route. There is not enough room for the train. It will cut Robbinsdale in half and people will be afraid to ride through North Mpls. A woman riding on a bus was hit by a stray bullet last week in North Mountain Mpls. The original route was good but this change will doom the project. Ridership will not support the line and it is a huge waste of money. Please stop this route	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>For safety and community impact concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p> <p>The ridership is gradually rising after the pandemic levels and will continue to rise, justifying the use of LRT in this corridor.</p> <p>This information is available on the Metro Transit website here: <a href="https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline">https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline</a></p> <p>This Project is an investment for several decades to come. The operation of this Project will not only provide alternate means to redistribute the growing traffic load on the roads but will also serve numerous community members</p>





Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				throughout this corridor who do not own personal vehicles.
P-77	Shull	M. Lee	<p>When Federal reports come out stating that MN light rail is dangerous I don't know why Robbinsdale would want this in their City. They have worked so hard to improve the City (restaurants, housing, Hyvee, etc) and the light rail will ruin it. There is no reason, other than political gain, to put this through Robbinsdale. This route should go around Robbinsdale, not through it.</p> <p><a href="https://www.americanexperiment.org/federal-data-shows-twin-cities-light-rail-is-the-most-dangerous-in-america/">https://www.americanexperiment.org/federal-data-shows-twin-cities-light-rail-is-the-most-dangerous-in-america/</a></p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>For safety and community impact concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-78	Okerstrom	Danika	<p>Would like to try pushing again to use existing railroad. concerns is congestion along the path going from one side of Robbinsdale to the other. Other concern is preservation of the downtown area and businesses, as well as the accessibility to the local park off 36th.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>As specified in SDEIS Chapter 1 (Purpose and Need) and Chapter 2 (Alternatives), negotiations with the rail company to use the freight rail right-of-way were unsuccessful, which led to the modified route for this portion of the corridor.</p> <p>For traffic concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 3 (Transportation). For property impact during the construction and operating phases, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-79	Sens	Sharon and Todd	ANY scope is too large because this is already ill-fated. Too much money to move minimal people around. Takes away from Robbinsdale's tax base. Brings noise and vibration to a quiet neighborhood. The bus terminal in Robbinsdale is already a bust, so we DON'T NEED THE BLUE LINE. This will lower our property values!!!	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>As specified in SDEIS Chapter 1 (Purpose and Need) and Chapter 2 (Alternatives), negotiations with the rail company to use the freight rail right-of-way were unsuccessful, which led to the modified route for this portion of the corridor.</p> <p>For traffic concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 3 (Transportation). For property impacts during the construction and operating phases, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-80	Roub	Benjamin	I have lived in Robbinsdale for 15 years. I love the small community and being close to the city without being part of the city. I like the restaurants and local businesses that the light rail would remove. I want them to stay. I do NOT want extra stops on 81 due to train traffic and I do NOT want the years of construction that would take place on 81 as it would be detrimental to local businesses. I live very close to HWY 81 and am also concerned about the noise of construction and operation of the line once completed. This line brings nothing to Robbinsdale other than tax debt and should not be part of our community	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>For traffic concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 3 (Transportation). For property impacts during the construction and operating phases, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-81-1	Kersten	Deb	<p>As a resident of Robbinsdale, I have significant concerns about the Blue Line being built.</p> <p>The cost. My understanding is it is estimated 30,000 people would ride the train per day. This is significantly overstated and a new study needs to be completed post-</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The ridership is gradually rising after the pandemic levels and will continue</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>pandemic. We know the world of work has changed. There are not as many people working in downtown Minneapolis as there were in the year before the pandemic. If we do a cost per rider analysis on the number of riders that would take the train on a daily basis, we would see something that looked more like Northstar. It is not sustainable to spend \$2Billion on a train and then not have paying users.</p> <p>The noise. Robbinsdale is a quiet suburb. As a resident, I enjoy the peace and quiet. If I wanted more noise pollution, I could move closer to the airport or closer to a freeway. I am not interested in hearing a train come through every 5 minutes. Development and urbanization. If I wanted to urbanize my community, I would move. Not all communities want to be urban. People need affordable single-family housing. Building more multi-family housing is not what our community needs. Owning a home is one of the greatest ways for families to build wealth....(Continued in P-81-2)</p>	<p>to rise, justifying the use of LRT in this corridor.</p> <p>This information is available on the Metro Transit website here: <a href="https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline">https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline</a></p> <p>This Project is an investment for several decades to come. The operation of this Project will not only provide alternate means to redistribute the growing traffic load on the roads but will also serve numerous community members throughout this corridor who do not own personal vehicles.</p> <p>For concerns related to noise and vibration data collection and analysis, please see SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis). For safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-81-2	Kersten	Deb	<p>Crime. According to federal data, people who decide to step on light rail in the Twin Cities are at more risk for being injured by an assailant than any other light rail system in America. Because Minnesota has degraded anyone in a position of authority, we are going to have trouble hiring Metro Transit and any type of police officer. Even if someone wanted to take light rail, the crime for a law abiding person is going to keep that person away. Even if they are not subject to a personal crime, there are</p>	



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>drugs openly being administered on the train. For people who do not partake in this behavior, this is unacceptable. Public transportation is something that can be accomplished through other avenues including busses. Our state does not need another light rail line particularly one that connects Brooklyn Park Target with downtown Target. Their employees aren't planning to return to downtown. This is a boondoggle project that needs to be dropped.</p>	
P-82	Goihl	Gordy	<p>As a 37 year citizen of Robbinsdale where we have raised a family and built our lives I can't think of anything that could be worse or more detrimental to our beautiful little city than this proposed project. Bottineau is the main artery through our small city, and the thought that it will be torn up for years during construction along with the commotion, noise and constant motion as trains run continuously down that road will change our lives forever. The ridiculous cost and waste of taxpayers money is hard to comprehend. There are so many other ways that this money could be used to improve the lives of the people that live along the propsed route. Not least of of all making this area safer for all. The idea that this route will stop in one of, if not the highest crime area in the state and then continue on to Robbinsdale and Crystal is very worrisome. Our lakes and parks are adjacent to the blue line route, these areas are frequented by families, mother's walking their children to playgrounds and baseball practice. Are they going to feel safe once this project is complete. Are riders going to feel safe everytime that train door opens at the North Minneapolis station? I have not read one positive article supporting the current light rail system in Minnesota. I'm against it.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>For noise and vibration concerns and to see the noise data collection and analysis, please see SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis). For safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			My neighbors are against it. Who's for it??? Please stop before it's too late!	
P-83	Scanlon	Andrea	I own a business in downtown Robbinsdale and live in Golden Valley. Initially I was positive on it, but since the crime has escalated so drastically over the last 2 years, I think it will bring more crime through and be riskier for both my business and home. Also, ridership has been significantly down and with Target pulling out/decreasing their focus in downtown Minneapolis I think this line will have low ridership (other than crime) and a high expense. Also will cut Robbinsdale into -literally- the “right” and “wrong” side of the tracks.	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>For safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p> <p>The ridership is gradually rising after the pandemic levels and will continue to rise, justifying the use of LRT in this corridor.</p> <p>This information is available on the Metro Transit website here:  <a href="https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline">https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline</a></p> <p>This Project is an investment for several decades to come. The operation of this Project will not only provide alternate means to redistribute the growing traffic load on the roads but will also serve numerous community members throughout this corridor who do not own personal vehicles.</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-84	Goihl	Robin	I have not heard one word of support from any resident in this community. This small historic city will never be the same and will be worse for this project. Consider the negative impact on Robbinsdale and it's residents .....we are citizens and taxpayers and we would like our interests to be represented. We do not need or want this transit option in this small town.	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>For community impact analysis and potential mitigation options, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-85	Not Provided	Bobby	It is over priced. It is going to disrupt the atmosphere of our city. It is taking forever to finish the one going through St. Louis Park and Eden Prairie. Our metro area should complete one before thinking about starting a new one. Our city does not need a debacle like that when we just started to turn our city around. It was a good idea before covid when downtown was more vibrant and people commuting, not so much anymore. Too expensive and not enough upside.	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p>
P-86	Moody	Tracey	It will be a detriment to Robbinsdale businesses. It will not add anything to Robbinsdale except an increase in crime- this I have real statistics and knowledge of what goes on on light rails and light rail platforms. I work in a major ED right across from the light rail. The passengers on these light rails are not "suburban commuters." This will increase crime and decrease our small businesses. Robbinsdale is doing very well- this will not help. The NorthStar lost 90% of its riders- why are we adding more and spending more money?	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>For safety concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p> <p>The ridership is gradually rising after the pandemic levels and will continue to rise, justifying the use of LRT in this corridor.</p> <p>This information is available on the Metro Transit website here:  <a href="https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline">https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline</a></p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				<p>This Project is an investment for several decades to come. The operation of this Project will not only provide alternate means to redistribute the growing traffic load on the roads but will also serve numerous community members throughout this corridor who do not own personal vehicles.</p>
P-87	Owens	John Myron	<p>I've grown up in Robbinsdale and spent tons of time on the lake and at the playgrounds near the proposed line. i still go waterskiing with my friends. It's a huge bummer to think that I might have to be listening to the sound of light rail and see the ugliness of it from our lake.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>For community impact analysis, visual/aesthetic analysis, and potential mitigation options, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis). For concerns regarding noise and vibration, please see SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis).</p>
P-88	Kulla	James	<p>I'm surprised there's still a push when there could be significant rider change since the pandemic and the amount of people still able to work from home. I'm curious why it wouldn't travel down existing railroad tracks. Rather, constructing new tracks, significantly impacting traffic in town down our main road. Another transit system is closed due to underutilization, spending \$2 billion on something that's not being used in other places doesn't seem like a wise use of our dollars.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The ridership is gradually rising after the pandemic levels and will continue to rise, justifying the use of LRT in this corridor.</p> <p>This information is available on the Metro Transit website here: <a href="https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline">https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline</a></p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
				This Project is an investment for several decades to come. The operation of this Project will not only provide alternate means to redistribute the growing traffic load on the roads but will also serve numerous community members throughout this corridor who do not own personal vehicles.
P-89	Not Provided	Not Provided	<p>Like idea of park &amp; ride matching the feel of our historic downtown and accommodating mixed use/bus routes. Park &amp; ride locations should consider traffic in and out during rush hour.</p> <p>We support LRT and want to maintain the feel of a cute downtown, community, and lake town.</p> <p>We walk around town extensively. Value the lakes, trees, trails and the local businesses.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and suggestions.</p> <p>Your suggestions will be considered throughout the design and planning for the park-and-ride areas. For other traffic discussion, please see SDEIS Chapter 3 (Transportation). For community cohesion and Project impact on the community, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis).</p>
P-90	Not Provided	Not Provided	<p>Why park &amp; ride in Robbinsdale? Is it needed? Streets like Bass Lake Road Station is a better fit for park &amp; ride.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments.</p> <p>The ridership models used for the ridership study reveal that a park-and-ride in Robbinsdale will be beneficial for overall ridership and accessibility of the METRO Blue Line LRT Extension. Park-and-rides are usually constructed in suburban areas where people wish to reach stations by vehicle.</p>





Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-91	Not Provided	Not Provided	NO!	Thank you for submitting your comment.
P-92	Gahlon	Emily	<p>Hello. I am a resident of Robbinsdale and have been for the last 5 years. I will not be able to attend the upcoming meeting on 10/25 due to work commitments.</p> <p>The proposed location of the light rail will drastically change the rhythm, flow, and energy of Robbinsdale.</p> <p>If the light rail project moves forward I think you will see crime rise in Robbinsdale and you will housing prices drop and quality citizens move away.</p> <p>I'm not opposed to a lightrail but the proposed location is terrible and will not go over well with the residents the large majority of residents do not want to move forward with this proposal.</p> <p>Please listen to all the people telling you we do not want this. Please don't assume because they don't come to the meeting means that they want the light rail.</p> <p>At every block party or city gathering the large majority of people talk about how they don't want the light rail in its proposed location. Please reconsider.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>For the Project purpose, please see SDEIS Chapter 1 (Purpose and Need). For concerns regarding community cohesion/character impact and house cost-burdening, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis). Additional discussion on house-cost burdening, especially in regard to environmental justice, is in SDEIS Chapter 7.</p>
P-93	Beard	Robert and Mary	<p>We are against the route being considered on Bottineau Blvd and West Broadway. It makes no sense other than to try to fixed the problem created with BNRR, who has stated from the beginning they were not going to allow use of their railway system. This route offers no benefits to the City of Robbinsdale or to me as a homeowner. You will be creating one big mess worse than the one you have now.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-94	Popousek	Kathy	According to the present plan, as a resident of Robbinsdale, I'm not in favor of the Blue Line proposed running thru our city. We are not Minneapolis and don't want to look as an urban environment by removing our trees and other greenery. This needs to be relocated at the very least.	Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.
P-95	Selman	George	<p>I am 100% opposed to going forward with this alignment through Robbinsdale. I fell very strongly that this alignment will do far more harm than good. The simple fact that this was not an option for Robbinsdale is just the beginning.</p> <p>This is a critical misuse of tax dollars. Millions have been spent studying this corridor without any form of agreement with the BNSF railroad. How can this happen?</p> <p>I Chaired the CAC for this project for 13 years and support LRT when properly placed and vetted by he public. This alignment was not.</p> <p>Met Council's resent display of skill and competence on other projects scares and disappoints me. Serious cost over runs and delays are like nothing I have ever witnessed. Similar problems on Highway 81 would be crippling to our cities and cities along this corridor.</p> <p>The business community is against this. Most residents are against this and yet it chugs along.</p> <p>My biggest concern is need. Since Covid19 people working downtown simply are not any were close to the same numbers. If you study anything on this project redo</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The Council notes your opposition to this alignment. A robust public engagement effort coupled with extensive technical analysis was used to identify the current Project Alignment, an alignment that was endorsed by the Project's Corridor Management Committee.</p> <p>Transit is a critical need for many people in the Project corridor and in our region as a whole. While the pandemic has had a significant effect on travel patterns and ridership for the short to medium term, transit investments are intended to last for decades. The METRO Blue Line LRT Extension would meet the immediate needs of transit-dependent populations, enable transit-oriented development to take place, and provide a long-term transportation investment that will meet the future</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>the ridership projections before doing ANY further wastingof tax dollars.</p> <p>The FTA should remove the alignment from the New Starts program as it is not in keeping with anything close to the original alignment supported by most of Robbinsdale.</p> <p>Stop wasting money now!</p>	<p>needs of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.</p> <p>The Council regularly meets with FTA to apprise them of the status of the Project; FTA is aware of the changes in the Project Alignment and supports continued advancement of the Project.</p>
P-96	Swanson	Randy	<p>I am strongly against moving forward with the light rail project for several reasons. Met Council has shown extremely poor management of this project for the last 10 years and seeing what has happened on the green line does not bode well for the future. My main objections are: (1) The Council has already spent well over \$125Million of taxpayer money and it's back to square one due to the confounding decision not to get BNSF approval before beginning the engineering design process. (2) Since covid, our culture has dramatically changed where significant numbers of people do not work downtown. (3) The council has demonstrated it cannot effectively manage or control crime on the existing lines. (4) This project will not be economically feasible-taxpayers will have to subsidize every ride in perpetuity. (5) whatever the route takes, it will be an ugly blight on the neighborhoods it goes through.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>In the SDEIS, Chapter 2 presents background on development of the Build Alternative and options explored, and Chapter 1 presents information about the Project's purpose and need.</p>
P-97-1	Brady	Patricia	<p>Hello.</p> <p>Normally, I'm a very relaxed, focused, peaceful Yogi, who basically is about live and let live. And then came this proposed Blue Line idea. It is quite a bit harder to hold onto that peaceful mindset now. I was told you need to see an email in my own voice? Sure. Here it is. My voice.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>In the SDEIS, Chapter 1 presents the Project purpose and need, and Chapter 4 addresses the topics of community cohesion and safety.</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>Today a Facebook post flashed across my screen: “The blue line allows us to connect people in real time.” What the hell does that even mean?</p> <p>In my opinion, the blue line allows the destruction of an established, small town feel community, creates barriers to the safety of the citizens, ruins the culture, and wipes out the existence of many community businesses. The literal division of the community will occur in real time, tearing apart the very heart of that community and what makes it special, and no matter how you dress it up, the fact is, the cost will fall to the community that is vehemently opposed to it in the first place. But, oh, we can voice our opinion on the color of the terracotta bricks....</p> <p>As a 50+ year tax paying resident of Robbinsdale, I am vehemently opposed to the creation of the Blue Line through Robbinsdale. I am absolutely sickened that strangers who know NOTHING about the reality of living where I do, somehow have the right to dismantle my world with their grotesque plan.</p>	
P-97-2	Brady	Patricia	<p>Anyone with half a brain can connect the dots and see that the Blue Line creates, just in Robbinsdale alone, a solid division line in the land splitting the community in two. Ripping out a longstanding place of worship and displacing many other long standing successful businesses and residents to take the hit and be forced out of the homes and businesses they worked their butts off to grow and provide themselves a healthy happy life. Can you say Rondo? Have we learned nothing from that? Absolutely heartbreaking to learn the light rail takes precedence over the mom and pop shops that have been mainstays, or the</p>	



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>homes that people chose because of the small-town culture and location, and like me, a nice, affordable place to retire in. Nope, not anymore. Well, except for Bills Gun Range which should see exponential growth in business from the northside with the train station planned to be right next door.</p> <p>Laying that track down 81 will generate permanent additional unwanted road traffic down once peaceful side streets to avoid waiting for the mostly empty trains to pass through the regular intersections multiple times an hour at 11mph at best. Most certainly, getting out of my driveway will be ridiculous – it already is. Crossing the tracks of those same streets used by residents to casually stroll up or down to downtown Robbinsdale for a lovely evening out in their neighborhood will be challenging for sure. Can you even imagine friends, families, neighbors, especially our handicap and elderly community crossing those tracks on foot? Walking will no longer feel or be safe.</p>	
P-97-3	Brady	Patricia	<p>OH, wait, you're going to raise the rail up over those cross streets? Wow, what a rocket science decision. Who in their right mind would think spending the BILLIONS of dollars needed to create that raised monstrosity so we can walk across the street for the FEW people who will actually use the mostly empty light rail makes fiscal sense when there are SO MANY BETTER uses for those billions of my taxpayer dollars?</p> <p>And then there's poor Minneapolis. Like those folks haven't been through enough? The tornadoes, and agonizing waits to rebuild. The George Floyd insurrection and loss of so many small businesses, the countless</p>	



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>redevelopment dollars spent to raise the Northside back up and re-energize it. And now toss that all aside, rip it apart yet again and put in a light rail? Good God. What happened to common sense? How irresponsible of those in charge to keep pushing this foolishness forward? Exactly where is all the money coming from to make these poor financial decisions? Clearly those involved in the Blue Line project don't have the balls to admit they've made a mistake in thinking the Blue Line is a good idea.</p>	
P-97-4	Brady	Patricia	<p>And finally, what ever happened to that great idea I'd heard about to create a dedicated lane on 81 for rapid bus transit? After the outrageous spending spree to create a whole new roadway to facilitate a dedicated lane for busses...um...where are those busses? WHY not implement the infrastructure that's already been created? Quite frankly, to be able to hop on a dedicated bus into Downtown from Robbinsdale, Crystal, or Brooklyn Center would be awesome. Board the bus out there and be dropped directly into downtown with no stops? Sweet. But NO, we need to rip up everything that was already bought and built and do-over with an ill-conceived light rail notion—for billions of more dollars. Geeze did someone learn him about that in college?</p> <p>Yeah, right. Connecting people in real time-- the big boost for a 'certain segment' of the inner city's inhabitants that will simply hop the train and head to the outlying communities to do their harm in a wider cast net. Great. My vehicle has already been broken into in my own driveway when I've been home. My front window has been tampered with from the outside with a circular cutting tool. Let's just keep that momentum going and be all inclusive for criminals with light rail transportation</p>	



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>options. My community will be wise to become a concealed carry community very soon, if we aren't already.</p> <p>Connecting people in real time—for those brave enough to hop that train from the suburbs into Target Center for an event, at the risk of enduring multiple stops into the heart of Minneapolis crime central. “How lucky do you feel tonight, dear? Let’s go downtown!” North Minneapolis was my work sales territory for several years. I’ll never forget the day I saw a woman clotheslined on West Broadway and 2nd, at 12:30 in the afternoon, by one of a group of perhaps 8 or 9 “upstanding hooded individuals” hovering around at the corner. I saw her come out of the corner bar as I was in my vehicle waiting for the light to change when it happened. As I dialed 911 on my phone to report what I was seeing, I looked up, one of those individuals met my eyes and pointed to me and motioned the action of firing a gun. Did I pull out to the wrong side of the street and turn onto West Broadway and pedal to the metal? Yes, you bet I did.</p>	
P-97-5	Brady	Patricia	<p>OH is that sounding racist? No, THAT is real time reality. Drugs, robberies, guns, oh my, that does make for an exciting night out downtown using the rail. Don't even try to say it's not valid. We all know it is. Let's be REAL real here.....it will be decades, if ever, before Minneapolis recovers from the crap show it is today, thanks to a long list of idiots who have allowed it to become dismantled into the crime central it currently is. Who in their right mind would choose to put themselves at risk to ride that rail into the city down West Broadway through the heart of “the hood”? The police reports speak for themselves. How about taking those billions of dollars and use them</p>	



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>to address the teen Kia crime situation? Or the homeless encampment situation? Or to get our Police Officers back? OR fund the endless list of other things SOOOO much more important than forcing light rail into an area it's not needed or wanted?</p> <p>Wake up and look at the reality of the Blue Line project. The evidence against it is STAGGERINGLY obvious. Minneapolis is not in the top 5, the top 10 or even the top 25 cities in the country that could justify this level of transportation. A handful of people may choose to use it, but I'll tell you now, as a Robbinsdale taxpayer for over 50 years, I'm not interested in succumbing to their entitled asses because they want to go downtown drinking on a Friday night, or to a ball game. And they're too naïve to realize the negative impact that rail would create for so many. No, be safe and take an Uber.</p> <p>Our communities' citizens don't need BILLIONS of dollars in light rail track that cannot be altered once it's in, to rip apart our small town feel community, when smart use of rapid bus transit bussing can achieve far more specific, cost efficient, and flexible options that will stand the test of time. We are not a bursting growth community of over 2.7 billion people. No one is clamoring to get downtown in droves. The landscape has changed for work and play, and the need for light rail down 81 into downtown simply does not exist.</p>	
P-97-6	Brady	Patricia	<p>In conclusion, the blue line project has connected THIS person in real time to recognize how badly I'm being violated, gas lighted and disregarded in all forms of how a true democracy should operate. Congratulations, you've stirred up the Kraken in me, and I will continue to argue</p>	





Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>against the Blue Line project to my last breath. I hold Mr. Tim Walz personally responsible, as well as the Met Council, and any other decision makers in the Blue Line Project that support implementing the Blue Line as absolute insurrectors of our community, and our democracy. You have no business making decisions for the good of the people, as you clearly don't give a damn about what is actually good for the people. Your arrogance is outrageous. How dare you try to push this project through despite the wrongness of it. The Blue Line makes no sense for the people in Robbinsdale on any level. It needs to end. Period. From my voice to your ears, Namaste!</p>	
P-98-1	Wescott	Jon	<p>Below are the comments that I had made at the CMC meeting earlier today. I also attached a diagram to help better explain my point. Thanks for organizing the comment period, and have a good evening!</p> <p>Hello my name is Jon Wescott and I am a resident of South Minneapolis. First of all I want to say that I do support the blue line extension, and am excited for it to finally be built, but I also want to see it done correctly. However, the most recent route alignment through Minneapolis has left me frustrated, because once again, we aren't putting transit first. We are putting the needs of car drivers ahead of everyone else. I was excited to see that a transit mall along 21st Ave was selected for the alignment, but then massively disappointed when I saw the crossing selected to get over 94. Because it's not really a transit mall if there is a freeway off ramp dumping into it!? This is dangerous, and the off ramp needs to be moved to Broadway only.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>SDEIS Chapters 2 and 3 evaluate the Build Alternative, include an analysis of ridership and multimodal transportation, and presents the options considered and rationale for the recommended Project Alignment.</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>We have a perfectly good route for cars to take over on Broadway. They don't need another route where all the pedestrian and bike traffic is supposed to be. I travel a lot for work and time and time again freeway off ramps are consistently the most dangerous crossings I encounter as a pedestrian, as cars have just finished doing 70mph, and have not thought about a pedestrian since before they got on the highway. Let alone a train.</p>	
P-98-2	Wescott	Jon	<p>This should be a bridge for lrt, and foot and bike traffic only, and I actually think 2 bridges, one for bikes and pedestrians directly across 94, and one sloped lrt bridge that goes from 21st Ave, up and over 94, Broadway, and Washington, avoiding level crossings at intersections would be far better. More in line with the lowered 94 ramp option, but utilize an elevated lrt track. It will result in fewer collisions between car and pedestrians, bikes, or trains. It also allows for higher track speeds and faster travel times for all. Trains and cars don't play well together, nor should we be putting them together unnecessarily. In the process of trying to cater to every request out there the train has ended up being put in places that just aren't logical, which results in a worse experience for everyone. At some point you've just got to select a route that is the best we can logically build.</p> <p>Somehow a route was chosen for the train without any time analysis being done, and that is one of the largest contributing factors to ridership. Especially if you want everyone to walk, roll, or ride in the future. When Bottineau was being considered for lane reduction, a time analysis for cars was done immediately. We should be putting that same level of energy into choosing the best route for the train, not just doing what gets the fewest</p>	



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			complaints from a couple vocal people. And tight corners like at Washington and the extended 21st ave, and level crossings, especially TSP crossings that result in stopping trains completely, are not a good foundation for a fast or frequent system. Keep in mind that every train might have 50-300 people on it, compared to the 15 cars that might be stopped every 5-10 minutes.	
P-98-3	Wescott	Jon	<p>Finally, I urge you to avoid using TSP or transit signal priority, and instead use gated crossings wherever possible. TSP is great for busses, but bad for trains. I would recommend looking at MLK Jr. Way in Seattle. It is the most dangerous section of the Seattle LRT system, and uses TSP instead of gated crossings. Perhaps a side running alignment down Bottineau where possible would be safer and faster.</p> <p>It seems we have lost our way on building RAPID transit. This is a train not a tram, and it's supposed to be the backbone of our transit system. Spending the additional money now on flyover bridges and gated crossings will likely pay off in the long run, as there will be fewer accidents that the met council will have to pay out for, and overall higher ridership. So Let's invest in it properly now, so we can enjoy more benefits for the next 100 years to come. Thank you for your time.</p>	
P-99	Schatz	Randy	<p>I live on Lake Dr. in Robbinsdale.</p> <p>What needs to be studied is the impact this construction will have on the underground rivers and water quality after being disturbed. Also, what is going to happen to all the buildings built on pilling's.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis) discusses the corridor-wide geology. During construction, the construction contractor would need to adhere to</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>The city of Robbinsdale is built on a swamp. Many of the buildings are built on pilling's.</p> <p>When the County rebuilt Lake Drive, they removed the special fill used to allow the underground stream running from South Twin Lake to Crystal Lake. This dam of the underground stream has permanently flooded many yards, including mine.</p> <p>The soil is not stable in the area also. My house is on a hill but my yard is in the swamp.</p> <p>During repair of Lake Drive, My house and neighboring houses shook. It took about a year after construction, that my house started to settle. I now have cracks in my poured concrete walls and my doors started to not close correctly. The house has been there for over 100 years without a problem. After work done on Lake drive caused structural issues, I hate to see what is going to happen with the construction for the train.</p>	<p>vibration control requirements set forth by the Council to maintain current integrity of structures around the area being constructed. For more discussion on vibration caused during the construction and operating phases and the mitigation options to control the vibration, please also see SDEIS Chapter 5.</p>
P-100	Ambrose	Lou	<p>I am concerned about the removal of all of the trees from the 81 corridor. These trees have finally gotten mature since their planting as part of the 81 reconstruction. Trees are an essential part of combating the urban heat island. The light rail removes mature trees and replaces them with more concrete. Not what we need.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>Tree removals will be avoided where possible.</p>
P-101-1	Girard	Wendi	<p>I write this to you today with serious concerns about the environmental impact that the SLR 81 train will have on the environment. During one of the open house meetings in 2021 it was divulged by one of the planners of the project that the environmental impact of just creating the train, the toxins used for paint, metal fabrication, exhaust created by the heavy equipment needed to dig up roads, and to get the train in place etc. will never be</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The SDEIS studies the corridor-wide impacts to, and mitigation options for, the natural environment including wetlands, floodplains, geology/soils, biological environment,</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>recuperated. Just putting the train in place will cause negative impacts on the environment let alone the noise pollution that this will cause.</p> <p>There is vibrant natural wildlife with deer, ducks, fish, herons, our state bird the Loon and the symbol of our country, the Bald Eagle that live in the areas that the proposed SLR81 train will run on and I am fearful of their demise because of the train.</p> <p>The SLR 81 train is not environmentally responsible. The train will cause chemical runoff into lakes like the Twin Lake chain and Crystal Lake causing serious harm to humans and the natural wildlife. The Twin Lake chain is already in distress from the negligence of the chemical runoff and poorly managed mitigation at the Joslyn Manufacturing site in Brooklyn Center. The poisons created by the SLR81 train will run into the lakes and other bodies of water will be disastrous...(Continued in P-101-2)</p>	<p>and water quality in Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis) and Appendix A-5. SDEIS Chapter 5 also studies existing noise and vibration and Project impacts on the existing conditions for the short term (construction phase) and long term (operating phase) based on the data collected through an extensive data collection process along the corridor. Chapter 5 also studies air pollution and energy impacts of the Project. Because the trains are electric vehicles, the impact on air pollution through mobile emissions is negative compared to the emissions created by vehicles for equivalent rides. Please see SDEIS Chapter 5 for the expressed concerns.</p>
P-101-2	Girard	Wendi	<p>The Twin Lake chain is not to be a dumping ground for waste materials. The SLR 81 train will cause waste materials to drain into the lakes.</p> <p>The negative environmental impact of the SLR81 train should outway the perceived necessity for the SLR 81 train.</p> <p>I am asking you to reconsider the production of the SLR 81 train and encourage the mayors, the Met Council and other decision makers to reinstate the bus line instead. The infrastructure already exists, the buses have already been produced, running on clean energy. The environmental impact of buses running on the Blue Line</p>	



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>will not destroy peoples and animals homes, lakes and aquatic life will remain healthier, there will be nearly no noise pollution, and the air quality will not be negatively impacted.</p>	
P-102-1	Shull	Karen	<p>My name is Karen Shull, I am one of the founders and Co/Chairs of a group of residents called SLR81.org.com. We are a coalition of citizens with members representing every city along the proposed Blue Line extension route.</p> <p>I am emailing you today to let you know of our opposition to the revised Blue Line Extension which now places the light rail route on 81/Bottineau Blvd. and North Minneapolis. We are unanimous with both the West Broadway and Lynn Park coalitions in support of BRT as an alternative to putting a permanent track going down on this busy corridor.</p> <p>We were not against the Blue Line Extension that was originally planned and presented, but when the route was changed from the original plan using the BNSF rail line (which could have actually provided “a Rapid Transit route”) and they moved it down to the middle of 81/Bottineau Blvd and to go through North Minneapolis, we got involved.</p> <p>Over the last years much effort and money has gone into improving Broadway, Bottineau Blvd. and 81, not only for greater flow of traffic but the additional design and landscaping, and creation of green spaces with little to no disruption to neighborhoods, and Crystal Lake. This has helped to maintain the unique neighborhood feel we all sought when purchasing our homes, and something many others in the metropolitan area seek. The impact of the</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The SDEIS studies the corridor-wide impacts to, and mitigation options for, the natural environment including wetlands, floodplains, geology/soils, biological environment, and water quality in Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental analysis) and Appendix A-5. SDEIS Chapter 5 also studies existing noise and vibration and Project impacts on the existing conditions for the short term (construction phase) and long term (operating phase) based on the data collected through an extensive data collection process along the corridor. Chapter 5 also studies air pollution and energy impacts of the Project. Because the trains are electric vehicles, the impact on air pollution through mobile emissions is negative compared to the emissions created by vehicles for equivalent rides. Please see SDEIS Chapter 5 for the expressed concerns.</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>new extension route will disrupt and destroy much of the progress that has been made over the last years.</p>	<p>The SDEIS also studies impacts to and explores mitigation options for community culture and cohesion, and safety in Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis). For concerns regarding traffic and pedestrian crossing, please see SDEIS Chapter 3 (Transportation).</p>
P-102-2	Shull	Karen	<p>We have great concern about Crystal Lake, damage to the lake itself and to the homes, apartments and businesses in the vicinity of the lake and the route. The previous reconstruction of 81/Bottineau Blvd. resulted in damage to many homes with resettling, cracks in walls, in addition to windows and doors that now have air gaps and uneven frames, creating a burden to all homeowners affected. At one time the land where the HyVee is located and Robbinsdale shopping center was all part of Crystal lake until they damaged the seal at one end of the lake many years ago. Those buildings were built on an old swamp and I wonder how stable it would all be for a light rail to go so close to the lake today.</p> <p>Our research has also shown this will be very slow-moving light rail route through Robbinsdale and North Minneapolis and along with a high cost, unknown ridership following the pandemic, in addition to numerous safety issues etc. etc. we have many concerns.</p> <p>There is already a high volume of pedestrians and vehicles trying to cross over this corridor, especially in Robbinsdale and North Minneapolis (including all the emergency vehicles with North Memorial being on the route), putting a light rail on this route is an accident waiting to happen.</p>	



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>They are also planning a 500 stall parking ramp on a already very busy intersection of Robbinsdale at 41st and Bottineau Blvd. The plan is to also have a Station at that same intersection that will have not only the light rail coming and going every 7 to 10 minutes but 5 city busses all using this station!</p>	
P-102-3	Shull	Karen	<p>The traffic this will cause to be getting to and from this Station and Park and Ride will be cause for much concern for the environment and the residents that live in the neighborhoods surrounding this area.</p> <p>If the original route is not a viable option, we feel BRT is the best alternative for our communities, it allows for greater flexibility in routes and better meets the needs of the majority of people living in this area. Money spent on higher efficiency buses and routes would reduce our carbon footprint, eliminate driving to light rail transit ramps, allow flexibility and adjustment of routes and better meet the needs of the communities. And if people are taking the bus to the rail transit stops, why not instead have buses take them to their destination and eliminate tracks that will be a permanent, inflexible fixture.</p> <p>There were already three NO votes last week at the Met council meeting on 9-13 and at the CMC meeting on 9-14 Mayor Adams of Crystal voted NO. We anticipate this number growing in the near future.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration to this request for BRT instead of LRT.</p>	
P-103	Shull	Karen	<p>Please see correction below to the email I sent on 9-18-23 at 3:37 p.m.</p>	





Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>(Both Kristel Porter and Donna Sanders work for West Broadway Business Coalition.</p> <p>The Lyn Park group is not a formal organization - they are a group of Lyn Park residents who got together and were successful in having their voices heard)</p>	
P-104	Popousek	Robert	<p>I live on Crystal Lake in Robbinsdale. I am very concerned about the impact of this project on the lake and the wildlife in the area. It is my understanding that the runoff from rain on streets around the lake all is channeled into the lake currently. How would construction and ongoing train operations impact the lake?</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments.</p> <p>The SDEIS studies the corridor-wide impacts to, and mitigation options for, the natural environment including wetlands, floodplains, geology/soils, biological environment, and water quality in Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis) and Appendix A-5. The stormwater and runoff from construction would be controlled through best management practices and stormwater basins.</p>
P-105	Okerstrom	Danika	<p>I am a Robbinsdale resident located near the proposed lightrail down Bottineau and I am concerned how it will impact the livelihood of the local park, lake, and community. So many families bike across Bottineau to enjoy the wonderful park near Hyvee, and this is an active crosswalk for people walking to Hyvee. So many people enjoy walks around the lake and frontage road, with the addition of the light rail that will disrupt the peace and tranquility. I am opposed to the light rail coming through North Minneapolis (disrupting and displacing so many businesses) as well as separating our quaint city of</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>For analysis of Project impacts and benefits to, and mitigation options for, pedestrians and bicyclists, please see SDEIS Chapter 3 (Transportation). For community character and cohesion concerns, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis). For parcel impacts within the limits of disturbance of this Project and property acquisition</p>



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			Robbinsdale. Concerned citizen	information, please see SDEIS Chapter 5 (Physical and Environmental Analysis).
P-106-1	Marino	Tim	<p>First of all, I want to thank the entire team for their hard work and patience in going through the long process to get the Blue Line Extension closer to being built. When I speak with project representatives, I always feel that they are truly listening and open to considering and potentially incorporating suggestions made by myself and others. I think most of the changes made through this process will result in a much better project.</p> <p>While the majority of this comment will be about things that I want to see improved, there is plenty I love in the design. Elevating the track to reach North Memorial station, and when leaving Bottineau’s right of way in Brooklyn Park is a great choice. Designing the pedestrian paths at Crystal Station to go underneath the highway ramps and avoid conflicts at the ramp is a stroke of genius, and the boldness in proposing two transitways on 10th Ave N and 21st Ave N showcases the creativity that this team has brought to this project. This route will open up the northwest suburbs in a truly transformative way. I’m excited to see the network redesign that will feed this line, and make those benefits able to be accessed by even more people.</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and suggestions.</p> <p>The SDEIS focuses mainly on environmental, social, and economic impacts of this project and explores mitigation options. The suggestions presented in this comment will be sent to the design and engineering team for their consideration.</p>
P-106-2	Marino	Tim	<p>Now, onto the ways I believe this project can be even better. An important part of creating a welcoming experience for riders on a light rail line is how car oriented the infrastructure surrounding the route is. The Blue Line Extension will provide a real alternative to driving. Therefore, we should not assume that car traffic will increase. MNDot states that “Four-to-three lane</p>	



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>conversion studies have demonstrated an upper limit of average daily traffic at around 20,000 vehicles per day. Certain locations may be able to handle as much as a 25 percent increase in capacity...Two local examples of three-lane roads in Minnesota with ADTs greater than 20,000 vpd are Rice Street and Lexington Avenue in Roseville.” We also know that the crash rate for 3 lane roads is 46% lower then 4 lane roads. We must take the opportunity to right-size our roads wherever possible.</p> <p>This is why I question the need for 2 lanes on Bottineau south of MN-100. North of MN-100, the Annual Average Daily Traffic on Bottineau Blvd is 38,000. But south of MN-100 it drops down to 20,000 in between Lake Dr and Highway 100, 21,700 near approximately 41st Ave N. And 17,700 just north of the interchange with Lowry Ave. This area will have a lot of pedestrian traffic accessing Robbinsdale Station, and the surrounding businesses, and residences. Since traffic can be accommodated, we must focus on making this area safer. This is something that will save lives. We should also be considering reducing Washington Ave to one lane in each direction, as it’s traffic count between 17th Ave N and West Broadway is also below the 20,000 vpd threshold sitting at 18,300. Also, I’m not sure if it’s in the scope of the project but making sure that N. 40th Ave is much skinnier is important regardless of whether the Robbinsdale station is north of 40th or south of 40th.</p>	
P-106-3	Marino	Tim	<p>Station placement through North Minneapolis remains a major issue. Particularly, the lack of a good D Line connection with the Blue Line. One of the things that made the Green Line in St Paul one of the top transit lines in ridership per mile in the whole country was the</p>	



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
			<p>improvement of the local bus network. Investing in perpendicular connections by improving the frequency of those routes, and adding new service in the form of Route 83 on Lexington Pkwy expanded the reach of the Green Line, and ensured a better return on investment. I'm frustrated to see that this planning practice is not being carried forward on this project. Missing a convenient connection to the busiest bus in Metro Transit's entire system is a mistake. The D Line serves 12,000 riders per day on weekends. Even while the rest of our system has lower ridership than pre-covid, the D Line has exceeded Route 5's pre-covid numbers on weekends as of February 2023 (I suspect it may have exceeded pre-covid weekday numbers since then, but I don't have evidence of it). Forcing riders to walk/roll 8 minutes between the Blue Line and the D Line on Broadway will kill connectivity. A rider that takes this transfer every weekday will lose 54 hours each year. Transit riders are expected to walk/roll from their origin, and to their destination already. Adding a long mid-journey walk/roll is an additional inconvenience that will lead to people taking more inefficient routes. This will lead to crowding on the D Line as ridership increases, we should be focusing on feeding riders into the light rail which has much higher capacity. The D Line's connection to light rail in downtown is already poor, requiring a three-block walk. Improving the Blue Line's connectivity to aBRT routes is one of the biggest things I was looking forward to in this project, and in my conversations with transit riders has been something they are excited about also. This is the opportunity to start over with a blank page. We can't waste it.</p>	



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-106-4	Marino	Tim	<p>A station in between Girard and Fremont should be included in addition to the one near Lyndale to serve Cub Foods and Route 22. If the community determines that there should be a station near the James Ave station in the alternative presented, then we should move it to near Morgan Ave, Illion Ave, and Logan Ave. There appears to be a little over 500 feet of linear space that could be used, especially if the roadway is adjusted a bit to utilize the empty lot on the south side of West Broadway in between Newton and Morgan. This would maintain 1/3-mile stop spacing which is similar to the South Loop in Bloomington. Considering the amount of loyal ridership that North Minneapolis generates, they deserve more stations. And since the station distance on the Blue Line Extension is much wider outside of Minneapolis than any of the other lines, it shouldn't impact operations as much.</p> <p>In order to keep the train moving, we must not add unnecessary traffic lights on West Broadway, and work to remove unnecessary ones throughout the corridor. The Green Line has had a lot of reliability issues due to the frequency of traffic lights, even though it usually only has around 4-5 lights per mile on University. For the first 2.1 miles north of Target Field this route will have 21 traffic lights, and 30 traffic lights in the first 5.1 miles. We must mitigate safety and running time issues.</p>	



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-106-5	Marino	Tim	<p>We need to seriously consider crossing gates throughout this corridor. While crossing gates for median running transit are not the norm in America, they are not unheard of. For example this image from Google Streetview in Charlotte, NC and in Edmonton, AB. At the very least they should be used on the transitway segments of 10th Ave, and 21st Ave. Or to limit left turns like LA Metro has on Flower St and I-10. Photo enforcement should also be implemented if possible, LA Metro has found that photo enforcement “Reduced left turn incidents by 60% when used in conjunction with engineering improvements, and educational activities.” Relying on traffic lights doesn’t sufficiently protect people from crashing into the train, and it has led to deaths. Sometimes it’s Metro Transit operators who don’t follow the signals either, leading to accidents. In addition, the running time suffers from having to operate the vehicle slower while being prepared to stop. Whatever is decided on, from a speed and safety perspective, we cannot afford to repeat the mistakes of the Green Line.</p> <p>Thank you once again for reading this, and for considering my comments on this project. If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out to me at <a href="mailto:trademarkrnf@gmail.com">trademarkrnf@gmail.com</a></p>	



Comment ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Comment	Response
P-107	Remus	Brenda	<p>I am opposed to the Blue Line Extension for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It has the potential to divide Robbinsdale and harm its vitality and growth for decades.</li> </ol> <p>Definition of environment should not just be limited to "green energy", it includes quality of life, acknowledgement of long term division caused within communities and cities due to transit projects (ex. Rondo neighborhood in St. Paul), etc.</p> <p>The environment in downtown Robbinsdale should not be subjected to a 400 - 500 space parking lot. No.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Safety is of utmost concern. Erratic behavior, drug use, crime, and violence are significant problems that light rail lines are dealing with.</li> <li>3. Police staffing shortages and very few, if any new recruits. Proposed goodwill ambassadors have no legal authority to detain or arrest violent individuals.</li> <li>4. Exorbitant cost and low ridership. Mpls is no longer the destination that it once was.</li> </ol> <p>Many employees that used to work downtown now work remotely from home.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Unjust tax burden on tax paying citizens.</li> <li>6. Additional bus routes and improving service would be the best option. Why tear up a vastly improved and costly Bottineau Boulevard for light rail?</li> </ol>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>For concerns regarding safety and community character/cohesion, please see SDEIS Chapter 4 (Community and Social Analysis). This chapter studies these and several other topics to evaluate potential impacts and explore mitigation measures.</p>

<sup>1</sup> P = Public



**Table 4. Business Comments**

ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
B-1	Coey	Matt	Cord-Sets Inc.	Email or Online survey	<p>On behalf of the 60 employees that work for Cord-Sets and all of our Customers, Vendors and Stakeholders, please take this in to consideration:</p> <p>Cord-Sets Inc., which has been operating in Minneapolis since 1952, is located on 10th Avenue on the route of the proposed East of I-94 option. The light rail would be a disruption to our factory specifically with deliveries. With the high level of traffic already, large trucks struggle with backing up to our loading dock. With the addition of the frequency of trains in addition to traffic, it will be extraordinarily difficult for large trucks to make deliveries. We are also concerned with the construction traffic, accessibility, and parking for our employees and frequent visitors. We also have employees that walk to work and we are also concerned about their safety and ability to continue to walk to the office during construction and after completion.</p> <p>Our main fear is that the major business disruption caused from the construction and additional traffic caused by the light rail, would have</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The Council will require that the construction contractor maintain access to businesses and residences along the construction zone. The contractor will also need to adhere to the guidelines for pedestrian and vehicle safety.</p>





ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
					<p>a negative financial impact on our company. We have upwards of 20 to 40 semi-trailers that either deliver raw material or pick up finished goods, that back up from 10th Avenue each and every business day. Without that access, we can not operate our daily business.</p>	
B-2	Vilender	Nikki	Cord-Sets Inc.	Email or Online survey	<p>I object to the East of I94 option. I am an employee of Cord-Sets Inc. 1015 N. 5th Street, Minneapolis, MN 55411. The light rail passing directly in front of our business will have a direct impact on our 20+ daily semi-truck deliveries who all use 5th street as the entry point into our parking lot. Due to city street parking on 10th Avenue semi-trucks cannot use this entry point into our parking lot as they cannot make the turning radius due to parked cars. Also concerning is the increased traffic that this change will have on 5th Street. The giant new Metro Transit (building (on 5th Street) will be opening anytime, this will drive hundreds of cars, trucks and buses onto 5th street further impacting our business. The increase in traffic is concerning for our employees who all park in front of our building or walk to nearby bus stops. For these reasons among others, I urge you to reconsider the</p>	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with Cord-Sets to understand the requirements and explore mitigation measures to minimize operational impacts.</p>



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
					new METRO Blue Line Extension project to take another route that will not impact 5th Street. Thanks for your consideration.	
B-3	Coey	Matt	Cord-Sets Inc.	Email or Online survey	My place of business is on 10th Avenue on the route of the proposed East of I-94 option. The light rail would be a disruption to our factory specifically with deliveries. With the high level of traffic already, large trucks struggle with backing up to our loading dock. With the addition of the frequency of trains in addition to traffic, it will be extraordinarily difficult for large trucks to make deliveries. I'm also concerned with the construction and traffic and accessibility and parking for myself and other employees. I have coworkers that walk to work and I'm also concerned about their safety and ability to continue to walk to the office during construction and after completion.	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with Cord-Sets to understand the requirements and explore mitigation measures to minimize operational impacts.</p>
B-4	Paalman	Leesa	Cord-Sets Inc.	Email or Online survey	Our business, Cord-Sets Inc, is located at 1015 N 5th St – at the corner of N 10th Ave and N 5th St. We are writing today because we are seriously concerned about the hazards which will be encountered daily by our 50+ employees and delivery/pick up drivers coming and going into our business should the	<p>Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with Cord-Sets to understand the requirements and explore mitigation measures to</p>



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
					<p>Target Field Station to West Broadway – East of I-94 option for the light rail be approved. We are now able to provide free parking to our employees - which is a benefit that many companies downtown cannot provide. Many of our employees could not afford to work downtown without the option of free parking. The loss of any of our parking lot would seriously impact our business if our employees had to find other parking options or chose to find jobs elsewhere. Our dock doors face 10th Ave and semi drivers struggle to maneuver around the automobile traffic now – many times blocking both lanes of traffic while they back into these doors from the street. Shortening the area they have to move back and forth in (if our lot is shortened) will seriously hamper the safe way they interact with the traffic flow. We have 30+ pick ups or deliveries to our business each day and the loss of access will affect our business in a very negative way. Where will these drivers wait while a train goes by? Most likely in the line of traffic, blocking other cars. Will the train wait while a driver who is just doing his job backs in? The intersection at 5th and 10th ave</p>	<p>minimize operational impacts.</p>



ID <sup>1</sup>	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Comment Type	Comment	Response
					has been a site of many accidents as cars try to cross 10th Ave or turn left or right. Adding a rail line will add to the difficulty this already busy corner presents to drivers each day. This intersection is used frequently by the fire department which is located behind us. How will having to wait for a train to clear the tracks affect their response time in an emergency?	
B-5	Phamanivong	Amy	Cord-Sets Inc.	Email or Online survey	I don't think it's a good idea to have the train go on that route only because it can be busy and terrible to get in and out from the parking lot at Cord-Set(I work there fyi)	Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns.  The Council will continue to work with Cord-Sets to understand the requirements and explore mitigation measures to minimize operational impacts.

<sup>1</sup> B = Business