



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL TRANSIT
ADMINISTRATION



Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement METRO BLUE LINE EXTENSION

JUNE 2024



METRO Blue Line Light Rail Extension Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Prepared by:

**United States Department of Transportation (USDOT)
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)**

and

Metropolitan Council, Minnesota (Council)

In cooperation with:

**Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
National Park Service (NPS)
Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT)**

Submitted pursuant to:

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, 42 USC § 4332 *et seq.*; Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) Implementing NEPA, 40 CFR Part 1500 *et seq.*; Federal Transit Laws, 49 USC Ch. 53; Environmental Impact and Related Procedures, 23 CFR Part 771, a joint regulation of FHWA and FTA implementing NEPA and CEQ regulations; Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, 54 USC § 306108; Section 4(f) of the United States Department of Transportation Act of 1966, as amended, 49 USC § 303; Section 6(f)(3) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, 16 USC § 4601-4 *et seq.*; Clean Air Act, as amended, 42 USC § 7401 *et seq.*; Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 USC § 1531-1544, 87 Stat. 884); Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, 42 USC § 4601 *et seq.*; Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations; Executive Order 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation’s Commitment to Environmental Justice for All; Executive Order 13166, Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency; Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management; Executive Order 14008, Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad; other applicable federal laws and procedures; and all relevant laws and procedures of the State of Minnesota.

FTA will issue a single Supplemental Final Environmental Impact Statement (Supplemental Final EIS) and Record of Decision (ROD) document to pursuant to Pub. L. 112-141, 126 Stat. 405, Section 1319(b) unless FTA determines criteria statutory or practicability considerations preclude issue of the combined document pursuant to Section 1319.

June 12, 2024

Date of Approval

Kelley Bookins
Regional Administrator
Federal Transit Administration
Region V

Jun 13, 2024

Date of Approval

Nick Thompson (Jun 13, 2024 10:53 CDT)

Nick Thompson
Deputy General Manager, Capital Programs
Metropolitan Council



METRO Blue Line LRT Extension (BLE)

Commitment to Accessibility

Metropolitan Council and the United States Department of Transportation - Federal Transit Administration are committed to ensure that information is available in appropriate alternative formats to meet the requirements of persons who have a disability. If you require an alternative version of this file, please contact FTAWebAccessibility@dot.gov.



Contents

Abstract
Signature Page
Executive Summary
Abbreviations and Glossary

1	Purpose and Need.....	1-1
1.1	Project Purpose and Need.....	1-1
1.2	Project Description.....	1-2
1.3	Project Background.....	1-6
1.4	Project Need Factors.....	1-11
2	Alternatives.....	2-1
2.1	Changes Since the Final EIS and ROD Publication (2016).....	2-1
2.2	Previous Studies and Environmental Review.....	2-3
2.3	Route Modification Process.....	2-3
2.4	Alternatives Considered in this Supplemental Draft EIS.....	2-13
3	Transportation.....	3-1
3.1	Transit Conditions.....	3-3
3.2	Pedestrian Conditions.....	3-9
3.3	Bicycle Conditions.....	3-14
3.4	Vehicle Traffic.....	3-20
3.5	Vehicle Parking.....	3-26
3.6	Freight Rail Conditions.....	3-32
3.7	Aviation.....	3-33
4	Community and Social Analysis.....	4-1
4.1	Land Use Plan Compatibility.....	4-4
4.2	Community Amenities, Character, and Cohesion.....	4-7
4.3	Acquisitions and Relocations.....	4-19
4.4	Cultural Resources.....	4-23
4.5	Visual/Aesthetics.....	4-31
4.6	Economic Effects.....	4-40
4.7	Safety and Security.....	4-46
5	Physical and Environmental Analysis.....	5-1
5.1	Utilities.....	5-6
5.2	Floodplains.....	5-11
5.3	Wetlands and Other Aquatic Resources.....	5-18
5.4	Geology, Soils, and Topography.....	5-29
5.5	Hazardous Materials Contamination.....	5-35
5.6	Noise.....	5-43
5.7	Vibration and Ground-Borne Noise.....	5-53
5.8	Biological Environment.....	5-57
5.9	Water Quality and Stormwater.....	5-67
5.10	Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	5-73
5.11	Energy.....	5-79
6	Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects.....	6-1
6.1	Methodology.....	6-2



- 6.2 Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment.....6-11
- 6.3 Mitigation and Summary of Effects6-22
- 7 Environmental Justice and the Justice40 Initiative7-1
 - 7.1 Regulatory Context7-1
 - 7.2 Methodology7-4
 - 7.3 Public Outreach and Engagement with EJ Communities7-27
 - 7.4 Analysis of Benefits and Adverse Effects.....7-38
 - 7.5 Disproportionately High and Adverse Effects.....7-51
 - 7.6 Conclusion7-52
- 8 Summary of Supplemental Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation.....8-1
 - 8.1 Introduction.....8-1
 - 8.2 Changes in the Project8-7
 - 8.3 Supplemental Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation Summary.....8-7
 - 8.4 Federally and State-Funded Parks8-7
- 9 Consultation and Coordination.....9-1
 - 9.1 Public Outreach and Engagement9-1
 - 9.2 Agency Coordination.....9-14
 - 9.3 Permits and Approvals9-17
- 10 Financial Analysis10-1
 - 10.1 Capital Funding Strategy10-1
 - 10.2 Operating Funding Strategy.....10-2
 - 10.3 Potential Responses to Operating Shortfalls10-4
- 11 Evaluation of Alternatives11-1
 - 11.1 Evaluation Framework and Methods.....11-1
 - 11.2 Build and No-Build Alternative Differentiators.....11-1
 - 11.3 Environmentally Preferred Alternative11-9
 - 11.4 Next Steps.....11-10

Tables

- Table 1-1 Population and Employment Forecasts.....1-11
- Table 1-2 Factors Influencing Public Transit Use.....1-17
- Table 2-1 Summary of Proposed Alignments by Area: Route Modification Process (2020–2022)2-6
- Table 2-2 Evaluation of Alignment and Design Option Locations (2023)2-9
- Table 2-3 Build Alternative Description by Project City2-14
- Table 2-4 Roadway Projects in the City of Brooklyn Park2-15
- Table 2-5 Elements of the 2016 Alignment and Build Alternative2-17
- Table 2-6 Station Characteristics2-20
- Table 3-1 Comparison of Impacts and Mitigation – 2016 Alignment and Project Alignment.....3-1
- Table 3-2 Defined Transportation Modes and Study Areas.....3-3
- Table 3-3 LRT Station Amenities and Connections to Local and Express Bus Service3-7
- Table 3-4 Projected Weekday Daily Boardings by LRT Station.....3-8
- Table 3-5 Blended Pre-COVID-19-Pandemic and Post-COVID-19-Pandemic Model Total Weekday Daily Boardings3-8
- Table 3-6 Summary of Pedestrian Service Changes at the City of Brooklyn Park LRT Stations.....3-12
- Table 3-7 Summary of Pedestrian Changes at Downtown Robbinsdale Station.....3-13
- Table 3-8 Summary of Pedestrian Service Changes at the City of Minneapolis LRT Stations.....3-14



Table 3-9 Summary of Bicycle Service Changes in the City of Brooklyn Park Station Areas3-18

Table 3-10 Summary of Bicycle Service Changes by LRT Station.....3-19

Table 3-11 Intersections Exceeding Capacities Under 2040 No-Build Condition3-21

Table 3-12 City of Brooklyn Park Intersections Exceeding Capacity Under Build Alternative.....3-21

Table 3-13 Traffic-Related Changes Included in the City of Crystal.....3-24

Table 3-14 Traffic-Related Changes Included in the City of Robbinsdale3-24

Table 3-15 Traffic-Related Changes in the City of Minneapolis3-25

Table 3-16 City of Minneapolis Intersections Exceeding Capacity3-26

Table 3-17 Parking Impacts in the Cities of Brooklyn Park and Crystal3-27

Table 3-18 Parking Impacts at City of Robbinsdale Stations3-30

Table 3-19 Parking Impacts in the City of Minneapolis3-30

Table 4-1 Comparison of Impacts and Mitigation – 2016 Alignment and Project Alignment.....4-1

Table 4-2 Summary of the Defined Study Areas: Community and Social Analysis.....4-3

Table 4-3 Community Comprehensive Plans.....4-4

Table 4-4 Neighborhood and Community Impacts Topics and Criteria4-7

Table 4-5 Community Amenities in the Study Area: City of Brooklyn Park4-8

Table 4-6 Community Amenities in the Study Area: City of Crystal4-10

Table 4-7 Community Amenities in the Study Area: City of Robbinsdale4-12

Table 4-8 Community Amenities in the Study Area: City of Minneapolis.....4-14

Table 4-9 Land Use Categories for Acquisitions and Relocations.....4-20

Table 4-10 Acquisitions and Relocations Required for the City of Brooklyn Park.....4-21

Table 4-11 Summary of Acquisitions and Relocations Required for the City of Crystal4-21

Table 4-12 Acquisitions and Relocations Required for the City of Robbinsdale4-22

Table 4-13 Acquisitions and Relocations Required for the City of Minneapolis4-22

Table 4-14 Visual/Aesthetics Terminology and Definitions4-32

Table 4-15 Changes to Existing Visual Quality and Character in the City of Brooklyn Park Landscape Unit4-37

Table 4-16 Changes to Existing Visual Quality and Character in the Cities of Crystal/Robbinsdale
Landscape Unit4-38

Table 4-17 Changes to Existing Visual Quality and Character in the City of Minneapolis Landscape Unit.....4-38

Table 4-18 Potential Long-Term Mitigation Measures4-40

Table 4-19 Capital Expenditure Categories4-44

Table 4-20 Applicable Safety and Security Codes, Standards, and Guidance4-47

Table 4-21 Railroad Crossings (Existing Conditions)4-49

Table 5-1 Comparison of Impacts and Mitigation – 2016 Alignment and Project Alignment.....5-1

Table 5-2 Resources and Study Areas for the Physical and Environmental Analysis.....5-4

Table 5-3 Floodplains in the Study Area5-12

Table 5-4 Potential Area of Water Body Encroachment on Floodplains5-13

Table 5-5 Wetland Delineation Results.....5-18

Table 5-6 Public Water Summary5-27

Table 5-7 Impacts to Delineated Basins from the Build Alternative by Wetland Type.....5-28

Table 5-8 Potential Stream Impacts from the Project5-28

Table 5-9 Major Soil Types Within the LOD for the Project5-31

Table 5-10 Risk Ranking Categories5-36

Table 5-11 Number of Recorded Properties with Potential Contamination.....5-42

Table 5-12 Summary of Existing Noise Level Measurements5-48

Table 5-13 Summary of Existing L10 and L50 Noise Levels at Long-Term Noise Measurement Locations5-49

Table 5-14 Summary of Noise Impacts by Project City5-50

Table 5-15 Summary of Vibration Impacts by Project City5-56

Table 5-16 State-Listed Species Documented in the Study Area5-58



Table 5-17 Federally Listed Species Documented in the Study Area.....5-59

Table 5-18 Regionally Significant Ecological Areas in the Study Area5-62

Table 5-19 Noxious Plant Species in the Study Area5-63

Table 5-20 Habitat for Federally Endangered and Threatened Species in Study Area5-63

Table 5-21 Nesting Season for Migratory Birds Within the Study Area.....5-64

Table 5-22 Regulatory Matrix of Stormwater Requirements.....5-68

Table 5-23 Downstream Impaired Waters Within 1 Mile of the Project5-71

Table 5-24 Increase in Impervious Surface5-72

Table 5-25 Potential Stormwater BMPs.....5-73

Table 5-26 Anticipated VMT Reduction for the Build Alternative.....5-75

Table 5-27 Emissions for Equivalent Passenger Vehicle per Regional Emissions Model (MT CO2e)5-75

Table 5-28 Monitored 2022 Carbon Monoxide Concentrations vs. NAAQS5-76

Table 5-29 Energy Impacts from Equivalent Passenger Vehicles (MMBtu)5-79

Table 5-30 Construction-Phase Estimated Energy Usage5-80

Table 6-1 Comparison of Impacts and Mitigation – 2016 Alignment and Project Alignment.....6-1

Table 6-2 Population of Minnesota and Hennepin County (1960–2020)6-5

Table 6-3 Population and Employment Projections for the Cumulative-Effects Study Area (2010–2040)6-7

Table 6-4 Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions6-10

Table 6-5 Summary of Indirect Impacts, Cumulative Effects, and Associated Mitigation6-23

Table 7-1 Comparison of Impacts and Mitigation - 2016 Alignment and Project Alignment7-1

Table 7-2 Low-Income Populations in the Study Area7-6

Table 7-3 BIPOC Populations in the EJ Study Area and Reference Geographies.....7-11

Table 7-4 Specific BIPOC Populations by Location.....7-13

Table 7-5 Engagement Strategies Used to Reach EJ and Disadvantaged Communities.....7-33

Table 7-6 Community Organizations Supporting Engagement with EJ and Disadvantaged Communities.....7-34

Table 7-7 Summary of EJ Issues and Concerns Received through Public Engagement7-36

Table 7-8 Feedback on Past Harms from EJ and Disadvantaged Communities7-37

Table 7-9 Review of Potential Adverse Effects by Topic7-41

Table 7-10 EJ and Non-EJ Project Property Impacts7-46

Table 7-11 Parcel Acquisitions and Relocations by City.....7-47

Table 7-12 Summary of Noise Impacts by Municipality.....7-48

Table 8-1 Comparison of Impacts and Mitigation – 2016 Alignment and Project Alignment.....8-1

Table 8-2 Impacts to Section 4(f) Properties (Build Alternative).....8-2

Table 8-3 Comparison of Impacts to Section 4(f) Properties in the 2016 Final EIS and ROD and Supplemental Draft Section 4(f) Evaluations (Build Alternative Only)8-8

Table 8-4 Summary of Preliminary Section 4(f) Property Impacts8-9

Table 9-1 Community Cohort Overview.....9-4

Table 9-2 Recommendations from Initial Community Input on Engagement Strategies9-6

Table 9-3 Cooperating and Participating Agencies.....9-14

Table 9-4 Documents Related to the Section 106 Process9-15

Table 9-5 Meetings Related to the Section 106 Process.....9-15

Table 9-6 Tribes in Section 106 Tribal Coordination.....9-16

Table 9-7 Official(s) with Jurisdiction.....9-17

Table 9-8 Permits and Approvals Required.....9-18

Table 11-1 Build/No-Build Alternative Evaluation Summary – Transportation11-3

Table 11-2 Build/No-Build Alternative Evaluation Summary – Community and Social11-4

Table 11-3 Build/No-Build Alternative Evaluation Summary – Physical and Environmental.....11-6



Figures

Figure 1-1 Project Area and Project Alignment.....1-3
Figure 1-2 Existing Area Transit Services and Facilities.....1-5
Figure 1-3 METRO Regional Transitway System.....1-7
Figure 1-4 Summary of Project Environmental Review and Related Studies.....1-8
Figure 1-5 Population Forecast in the Project Area, 2020–2040.....1-12
Figure 1-6 Employment Forecast in the Project Area, 2020–2040.....1-13
Figure 1-7 Percentage of Zero-Car Households by Census Tract1-18
Figure 1-8 Housing Cost-Burdened Households in the Project Area1-19
Figure 1-9 Walksheds Around Proposed LRT Stations1-20
Figure 1-10 Prevalence of Redlining in the Project Area1-22
Figure 1-11 BIPOC Residents in the Project Area and Racially Restrictive Covenants in Hennepin County1-23
Figure 1-12 Average Weekday Ridership from January 2019 to present (December 2023) on Blue Line.....1-24
Figure 1-13 Changes in Daily Metro Transit Ridership due to the COVID-19 Pandemic.....1-25
Figure 2-1 Build Alternative Compared to 2016 Alignment.....2-2
Figure 2-2 Project Principles.....2-4
Figure 2-3 Decision-Making Framework2-6
Figure 2-4 Alignments Assessed in the Route Modification Process (2020–2022)2-7
Figure 2-5 Alignment Options Considered in the City of Minneapolis2-11
Figure 2-6 Grade-Separated Intersection at Bass Lake Rd/CR 81.....2-16
Figure 2-7 Project Structures.....2-19
Figure 2-8 Project Park-and-Ride Locations2-21
Figure 3-1 Planned METRO System by Target Year of 2026 Under Current Revenue Scenario.....3-5
Figure 3-2 Existing Bus Transit Service as of June 20223-6
Figure 3-3 Pedestrian Study Area3-11
Figure 3-4 Bicycle Network in the Project Area.....3-17
Figure 3-5 2040 Afternoon Peak Hour Impacts to Intersections.....3-23
Figure 3-6 Parking Impacts in the Cities of Brooklyn Park, Crystal, and Robbinsdale3-28
Figure 3-7 On-Street Parking Impacts in the City of Minneapolis3-29
Figure 3-8 Off-Street Parking Impacts in the City of Minneapolis.....3-31
Figure 3-9 Crystal Airport Runway Protection Zone and State Safety Zone Effects3-35
Figure 4-1 Community Amenities and Parks in the City of Brooklyn Park4-9
Figure 4-2 Community Amenities and Parks in the City of Crystal4-11
Figure 4-3 Community Amenities and Parks in the City of Robbinsdale4-13
Figure 4-4 Community Amenities and Parks in the City of Minneapolis4-15
Figure 4-5 Architecture/History APE and Properties Identified (North).....4-27
Figure 4-6 Architecture/History APE and Properties Identified (South)4-28
Figure 4-7 Archaeological APE (North).....4-29
Figure 4-8 Archaeological APE (South).....4-30
Figure 4-9 Landscape Units and Key Viewpoints in the Visual/Aesthetics Study Area.....4-36
Figure 4-10 Input/Output Illustration4-42
Figure 5-1 Locations of Major Utilities in the City of Brooklyn Park.....5-7
Figure 5-2 Locations of Major Utilities in the Cities of Brooklyn Park, Crystal, and Robbinsdale5-8
Figure 5-3 Locations of Major Utilities in the City of Minneapolis5-9
Figure 5-4 Overview of Potential Floodplain Impacts from the Project5-14
Figure 5-5 Potential Floodplain Impacts to Stormwater Pond at TH 6105-15
Figure 5-6 Potential Floodplain Impacts to Century Channel Ponds and Setzler Pond5-16
Figure 5-7 Potential Floodplain Impacts to Shingle Creek5-17
Figure 5-8 Overview of Wetlands Near the Project.....5-19



Figure 5-9 Detail of Wetlands Near the Oak Grove Pkwy Station Area5-20

Figure 5-10 Detail of Wetlands Near the 85th and 93rd Ave N Station Areas5-21

Figure 5-11 Detail of Wetlands Near the Brooklyn Blvd Station Area5-22

Figure 5-12 Detail of Wetlands Near the 63rd Ave N Station Area5-23

Figure 5-13 Detail of Wetlands Near the Bass Lake Rd Station Area5-24

Figure 5-14 Detail of Wetlands North of the Downtown Robbinsdale Station Area5-25

Figure 5-15 Detail of Wetlands Near the Downtown Robbinsdale Station Area5-26

Figure 5-16 Active Karst Areas5-32

Figure 5-17 Poor Soils Near the Project5-34

Figure 5-18 Contamination Risk Along the Project Alignment5-37

Figure 5-19 Contamination Risk Along the Project Alignment in the City of Brooklyn Park5-38

Figure 5-20 Contamination Risk Along the Project Alignment in the City of Crystal5-39

Figure 5-21 Contamination Risk Along the Project Alignment in the City of Robbinsdale5-40

Figure 5-22 Contamination Risk Along the Project Alignment in the City of Minneapolis5-41

Figure 5-23 Typical Day-Night Sound Level (Ldn) Noise Exposure Levels5-44

Figure 5-24 FTA Noise Impact Criteria5-45

Figure 5-25 Locations of Noise Measurement Sites5-47

Figure 5-26 Locations of Vibration Measurement Sites5-55

Figure 5-27 Detail of Regionally Significant Ecological Areas Near the Oak Grove Pkwy Station Area5-60

Figure 5-28 Detail of Regionally Significant Ecological Areas Near the Brooklyn Blvd Station Area5-61

Figure 5-29 Impaired Waters5-70

Figure 5-30 Air Toxics Cancer Risk5-77

Figure 6-1 Primary Study Areas for Indirect Impacts and Cumulative Effects6-6

Figure 7-1 EJ Study Area7-5

Figure 7-2 Low-Income Populations in the Study Area7-8

Figure 7-3 Subsidized Housing (2020) in the EJ Study Area7-9

Figure 7-4 Housing Choice Voucher Use (2021) in the EJ Study Area7-10

Figure 7-5 BIPOC Populations in the Study Area7-12

Figure 7-6 Households with High Housing Cost Burden in the Study Area7-15

Figure 7-7 Limited English Proficiency Populations in the Study Area7-16

Figure 7-8 Disadvantaged Communities in the EJ Study Area7-18

Figure 7-9 Prevalence of Redlining in the Project Area7-21

Figure 7-10 BIPOC Residents in the Project Area and Racially Restrictive Covenants in Hennepin County7-22

Figure 7-11 Senior Populations (65+) in the EJ Study Area7-24

Figure 7-12 Households with 1+ Persons with a Disability in the EJ Study Area7-25

Figure 7-13 Households with No Vehicle in the EJ Study Area7-26

Figure 7-14 Engagement Events in BIPOC EJ Communities, December 2020 through January 20247-31

Figure 7-15 Engagement Events in Low-Income EJ Communities, December 2020 through January 20247-32

Figure 8-1 Park Resources: Northern Portion of the Project Alignment8-3

Figure 8-2 Park Resources: Southern Portion of the Project Alignment8-4

Figure 8-3 Historic Sites: Northern Portion of the Project Alignment8-5

Figure 8-4 Historic Sites: Southern Portion of the Project Alignment8-6

Figure 9-1 Metropolitan Council Decision-Making Process9-2

Figure 9-2 Photograph of Driveway Chat (July 2022)9-8

Figure 9-3 Engagement Summary (February 2024)9-9

Figure 9-4 Council Engagement Comment Data Interactive Website Overview Summary (February 2024)9-10

Figure 9-5 Community-Led Bike Tour of the Project Alignment (October 2021)9-11

Figure 9-6 Your Blue Line Extension Website9-13



Appendices

Appendix A-CR	Comments and Responses to Preparation Notices
Appendix A-E	Conceptual Engineering Drawings
Appendix A-1	List of Preparers and List of Recipients
Appendix A-2	Appendix Chapter 2: Alternatives Development Process
Appendix A-3	Appendix Chapter 3: Transportation Traffic and Aviation Documents
Appendix A-4	Appendix Chapter 4: Community and Social Analysis Cultural Resources Technical Report Visual Quality Tech Report Archaeological and Architectural History Reports Cultural Resources Documents
Appendix A-5	Appendix Chapter 5: Physical and Environmental Analysis Water Resources Technical Report Noise and Vibration Technical Report Biological Environment Technical Report Biological Environment Documents
Appendix A-6	No Content
Appendix A-7	No Content
Appendix A-8	Appendix Chapter 8: Summary of Supplemental Draft Section 4(f) and 6(f)
Appendix A-9	Chapter 9 Agency Coordination and Engagement Reports