



Appendix CR: Responses to Comments on the Supplemental Draft EIS

Appendix CR is a companion document to the Supplemental Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) containing responses to comments on the Supplemental Draft EIS published in June 2024. Metropolitan Council and the United States Department of Transportation - Federal Transit Administration are committed to ensuring 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.

To request special accommodations, contact Kaja Vang, Community Outreach Coordinator, by phone at 612-373-3918 or by email at Kaja.Vang@metrotransit.org.

This appendix includes frequently received comments and responses, documentation of comments received from government agencies, and comment and response tables catalogued by theme.

Supplemental Draft EIS Public Hearing Transcripts are included in Chapter 9, Appendix A-9. Recordings of public hearings are available upon request.

Comment letters received on the Supplemental Draft EIS from the Cities of Brooklyn Park, Crystal, Robbinsdale, and Minneapolis are included in Chapter 9, Appendix A-9.



A.1 Appendix CR: Responses to Comments on the Supplemental Draft EIS

The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the METRO Blue Line Light Rail Extension Project (Project) was made available to stakeholders, agencies, and the public for review and comment during a 46-day public comment period between June 21 and August 6, 2024. Two public hearings were held on July 16 and July 23, 2024, to receive oral and written comments on the Supplemental Draft EIS. This appendix:

- provides responses to the most frequently received comments in Section A.1;
- responds to comments received on the Supplemental Draft EIS grouped by theme (e.g. Purpose and Need, Alternatives) in Section A.2; and
- provides a record of agency letters and public hearing transcripts in Section A.4.

A.2 Frequently Received Comments and Responses

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Metropolitan Council (Council) received over 1,000 comments on the Supplemental Draft EIS. These included more than 250 individual comment letters, emails, voicemails, submissions via an electronic comment form, and oral testimony recorded at the public hearings. Individual submissions often contained multiple comments, which is why there are more comments than submissions. This section identifies frequently received comments (FRC) and provides responses to those comments.

FRC 1. Commenters expressed broad support for the Project noting that it would be good for mobility, connectivity, and the environment. Commenters noted their belief that light rail would reduce traffic congestion, would be easier to access than city buses for individuals with disabilities, would support households who cannot afford a car, and would benefit working class people and their communities.

The Council acknowledges the support for the Project. FTA and the Council have determined that the Locally Preferred Alternative meets the need for transit improvements in the area. The Locally Preferred Alternative is defined in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS and is the Build Alternative that was analyzed in the Supplemental Draft EIS with the addition of a station at Washington Ave and W Broadway Ave in the City of Minneapolis. This light rail transit (LRT) station was added in response to City of Minneapolis and community stakeholder input, would further integrate the communities to the east and west of Interstate 94 (I-94), and would provide equitable development opportunities in an underdeveloped industrial area.

Careful analysis and stakeholder coordination resulted in the selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative. Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS summarizes the route modification process and the alignment and design options that were evaluated. The Locally Preferred Alternative is the environmentally preferred alternative because it would cause the least damage to the biological and physical environment and it best protects, preserves, and enhances historic, cultural, and natural resources.

FRC 2. Commenters were opposed to implementation of the Project for multiple reasons. Commenters favored investment in bus over light rail; were opposed to the preferred route; felt that costs would outweigh the benefits; and believed the light rail system would be unsafe, cause traffic congestion, displace businesses and residents, adversely affect the character of their communities, and/or degrade the quality of the environment.

The Council acknowledges the opposition to the Project. The Council also acknowledges the support expressed for other modes of travel and alternative routes.

As indicated in Chapter 1 of the Supplemental Final EIS, the purpose of the Project is to provide transit service that would satisfy the long-term regional mobility and accessibility needs for businesses and the traveling public. Six factors contribute to the need for the Project: (1) growing travel demand; (2) reducing local pollution with a



balanced transportation network; (3) increased reliance on transit; (4) changing travel patterns resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic; and (5) regional objectives for growth.

The Project plays a critical role in supporting goals identified at the local, regional, and State of Minnesota levels to balance transportation modes and reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT). High-frequency LRT service would convert single-occupancy vehicle trips to transit trips in an area of the Twin Cities metropolitan area that is not currently served by similar transit service. The transportation investment is consistent with federal equitable transportation policy because the investment would be made in an area that has been harmed by disinvestment, discriminatory policies, and past transportation decisions.

FRC 3 through FRC 8 below address the most common reasons for opposition to the Project. Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS presents an updated traffic analysis for the Project and identifies specific improvements for the intersections that would be affected. The improvements include traffic signal adjustments, roadway lane striping, and added turn lanes. The intersection improvements would be undertaken as part of the Project.

Chapter 4, Section 4.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS describes the anticipated changes to community amenities and character and identifies specific mitigation measures for those locations where long-term operational impacts and short-term construction impacts are anticipated. The Council anticipates that any adverse effects on community amenities and character would be largely addressed by the mitigation measures and offset by the enhanced connectivity provided by the new LRT, sidewalk, bikeway, and the public realm improvements proposed for the station areas.

FRC 3. Given the COVID-19 pandemic and changes in ridership, the Project is not needed.

The need for the Project has not changed and is described in Chapter 1 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Transit served a critical function during the COVID-19 pandemic providing many transit-dependent people the means to get to work and provide essential services. Average weekday ridership on Metro Transit services increased by more than 50 percent between 2021 and 2025. The demand for all-day, all-purpose trips is expected to continue to increase. Metro Transit publishes performance metrics online at <https://www.metrotransit.org/performance#blueline>.

The ridership forecast model has been updated and calibrated to a 2023 post–COVID-19 pandemic ridership level. Inputs into the model include 2023 transit networks, onboard survey data from 2022 weighted to reflect 2023 ridership levels, and 2023 route- and stop-level ridership. Model validation was completed using COVID-19 pandemic–era park-and-ride license plate survey data, which includes the number of people using each park-and-ride in the region. In 2045, an estimated 12,000 to 13,700 trips would be made on the Project every day. An estimated 5,000 riders are anticipated to shift from driving or other travel modes to transit each weekday resulting in a reduction of about 37,000 daily vehicle miles travelled leading to less congested regional roadways and cleaner air.

FRC 4. The Project is too expensive and is not a good use of public funds.

The Locally Preferred Alternative meets the intended purpose and need for the Project, which is to effectively address long-term regional transit mobility and local accessibility needs while providing efficient, travel-time-competitive transit service that supports economic development goals and objectives of local, regional, and statewide plans. Meeting federal cost-effectiveness criteria is an essential part of advancing the Project’s design and construction. The federal funding process is a multi-year, multi-step process that proposed new or expanded fixed guideway transit must go through to be eligible for and receive discretionary funding from FTA. FTA rates projects from around the country based on a project’s cost-effectiveness, mobility improvements, congestion relief, environmental benefits, and economic development effects, and requires an acceptable degree of local financial commitment, including evidence of stable and dependable financing to construct, operate, and maintain the new system. The Project closely aligns with the federal priorities and goals of the competitive grant process. Chapter 1 of the Supplemental Final EIS describes the purpose and need for the Project and its benefits. Chapter 10 of the



Supplemental Final EIS provides a financial analysis and describes the capacity of the local funding partners to fund the Project.

FRC 5. Bus rapid transit (BRT) or enhanced bus would be a better option.

Hennepin County and the Council undertook an extensive Alternatives Analysis process that considered multiple modes and corridor options and culminated in the selection of LRT and a locally preferred alternative in 2016. The Alternatives Analysis process is summarized in Chapter 2 of the 2016 Final EIS found at: https://metro council.org/Transportation/Projects/Light-Rail-Projects/METRO-Blue-Line-Extension/Publications-And-Resources/Environmental/FEIS/Main/BLRT_FEIS_Chapter_02_Alternatives.aspx. BRT was eliminated from further consideration because the forecast total ridership was estimated to be approximately 25 percent lower than LRT, connections from BRT to other transit modes/facilities would be less convenient than LRT, and BRT would not have the capacity to handle event crowds as well as LRT.

FRC 6. Public transit is unsafe and not well maintained. How is Metro Transit going to address public safety and security?

Metro Transit is addressing public safety and security on the transit system by implementing the actions identified in the Metro Transit *Safety & Security Action Plan* (see <https://www.metrotransit.org/safety-library>). The plan includes more than 40 action items and was endorsed by the Council in June 2022. The actions taken to date have been effective. Metro Transit reports crime data for its system at <https://www.metrotransit.org/performance>. Reported crimes have declined 7 percent from 2023 to 2024 while ridership has increased 6 percent.

The following actions have been completed by Metro Transit:

- Launched the Transit Rider Investment Program (TRIP) in February 2024 and reached an agreement with Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Local 1005 to hire agents as Metro Transit employees. TRIP agents ride vehicles to assist customers, inspect fares, and issue citations for fare non-compliance. In Quarter 2 of 2024, Metro Transit hired 22 TRIP agents who are Metro Transit employees. Additional assistant manager and supervisor staffing have been identified for Quarter 3 of 2024.
- Hired more staff to proactively clean buses, trains, and public facilities and to respond to cleaning and repair needs reported by riders.
- Contracted with 10 community-based organizations whose representatives offer resources to riders facing issues like substance abuse disorders, unsheltered homelessness, and mental illness.
- Provided resiliency, de-escalation, and crisis intervention training to hundreds of bus and train operators.
- Revised and prominently posted rules for riding at all LRT and BRT stations and introduced the “Take Pride in Your Ride” campaign encouraging respectful behaviors on transit.
- Expanded tuition assistance and support for individuals preparing to become police officers while serving as Community Service Officers.

In addition to these actions, the Metro Transit Joint Labor Management Safety Committee has been established to evaluate safety data and risks and to recommend mitigations and strategies for continuous improvement. Metro Transit seeks to improve safety and security on transit property through integration of a safety culture throughout the organization, as outlined in Metro Transit’s *Light Rail Transportation Agency Safety Plan* dated February 2024 (https://metro council.org/Council-Meetings/Committees/Transportation-Committee/2024/02-26-2024/0226_2024_50-SW-attachment-2-RAIL-ASP.aspx).

Chapter 4, Section 4.7 of the Supplemental Final EIS describes how safety and security would be addressed for the Project. The Council would continue to develop the Project’s design and construction plans in consultation with local jurisdictions. Pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular traffic safety is being addressed through traffic engineering and redesign of some roadways. The Project would improve or add pedestrian and bicycle facilities and would include



major investment in High Injury Streets identified in the City of Minneapolis *Vision Zero Action Plan* to make them safer.

FRC 7. Crime will increase in station areas.

The Council plans to address station area safety by designing safe stations, investing in the community and culture, encouraging good behavior, discouraging unlawful or anti-social behavior, and enforcing rules. Station areas would be designed for maximum visibility with adequate lighting and security cameras and would implement design features to deter criminal or disruptive activity. The creation of new public spaces around stations and active programming and use of those spaces would encourage foot traffic and lead to more eyes on the station, improving both actual and perceived safety.

Metro Transit and city police would patrol station areas, and response teams from Metro Transit, city police departments, fire departments, and emergency response units would operate in conformance with the Council's *System Safety and Security Management Plan* and Metro Transit's Security and Emergency Preparedness Plan. For more information, see Supplemental Final EIS Chapter 4, Section 4.7 and the response to FRC 6.

FRC 8. The Project will directly displace businesses and residents, and rising property values will cause more displacements in the future.

The Council and Hennepin County and partners are committed to mitigating the effects of the Project. Mitigation measures have been developed to address both the Project's direct displacements and potential future indirect displacements resulting from rising property values and gentrification.

Development and redevelopment are regulated by the cities and are predominantly driven by regional and local economic conditions and allowable land uses as defined in zoning codes and local comprehensive plans. However, LRT lines can advance the timing and increase the intensity of development in areas near proposed stations within the limits of the land use regulations. A review of previous case studies of the effect of high-capacity transit on property values is included in Chapter 4 of the Supplemental Final EIS.

Previous case studies highlight the importance of developing strategies and mitigation measures to build resilient communities that benefit both socially and economically from transportation investments. In response, Hennepin County developed a *Coordinated Action Plan for Anti-Displacement: Blue Line Extension Corridor*, published in August 2024 (<https://yourblueline.org/coordinated-action-plan-overview>). The plan recognizes that no one agency or entity alone can deliver a program that counteracts gentrification and supports building generational wealth in the communities along the alignment. Building on the recommendations of the Anti-Displacement Community Prosperity Program Board (formerly known as the Anti-Displacement Work Group), published in May 2023, the plan is intended to guide the efforts to prevent displacement and maximize the benefits of the Project for current corridor residents and businesses. The plan addresses preservation and development of affordable housing, legal and financial services for residential tenants and businesses, workforce development programs, community investment, and other strategies.

Hennepin County has committed full-time staff to lead the anti-displacement program, and the Council has committed to implementing project mitigation as outlined in Chapter 4.

It is important to note that the Council is committed to the Project actions mentioned above, while the anti-displacement program described in Chapter 9 initiated by Hennepin County that falls outside of the Project budget, it is supported by State of Minnesota and community driven funding.



FRC 9 Traffic and access changes will result in increased congestion and diversions to local streets and the loss of parking will harm local businesses.

Traffic and Access

The Project has been designed to integrate the light rail system into the roadway, sidewalk and bicycle lane network in such a way that all modes would be accommodated safely and with optimal flow. Substantial changes to vehicle access would not occur and the pedestrian and bicycle network would be improved. With few exceptions, vehicle access to arterial and local roadways, residential driveways, and commercial parking lots would be maintained.

New and modified traffic signals would be required throughout the alignment to provide control of LRT movement through intersections and roadways in the vicinity of the operations and maintenance facility, stations, and park-and-rides would be reconstructed to accommodate buses, pedestrians and park-and-ride traffic near stations. Significant infrastructure improvements would include:

- In the City of Brooklyn Park, roadway modifications include conversion of full-access intersections to right-in/right-out intersections and a reduction of lanes on CR 81 between 63rd Ave N and 73rd Ave N;
- In the City of Crystal, a new interchange would be added to grade-separate the intersection of CR 81 and Bass Lake Rd. to accommodate future traffic demand at acceptable levels of service; and
- In the City of Minneapolis, notable changes would include restricting general traffic along N 21st Ave (between Lyndale Ave N and James Ave) and 10th Ave (between N Washington Ave and N 5th St).

The Council prepared an updated traffic analysis for the horizon year of 2050, which assesses these changes and analyzes cross-street delay. The results of the analysis are summarized in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS and in the *Traffic Operations Technical Report* provided in Appendix A-3 of this Supplemental Final EIS. Chapter 3 describes the effects of the Project on pedestrian and bicyclists and incorporates the results of updated traffic analysis. Chapter 3 also lists the mitigation measures that the Council would implement to mitigate traffic impacts and the access restrictions on N 21st Ave and 10th Ave N for the proposed transit malls.

The Project includes smart signaling, lane utilization strategies, and other traffic management measures to reduce congestion and delay and enhance safety. While delay may increase for east-west movements crossing the tracks, those traveling in the same direction of travel as the LRT may benefit from the LRT signal prioritization. Diversions to local streets would not be expected to occur due to the lane reductions on CR 81 in the City of Brooklyn Park since traffic demand is not expected to exceed the capacity of the four-lane roadway. For most local and corridor trips, travel time for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles would be similar to what is experienced today.

Under mitigated Build conditions, most intersections would operate at acceptable levels of service in 2050 with improved conditions compared to the No-Build Alternative. Under mitigated Build conditions, the intersections expected to operate at unacceptable levels of service (i.e., E or F, where queuing and more than 100 seconds of delay would occur), would also operate poorly under No-Build conditions.

The Project would improve access to key destinations in the Corridor by providing a reliable and affordable alternate mode of transportation that is competitive with the automobile. With an estimated 10,000 trips per day served by LRT, vehicle miles traveled would be reduced by approximately 39,200 each day, leading to less congested regional roadways compared to No-Build conditions.

To minimize traffic impacts during construction, maintenance of traffic plans would be developed during final design and construction and submitted for approval to the roadway authorities. The maintenance of traffic plans would address construction phasing, traffic signal operations, access through the construction work zone, road closures, and traffic detours. In accordance with a Construction Communication Plan, the Council would issue regular construction updates and provide advance notice of roadway and driveway closures and operate a 24-hour construction hotline to address concerns.



Parking

The construction of the Project and associated modifications to roadway geometry would alter the supply of on-street and off-street parking. Most of the on-street parking loss would occur in the City of Minneapolis. Within City of Brooklyn Park and Crystal all parking impacts are to off-street parking and no on-street parking spots would be affected. In the City of Robbinsdale most parking impacts involve off-street parking except for a small loss of on-street parking associated with geometric changes to the W Broadway Ave at 42nd Ave N intersection.

On-Street Parking Loss

In the City of Minneapolis, the Project would result in a total loss of more than 996 on-street parking spaces primarily along W Broadway Ave (between N 29th Ave and Irving Ave N), N 21st Ave, and 10th Ave N. While the Project would reduce the supply of parking, it would also reduce the demand for parking by providing mobility for approximately 10,000 people per day without need for vehicular parking at trip destinations. The Project would be consistent with the City of Minneapolis' Complete Streets policy, which supports the prioritization of street space for people walking, bicycling, and using transit over vehicles. While the loss of on-street parking would reduce convenient vehicular access to businesses, businesses would benefit from the increased pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the station areas.

To mitigate the loss of on-street parking in the Project area, the Council has committed to

- Compensate business owners for loss of off-street parking through the property acquisition process, consistent with state and federal law, which includes the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (Uniform Act).
- At Penn/W Broadway, the Project will acquire a private parking lot currently in use for a commercial property that will be acquired by the Project and convert that lot to public parking to mitigate for the reduction in off-street parking at an adjacent public lot.
- The Project area has been designed to facilitate multimodal transportation options with greater emphasis on transit, bicycle, and pedestrian modes.

In addition, the Council would continue to refine the street design of the blocks surrounding the Penn Ave/W Broadway Ave intersection to lessen parking impacts. Adjustments would focus on making space for on-street parking, which would include accessible parking stalls that allow people using wheelchairs and other mobility devices to better navigate from vehicles to the sidewalk.

Off-Street Parking Loss

The Project would result in the loss of approximately 952-989 off-street parking spaces. A parking utilization study of the affected lots was conducted by the Council in fall 2024. The results of the survey, described in Chapter 3, Section 3.5 of the Supplemental Final EIS, indicate business owners are concerned that a loss of parking spaces (on- or off-street) would negatively impact their business by making it more difficult for customers to access their business by car.

FRC 10. Public opinion will be ignored by the Council in this process.

The Council acknowledges concern about public input into the planning process for the Project. Chapter 9 of the Supplemental Final EIS describes the public outreach process used for public and stakeholder outreach. For the Project, the Council has implemented a comprehensive public outreach program that has engaged nearby communities and underrepresented groups in the environmental review and design process. This includes appointing two voting members to the Project Corridor Management Committee (CMC) that represent the Blue Line Coalition (a community-based group working to advance local and regional equity and community health along the Project corridor). The Council has also established a Business Advisory Committee and Community Advisory



Committee to seek public input and advise the CMC and the Council. The Project design incorporates the feedback received during the public outreach process, notably for the Lowry Station, the N 21st Ave alignment, and the W Broadway Ave Station. Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS summarizes how community input informed the decision-making process. Community input has also been instrumental in the development of the mitigation measures that the Council would implement. Chapter 9 of the Supplemental Final EIS describes the outreach that occurred after publication of the Supplemental Draft EIS. The Council will continue to engage community groups directly and via local/neighborhood-based media to inform them on Project progress as the design advances.

A.3 Responses to Agency, Organization, and Public Comments

Eight government agencies provided comments on the Supplemental Draft EIS for the Project:

| Letter Number | Agency Name | Date of Letter |
|---------------|--|----------------|
| 1 | City of Crystal | 6/21/2024 |
| 2 | City of Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development, and Public Works Department | 7/9/2024 |
| 3 | City of Minneapolis City Council | 7/18/2024 |
| 4 | United States Environmental Protection Agency | 7/31/2024 |
| 5 | City of Brooklyn Park | 8/5/2024 |
| 6 | City of Robbinsdale (via email) | 8/5/2024 |
| 7 | United States Department of the Interior | 8/5/2024 |
| 8 | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | 8/12/2024 |

In addition to the agency comments, comments were received from members of the public and representatives from businesses and other non-governmental organizations. These comments were received via an online form, emails, voicemails, letters, comment cards, and in the public hearing transcripts. Comments were catalogued according to the following themes:

1. Purpose and need
2. Alternatives
3. Transportation (active transit; transit; and traffic, access, and parking)
4. Community and social analysis
5. Physical and environmental analysis
6. Cumulative effects
7. Environmental justice

Executive Order 14148 (Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, January 20, 2025) and Executive Order 14173 (Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, January 21, 2025) rescinded Executive Order 14096 (Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All, April 21, 2023), Executive Order 13990 (Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science to Tackle the Climate Crisis, January 20, 2021), and Executive Order 12898 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, February 11, 1994).

The Supplemental Final EIS and Supplemental Draft EIS included analysis under the rescinded Executive Orders; however, consideration of subject matter mandated by the rescinded Executive Orders is no longer required. Accordingly, the analysis under rescinded Executive Orders does not inform the determination reached in this Supplemental Final EIS and Amended Record of Decision.

8. Process and public outreach



9. Financial analysis and funding
10. Project design
11. Construction
12. General support
13. General opposition
14. General comments on executive summary
15. Mitigation

In the comment responses, references to chapters, figures, tables, and appendices are to the Supplemental Final EIS for the Project.

A.4 Public Hearing Transcripts and Comment Letters

Public hearing transcripts are included in this Appendix. A recording of the public hearings is available upon request from the Blue Line Project Office Community Outreach Coordinator, Kaja Vang, by email at Kaja.Vang@metrotransit.org.

Comment letters received from the Cities of Brooklyn Park, Crystal, Robbinsdale, and Minneapolis are included in Appendix A-9.



Chapter 1 Purpose and Need

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Individuals | Randy | Voelker | | Ridership numbers are not looking good. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 3. |
| Individuals | Lili | Johnson | | So much of the predicted ridership from previous studies is now working from home | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 3. |
| Individuals | Barb | Kindle | | The needs of the people have changed because of covid, and people will not use this extension. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 3. |
| Individuals | Barb | Kindle | | With covid, needs have changed, and this rail is no longer needed. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 3. |
| Individuals | James | Nepp | | Although I generally support mass transit, I challenge myself and others to really stand back and say is this light rail really necessary given how much it will cost and the decrease in actual traffic to/from downtown due to the way pandemic changed work. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2 and FRC 3. |
| Individuals | Emily | Gahlon | | The projected speed of this rail is slower than new lines in other metros and will not improve commute time that much. | The LRT would operate at similar speeds as other LRT systems around the country and would operate at a speed competitive with private vehicles due to its dedicated guideway. Vehicular traffic congestion and commute time will continue to increase as a result of the projected 31 percent increase in employment and 16 percent increase in population by 2040. The LRT is expected to offer a competitive, and more reliable trip compared to vehicular traffic. See Chapter 1 for a description of the Project's purpose and need, which is not based on the need to improve commute time. |
| Individuals | James | Holthus | | Needs have changed in the last 4 years, and the train is not needed anymore. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 3. |
| Individuals | Karen | Andler | | Needs have changed in the last 5-6 years, and the train is not needed anymore. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 3. |
| Individuals | Jacob | Mertens | | I will not use this train, and I don't see how it adds value to our community | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Hank | Not provided | | The BLRT should stop, it is not needed. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Pam | Sayler | | Since the pandemic there are thousands of fewer employees going downtown to work in an office. Because of this shift, and the move of many large businesses out of downtown Minneapolis, the need for a large-scale public transportation system from the north to the city is greatly reduced - and can be serviced by existing bus lines. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 3. |
| Individuals | Jen | Salyers | | There is no reason for people of Robbinsdale to use this train, but the station and park and ride will sacrifice a lot of space for the people. | By 2045, the Project is projected to serve 12,000 – 13,700 trips each day, with 5,300 trips from zero-car households. The Project is needed to effectively address long-term regional transit mobility and local accessibility needs and to support the economic development goals found in local, regional, and statewide plans. Chapter 1 describes the purpose and need for the Project. |
| Individuals | Ronald | Williams | | Need will increase as people return to work in the office, which is a national trend. Further, this line in particular will serve people that do not have jobs that can be made remote and are thus still dependent on transit. | Thank you for your comment. |
| Individuals | David | Dirkers | | Need might have changed and should be reassessed. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 3. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | Page 1-4 Reference to "Victory Memorial Park" is incorrect. The official park name is "Wirth/Victory Memorial Parkway Regional Trail. It could also be appropriate to reference the Grand Rounds here. | Revised as suggested. |



Chapter 1 Purpose and Need

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The City of Minneapolis supports the project purpose and need based on the understanding that "the Project would invest in an area that has experienced a history of systemic racism and disinvestment, provide improved connectivity and access for communities in the Project area, and advance local and regional equity. The Project is needed to effectively address long-term regional transit mobility and local accessibility needs while providing efficient, travel-time-competitive transit service that supports economic development goals and objectives of local, regional, and statewide plans." | Comment noted. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 8 -- Figure 1.4.5.1: Update project map study area to reflect built alternative. | The figure has been updated to address this comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 8 -- Figure 1.4.5.1: Update and clarify project map study area to reflect an alignment that is primarily at-grade, not elevated structure. | The figure has been revised to remove the structure symbol. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-3 -- Replace Lyndale Ave N with 21st Ave N in Section 1.2.1. | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Check accuracy of section 1.2.3. Route 14 and Route 32 operate north of 29th Avenue North. | The sentence indicating that there are no bus routes currently operating north of N 29th Ave has been deleted. Figure 1-2 has been updated to reflect current service. Specific bus routes are not described in Chapter 1 because it is meant to provide a brief description of purpose and need for the Project. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-4 -- Map shows Lowry Station in Robbinsdale only; this is not accurate. The station is sited in both Minneapolis and Robbinsdale; the circle on the map needs to be on the border. | Circle indicating station location has been adjusted to show the station location on the border of both cities. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-5 -- Project setting should better reflect a built urban form, grid layout, fully built out with a highway dividing portions of alignment in north Minneapolis | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Section 1.2.2: Add potential redevelopment sites, opportunities and developments near Washington Ave and West Broadway in Minneapolis, similar to the comments about development opportunities in Brooklyn Park. | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-5 -- In regional transit system, refer to existing local routes (14, etc.) serving north Minneapolis. | Specific routes are discussed in Chapter 3 and shown in Figure 3-2. Chapter 1 focuses on relaying a concise statement of the purpose and need for the Project, and details like this are included in Chapter 3. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-5 -- In regional transit system, include H Line. | Revised as suggested. |



Chapter 1 Purpose and Need

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-7 -- Figure 1-2 needs to show Lowry Station in both Robbinsdale and Minneapolis; will not comment again on this, but all maps need to adjust. | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-8 -- Figure 1-3 should label D Line in North Minneapolis and include H Line, especially since it connects to project. | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-8 -- Figure 1-3: recommend pull out of Minneapolis project area (vs downtown). | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-9 -- Figure 1-4: In 2023, please add Minneapolis' Racial Equity Framework for Transportation. | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-11 -- In general, would be good to link more directly to things when referenced (e.g., the criteria used in the analysis of alternatives are based on Project Principles, which are available on the Council's website in footnote 20, but the link at footnote 20 goes to overall report, not Project Principles). | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-12 -- Under Growing Travel Demand, and Table 1-1 in particular, raw number as well as percent change for population and jobs growth should be noted. This factors into ridership estimates, as the number of people and jobs matter more than the percent change. | Table 1-1 includes raw numbers and percent change. For additional details on ridership methodology and results, see Chapter 3, Section 3.3. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-13 -- Figure 1-5: can you provide more delineation between the 10-25% band? It would be helpful to distinguish visually. | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-14 -- Figure 1-6: Please site year of data. Will this be updated in SFEIS? | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-16 -- When talking about Minneapolis TAP, you can reference the mode shift goal (3 of every 5 trips taken by walking, biking and transit by 2030), along with GHG (80% reduction from 2006 baseline by 2050) and VMT reduction goals (1.8% per year). Also, transit actions 4.3 and 4.5 directly support transit on West Broadway and the BLRT project. (Link: https://go.minneapolismn.gov/final-plan/transit/strategy-4) | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-19 -- Table 1-2: Is the project cities line at top of table just an average of the 5 or weighted by population? It would be good to clarify on the table. Recommend weighting it by population. | Weighted averages are used in the table. |



Chapter 1 Purpose and Need

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-20 -- Figure 1-8: Please put description in legend of standard deviation and other terms. | Legend revised to clarify. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-20 -- Figure 1-8: What are the dotted lines on the map? These are not included in the legend. | Gray and white dashed lines represent municipal boundaries on all maps and are labeled with matching gray font. Color saturation has been adjusted to better distinguish as the comment requests. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-23 -- Figure 1-10: What are the grey areas? Please add this to legend. | Figure 1-10 has been replaced with a graphic that identifies all areas on the historic redlining map. The grey areas on the original represent "Undeveloped and Business/Industrial." |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-23 -- It is important to talk about interstate building as a keyway that communities along this corridor were impacted by racist policies/programs -- it wasn't just about housing -- in this chapter. Note how the project is working toward and has goals to address some of the impacts of that legacy as well. | Text has been added to address this comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-25 -- This sentence is confusing, consider adjusting: "LRT experienced decline from 2019 conditions, between 90 percent and 75 percent, respectively, which occurred during summer 2020." | The sentence has been deleted, and the section has been updated to reflect recent transit ridership in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-25 -- Figure 1-12: Update with newer data if available. | Updated as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-25 -- When talking about impacts of COVID-19 on transit demand, in particular express service, please contextualize whether project communities have that type of service, or not. | Chapter 1, Section 1.4.5 has been updated to reflect the most recent transit ridership data in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-25 -- When talking about impacts of COVID-19 on travel demand, include information on vehicular travel impacts especially peak periods and VMT. This could help support some of the project decisions related to lane reductions on West Broadway and other corridors. | The effects of the Project on traffic resulting from lane reductions is addressed in Chapter 3. This chapter is a brief statement of the purpose and need for the Project. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-27 -- Consider removing "orderly" from this sentence: The Council is working to ensure the orderly economic development of its seven-county... | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 1-27 -- If Met Council has adopted any of the new goals/outcomes/etc. of the 2050 Transportation Policy Plan, recommend switching from 2040 to 2050 in SDEIS or SFEIS. | Since the 2050 TPP was not adopted prior to the completion of the environmental analyses conducted for this Supplemental Final EIS, the goals and outcomes of the 2040 TPP are reflected in the document. The traffic analysis presented in Chapter 3 has been updated to reflect estimated 2050 travel demand levels to satisfy the requirements of FHWA. |



Chapter 1 Purpose and Need

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|--|--|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The project will advance goals and objectives in the Minneapolis 2040 Comprehensive Plan, the Transportation Action Plan, the Climate Equity Plan, the Racial Equity Framework for Transportation and the Vision Zero Action Plan. The Blue Line Light Rail Extension project will connect people to new and existing opportunities and destinations, link people more efficiently to educational and employment opportunities, reduce transit commute times, and increase access to goods and services in an area where building community wealth is a priority. The project will improve public health and reduce pollution by connecting people to quality health care and providing active transportation options and make a generational and unprecedented transit investment in a corridor that has experienced a history of systemic racism and has a high percentage of zero-car households. The extension of the existing METRO Blue Line through North Minneapolis presents an opportunity for improving fast and reliable transit service, supporting citywide climate and mode shift goals, extending opportunities for inclusive economic development and growth, and better connect neighborhoods to regional destinations and employment centers. This REIA is being updated with the federal publication of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) and provides an opportunity to emphasize racial equity impacts in affected neighborhoods identified in the SDEIS. Actions to mitigate the impacts identified in the SDEIS are a critical component of the Supplemental Final Environmental Impact Statement (SFEIS); this is anticipated in early 2025 and we anticipate updating this REIA at that point. In this REIA, the information and questions will be used to determine if the impacts identified in the SDEIS may disproportionately impact communities along the line and whether investments proposed align with the city's racial equity goals. | Thank you for your comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The availability of safe, affordable, fast and reliable transportation options has a large influence on access to housing options, community health, economic opportunities and the built and natural environment. | Thank you for your comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The West Broadway route aligns with Minneapolis 2040, Climate Equity Action and Transportation Action Plan policies and supports goals and actions identified in the Racial Equity Framework for Transportation and the Vision Zero Action Plan; strengthens historical development patterns and Minneapolis 2040 land use designations; has greater development potential; offers a high level of access to residents and businesses; has historically been considered for fixed rail development (including streetcar) and connects with more community services destinations. The project is anticipated to support city mode shift goals, reducing dependency on vehicles, and offering transportation options for residents in an area of the city with some of the highest percentage of residents of color and of household vehicle availability. This area is identified as the highest priority tier in the city's Racial Equity Framework for Transportation. | Thank you for your comment. |
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | We do not have the density to support this. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |



Chapter 2 Alternatives

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Individuals | Randy | Voelker | | BLRT is a better choice. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Jenny | Creary | | BLRT is a better choice. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | In the West Broadway Transit Study done a few years ago, West Broadway was dismissed. What changed since then? | At the time of the West Broadway Transit Study, the 2016 Alignment was under study for LRT. Negotiations to secure the necessary right-of-way from the freight rail carrier to allow construction of the Project continued over several years but were ultimately unsuccessful. In August 2020, the Council and Hennepin County issued a joint statement to advance the Project without use of freight rail right-of-way and embarked on a route modification process, which included the evaluation of alignment and design options and a robust regional engagement program. Chapter 2 describes the decision-making process that led to the identification of the recommended Locally Preferred Alternative in the Amended ROD. |
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | You should communicate to communities about Bus Rapid Transit. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. In addition, the existing and proposed Bus Rapid Transit network, and how the Project would be integrated with in the transportation system, is described in Chapter 3 |
| Individuals | David | Lau | | Busses are better than trains. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Government Organizations | Joseph | Hogeboom | Community and Economic Development Director, City of Maple Grove, MN | Consider how bus routes might better serve this community, given changing service trends. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Government Organizations | Joseph | Hogeboom | Community and Economic Development Director, City of Maple Grove, MN | Consider extending the Blue Line to Maple Grove, a city that is in need of additional connections as well as a regional job center home to 39,000 jobs. | The recommended Locally Preferred Alternative identified in the Amended ROD would not preclude a future extension to Maple Grove. Hennepin County and the Council share a goal of promoting economic vitality through the development of an environmentally responsible and multimodal transportation system. Planning and programming new routes are performed through Hennepin County's comprehensive planning process and the Council's development of the Transportation Improvement Plan. Also, please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Michele | Joy | | Use buses, they are cheaper and less crime. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Cecilia | Blackwood | | I give full support to utilizing the stretch of Lyndale from Plymouth to Broadway. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Colleen | Patterson | | Money would be better spent on ADA compliant buses. | The LRT stations and trains would be fully ADA compliant, offering level boarding and wide doors, and individuals with disabilities would benefit from the improved ADA compliant sidewalks and trails near station areas that are part of the Project. Also, please see response to FRC 5. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Donna | Sanders | West Broadway Business and Area Coalition | The West Broadway Business and Area Coalition is against building the BLRT on West Broadway in North Minneapolis | The recommended Locally Preferred Alternative described in the Amended ROD traverses N 21st Ave between Washington Ave N and James Ave N, avoiding property impacts to W Broadway Ave businesses where a feasible alternative route to W Broadway is available. Chapter 2 describes the route modification process and design decision process that resulted in the preferred alignment. The recommended Locally Preferred Alternative is identified in the Amended ROD. |
| Individuals | Mary | Pattock | | Bus ridership is rebounding after COVID, LRT is not. Why not expand the service that people want to use? | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 3 and FRC 5. |



Chapter 2 Alternatives

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|---|---|
| Individuals | Richard | Sollberger | | Bus rapid transit works well and should be considered using electric buses. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Meghan | Andrukaitis | | I think money should be spent on the safety of other rail lines in the city as opposed to building new rail lines, which I am generally in support of if they are clean and safe. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 6. |
| Individuals | Joe | Wiatros | | Busses would be a more flexible, cheaper, better option. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Robert | Henjum | | I hope they take the West Broadway route instead of the 21st Avenue route if that is still an option. | The N 21st Ave and W Broadway Ave alternatives are discussed in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Because the intent of the Project is to provide a major transportation infrastructure investment that supports the economic health of communities, carrying forward an option that avoids impacts to W Broadway Ave businesses was preferred. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Kristel | Porter | | Why is Lyndale Ave still listed as an option and West Broadway Avenue between Lyndale and James still an option when we have been told at every "engagement" session hosted by Met Council that Lyndale and West Broadway between Lyndale and James is off the table? | Chapter 2 describes the decision-making process for the Preferred Alternative identified in the Amended ROD, which included a route modification process and the evaluation of alignment and design options, including an alignment on Lyndale Avenue and W Broadway between Lyndale and James. NEPA regulations require a brief description of why feasible alternatives have been eliminated from consideration. As described in Chapter 2, the Preferred Alternative does not include routing the LRT on Lyndale Avenue or W Broadway between Lyndale and James. W Broadway, in this section, would only include roadway reconstruction, wider sidewalks, and other improvements to the streetscape. |
| Individuals | Rachelle | Hamilton | | I would LOVE to see expansion of the blue line out to this area. This shouldn't be a new route that would cause major displacement issues- why not utilize (for most of the line) existing rail routes? Like the major cities do? We have train lines laid and Park n Ride buildings completely unused out here. Looking into partnering with owners of those routes should be explored for the majority of the project, before building huge new rail structures in places we do not need them | Chapter 2 describes the process to identify the Preferred Alternative without using freight rail property, a goal of the Route Modification process. |
| Individuals | Eli | Schlossberg | | I just want to say as a citizen of the metro I think it is a real shame we are investing our dollars into the suburbs instead of bolstering the metro. Getting people to the metro is very important but why are we not expanding rail networks and supporting people already within the metro? | Thank you for your comment. See Chapter 1 for background on the Purpose and Need for the Project and response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Christopher | Thanghe | | Busses would be a better, more flexible, more resilient option. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Emily | Gahlon | | The original alignment (route) was planned for the BNSF rail corridor, rather than CR 81, including West Broadway & Bottineau Avenues is better for a variety of reasons. | Negotiations to secure the necessary right-of-way from BNSF for the original route continued over several years but were ultimately unsuccessful. In August 2020, the Council and Hennepin County issued a joint statement to advance the Project without use of freight rail right-of-way and embarked on a route modification process, which included the evaluation of alignment and design options and a robust regional engagement program. Chapter 2 describes the decision-making process that led to the identification of the Locally Preferred Alternative in the Amended ROD. |
| Individuals | Charles & Anne | Hedlund | | We do see the MTC buses run on Lake Drive and also France Avenue. They are very empty but on a positive note they are quiet, environmentally clean and a better choice for Bottineau Blvd. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2 and FRC 5. |



Chapter 2 Alternatives

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---|--|
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | Expanding highways would be better | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Joshua | Carlson | | Brooklyn Boulevard is the better choice than hwy 81, Brooklyn Boulevard already travels under the 694 bridge deck allowing room for a train. Brooklyn Boulevard would better serve high density housing, existing businesses, and underserved communities. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Patricia | Brady | | The BLRT should stop, and bus rapid transit should be implemented. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Karen | Andler | | More bus connections east and west of the train would better get people to jobs. | Thank you for your comment. Additional service planning and route adjustments will occur prior to Blue Line Extension operations, and coordination around bus infrastructure will continue into final design and construction. |
| Individuals | Mark | Laverty | | The BLRT should stop, and bus rapid transit should be implemented. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | In the West Broadway Transit Study done a few years ago, West Broadway was dismissed. What changed since then? | At the time of the West Broadway Transit Study, the 2016 Alignment was under study for LRT. Negotiations to secure the necessary right-of-way from the freight rail carrier to allow construction of the Project continued over several years but were ultimately unsuccessful. In August 2020, the Council and Hennepin County issued a joint statement to advance the Project without use of freight rail right-of-way and embarked on a route modification process, which included the evaluation of alignment and design options and a robust regional engagement program. Chapter 2 describes the decision-making process that led to the identification of the recommended Locally Preferred Alternative in the Amended ROD. |
| Individuals | Scott | Fuhrman | | The BLRT should stop, and bus rapid transit should be implemented. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Tracy | Davenport | | The BLRT should stop, and bus rapid transit should be implemented. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Curtis | Franks | | The BLRT should stop, and bus rapid transit should be implemented. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Marshall | Clegg | | I wanted to inquire about a "Spur route" of the Blue line going into Maple Grove as it would provide transit to an already growing and expanding urban area connecting to Arbor lakes which is a shopping mall. Doing this would mean more jobs for people, bigger economic development, and connecting Maple Grove to major destinations like, the MSP Airport, Downtown Minneapolis, and Mall of America. | The recommended Locally Preferred Alternative identified in the Amended ROD would not preclude a future extension to Maple Grove. Hennepin County and the Council share a goal of promoting economic vitality through the development of an environmentally responsible and multimodal transportation system. Planning and programming new routes/route extensions are performed through Hennepin County's comprehensive planning process and the Council's development of the Transportation Policy Plan. |
| Individuals | Jesse | Christensen | | The BLRT should stop, and bus rapid transit should be implemented. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Lisa | Crockett | | Busses are better for business because they make more frequent stops. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | David | Dirkers | | Why are you not analyzing whether bus rapid transit would be a viable alternative? | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Mona | Grellson | | We prefer BRT, and we feel like Met Council is not acknowledging it as an option. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |



Chapter 2 Alternatives

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------|------------|------------|--------------|---|--|
| Individuals | Jenny | Lind-Sadow | | The 10th Avenue North portion of the proposed expansion raises concerns, including potential structural damage to historic buildings, reduced quality of living for residents, impaired traffic flow, as well as privacy and noise concerns. | The Minnesota Historic Preservation Office, FTA, and the Council have developed mitigation measures to protect the historic resources along the alignment (see Attachment B in the Amended ROD). The Council commits to a number of mitigation measures that would protect historic buildings, including performing pre- and post-construction surveys, establishing vibration thresholds, and conducting vibration monitoring at each historic property during construction. These measures are established to address the potential for cosmetic damage; structural damage is not anticipated due to the types of construction activities needed for the LRT system. The traffic analysis identified a limited number of intersections in the City of Minneapolis along N Washington Ave that would operate at or over capacity with the new LRT and roadway reconfiguration. The measures that would be implemented by the Council to reduce delay at these intersections are presented in Chapter 3 and in Attachment D of the Amended ROD. Improvements to circulation and access to reduce traffic from 10th Ave N include new roadway connections for bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles. These connections are located half a block south of 10th Ave N between 4th St N and 5th St N, and two blocks south of 10th Ave N between 3rd St N and 5th St N, as well as between 10th Ave N and 12th Ave N. These connections are presented in Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings. Chapter 5 presents the results of the noise analysis. |
| Individuals | Jenny | Lind-Sadow | | Why would the USDOT, FTA, Metropolitan Council, Minnesota, FHWA, FAA, USACE, NPS and Minnesota Department of Transportation even consider N. 10th Ave to Washington Ave route when they have an alternative? Which is the pink route-East of I-94. Met Council's Route Modification Report dated April 18, 2022, eliminated the N.10th Ave to Washington route - "This option has been removed after further study determined there was not suitable right-of-way to accommodate LRT and required vehicular movements." | Thank you for your comment. The Preferred Alternative was advanced through the Municipal Consent process and impacts, and mitigation measures are presented in the Supplemental Final EIS. Chapter 3 presents the results of an updated traffic analysis, which demonstrates that the intersections along this route would operate at similar or better levels of service under the Build Alternative compared to the No Build conditions. |
| Individuals | Jenny | Lind-Sadow | | The community questions why the 10th Avenue route is being considered when the Pink Line option east of I-94, which requires less infrastructure reconfiguration and encourages development, is available and was previously recommended over 10th Avenue. | Chapter 2 describes the route modification process and the alignment decisions and states that the Washington Ave/10th Ave sub-option was selected because it would allow for a more centrally located station to better serve the North Loop neighborhood, provide the opportunity to create a transit mall along 10th Ave, and avoid placing LRT tracks adjacent to the Twin Cities International School. This sub-option also avoids the need to reconstruct the ramp from the 3rd/4th St viaduct to westbound I-94. |
| Individuals | Jenny | Lind-Sadow | | The community suggests that a no-build alternative or Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) might be better strategies, as BRT is less costly, quicker to implement, and has shown strong ridership recovery. They request reconsideration of the 10th Avenue North section in favor of the Pink Line or expanding BRT. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Ron | Williams | | The LRT is better than the BRT because it spurs development and moves more people. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Richie | Song | | We also need to connect residents like me to the Blue Line Extension by improving walk, bike, and transit connections to the Blue Line, including feeder fixed bus routes to and from the Blue Line Extension | The Project includes pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure improvements and is being designed to accommodate active transportation and transit connections at the LRT stations. |



Chapter 2 Alternatives

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | It appears there may be some inadvertent references to an elevated light rail bridge and/or station at the Lowry Station area. MPRB's understanding is that the "flyover" option is no longer being considered, so these references should be removed from descriptions of the Build Option. | References to an elevated Lowry Station and LRT bridge in the Supplemental Draft EIS and this document relate to the route modification and design decision process, which eliminated the elevated station and light rail bridge from consideration. The description of the Build/Preferred Alternative does not include the "flyover" option. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 2-14 Add elevated/flyover station to the list of alternatives not carried forward. | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 2-17 The build option for the Lowry Station is not included here nor in the Minneapolis section and should be. | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 2-18 The list of "Build Alternative" bridges is confusing and may not be correct. Where does the modification/expansion of the Broadway Bridges appear? | No modifications or expansion of the W Broadway Bridges are proposed as part of the Project. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 2-19 Why is there a label referencing "BLRT bridge and vertical circulation"? | The label has been removed. |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | 1. Include additional exhibits or links to the specific section of the Project website to provide reviewers with a general idea of what atypical, proposed changes would look like. 2. Recommend creating exhibits with street names corresponding to proposed station and park-and-ride locations as stated in the Preferred Alternative so reviewers can easily understand where transit amenities are proposed. | Please see the Conceptual Engineering Drawings in Appendix A-E. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-20 -- "The Council anticipates that most TPSS sites would be located within existing transportation rights-of-way." This seems unlikely for Minneapolis sites. Add a caveat for Minneapolis TPSS if unlikely to be in existing ROW. | The sentence has been deleted. The traction power substation locations are presented in the preliminary engineering drawings in Appendix A-E. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-21 -- Include a description for Figure 2-8 that describes what "future" park and ride locations mean. Will these be built with the project or at a later date? Include a similar map as Figure 2-8 for future stations e.g., Washington Avenue and West Broadway. If the blue dots are meant to signify existing locations, then include that in legend. | The section has been renamed "Stations and Park-and-Ride Facilities" and text added to indicate they would be built as part of the Project. The graphics have been updated to show all 13 proposed station locations. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-22 -- When talking about LRT vehicles traveling at speed of up to 55 mph, may want to caveat with something like "but expected to travel at much slower speeds in the dense urban core of Minneapolis." | Revised to average speed, accounting for acceleration and deceleration and slower speed in the dense urban core of the City of Minneapolis |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-22 -- When talking about how transit frequencies are expected to return, it would be helpful to know by when and state how much they have been reduced now. | This information is presented in Chapter 1, Section 1.4.5. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Include consideration of a station at West Broadway at Washington. | A new station called the W Broadway Station has been added and evaluated in the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 2 Alternatives

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2 -- Figure A2-1 Alignment options should include Build Alternative (East of I-94 sub-option) on 10th Ave N and Washington Ave, through the intersection of those two streets and show the proposed Plymouth Ave Station on Washington Ave between Plymouth Ave and 10th Ave N. | The Supplemental Draft EIS Appendix Chapter 2: Alternatives Development Process presented the alignment and design options considered prior to the selection of the Build Alternative on 10th Ave N and Washington. These are not presented in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 11 -- Lowry Station should be referred to as a shared station between Robbinsdale and Minneapolis. | Lowry Ave Station is represented as a shared station for the Cities of Robbinsdale and Minneapolis in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 13 -- Figure A2-7 should reflect the Build Alternative alignment (East of I-94 sub-option) on 10th Ave N and Washington Ave, through the intersection of those two streets and show the proposed Plymouth Ave Station on Washington Ave between Plymouth Ave and 10th Ave N. | Appendix Chapter 2: Alternatives Development Process presented the alignment and design options considered prior to the selection of the Build Alternative on 10th Ave N and Washington. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Narrative talks with uncertainty about alignment; please update to reflect proposed project. | The alignment and design options are now discussed only in Chapter 2, which reviews the decision-making process that resulted in recommending the Locally Preferred Alternative identified in the Amended ROD. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Whenever referencing Lowry Station, it needs to be referred to as both a City of Robbinsdale and a City of Minneapolis station. It is consistently referred to only in the City of Robbinsdale sections and only shown in Robbinsdale maps. | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Revise the multiple options under east of 94 option and eliminate Lyndale option. | The alignment and design options are now discussed only in Chapter 2, which reviews the decision-making process that resulted in recommending the Locally Preferred Alternative identified in the Amended ROD. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Narrative needs to be updated to only reflect alignment being considered. | The alignment and design options are now discussed only in Chapter 2, which reviews the decision-making process that resulted in recommending the Locally Preferred Alternative identified in the Amended ROD. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Narrative talks about options still under consideration; update to reflect project decisions to date. | The alignment and design options are now discussed only in Chapter 2, which reviews the decision-making process that resulted in recommending the Locally Preferred Alternative identified in the Amended ROD. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Narrative - Update to reflect current project proposed alignment only. | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The narrative talks about 'all options in Minneapolis' - refine for project description as is. | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Washington and West Broadway station should be included in analysis, since one/two stations on 21st, West Broadway and Lyndale Ave N options were all analyzed. | The W Broadway Station has been included and analyzed in the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 2 Alternatives

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The City of Minneapolis supports regional investment in high quality neighborhood-based transit in the West Broadway corridor. We acknowledge the current SDEIS focuses on light rail transit and also recognize that bus rapid transit (BRT) could provide similar benefits to communities and businesses along the corridor if the project office considered alternative modes in the future. | Thank you for your comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 11-3 -- Spell out PLTS. | This acronym is spelled out in Chapter 3. Acronyms are spelled out only at their first use beginning with Chapter 1 and are included in the Abbreviations and Glossary attachment to the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Whenever referencing Lowry Station, it needs to be referred to as both a City of Robbinsdale and a City of Minneapolis station. It is consistently referred to only in the City of Robbinsdale sections, and only shown in Robbinsdale maps, | The Lowry Ave Station is now described throughout the document as serving both the City of Robbinsdale and the City of Minneapolis. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-3 -- First time using AA, please spell it out. It would be helpful to have a quick summary of the relationship and sequencing of the AA/DEIS/FEIS/SDEIS/SFEIS/ROD, etc. | This acronym is spelled out in Chapter 1. Acronyms are spelled out only at their first use beginning with Chapter 1 and are included in the Abbreviations and Glossary. AA is also spelled out in Figure 2-1. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-3 -- Section 2.2.1, for the sentence that compares BRT and LRT and includes the statement that BRT has “greater impact to general roadway traffic compared to LRT” – this does not seem to necessarily be the case in Minneapolis, since there are lane reductions planned through much of the alignment to accommodate LRT. Please revise. | BRT would require dedicated bus lanes, similar infrastructure, and the similar lane reductions as LRT. Buses have less capacity than light rail vehicles and would require shorter headways between vehicles to carry the same number of passengers. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-3 -- Regarding this sentence: Transportation decisions made more than 60 years ago devastated the communities along the Project, and those impacts are still felt today. More needs to be included in the chapter about this, for example, the impact of building interstates, the high injury streets that still remain. Recommend including this context in Chapter 1 or earlier in this chapter. It is important to root this in real actions that were taken by the government. | Reference has been added to the Chapter 1 where more information on past harms can be found. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-4 -- This is the first use of the term “disadvantaged communities.” Please explain what this means in the text or seek alternate term. | Definition of disadvantaged communities has been added. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-4 -- “Downtown Minneapolis” in the first full paragraph on page 4 should be reframed as downtown and north Minneapolis. | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-4 -- Define CAC, BAC, CMC in the text. | These acronyms are spelled out in Chapter 1. Acronyms are spelled out only at their first use beginning with Chapter 1 and included in the Abbreviations and Glossary attachment to this Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 2 Alternatives

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-7 -- Figure 2-4: Similar to treatment of 2016 stations, include/show stations considered as part of Lowry Avenue, Lyndale Avenue North and the "pink line" alignment. This was an important part of the route modification process and should be included in the documentation. | Figure 2-4 Alignments Assessed in the Route Modification Process (2020–2022) in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Draft EIS presents the Lyndale Avenue North alignment in green. This figure is not included in the Supplemental Final EIS however, the route modification process was an important part of Project development, and the report, findings and additional materials are referenced in the Supplemental Draft EIS and the Supplemental Final EIS Chapter 2. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Throughout: Correct terminology is West Broadway, not West Broadway Avenue. | Use of W Broadway Ave is consistent with the 2016 Final EIS and street maps of the Cities of Brooklyn Park, Robbinsdale, and Crystal. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-8 -- Statement says: W Broadway Ave alignment would serve a higher percentage of low-income and BIPOC populations and zero-vehicle households through three stations on a shorter route. There was never a decision about the number of stations during the Route Modification process -- please adjust. The Route Modification process was not intended to define the number of stations included with the project; this was always considered secondary to the route and an item to confirm later in the process. | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-8 -- Statement says: ...acknowledged that more detailed evaluation was needed to identify the best route in downtown Minneapolis. Please include "including stations to best serve the community" and remove "downtown." | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-8 -- Description includes organizations and neighborhoods. Consider including a map of the Lyn Park neighborhood, West Broadway Business Coalition service area, and others. Otherwise, please include more description of what these things/areas mean to outline their significance. | Thank you for your comment, this narrative is specific to the Supplemental Draft EIS as it relates to alternatives not carried forward in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-8 -- Add "The business coalition was concerned that..." to the sentence that begins "The loss of parking..." if accurate. | Thank you for your comment, this narrative is not included in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-8 -- Include a map with the alternatives labeled. The 21st Avenue North and East of I-94 alignment is not easy to understand in text alone without a map. | Thank you for your comment. A map is presented in the Supplemental Draft EIS Appendix Figure A2-7 Project Alignment Options in the City of Minneapolis for additional figures available online at https://metro council.org/Transportation/Projects/Light-Rail-Projects/METRO-Blue-Line-Extension/Publications-And-Resources/Environmental/SDEIS/BLE_SDEIS_Appendix-A-2-Alternatives-Development-Pr.aspx . The Supplemental Draft EIS Appendix Chapter 2: Alternatives Development Process presented the alignment and design options considered prior to the selection of the Build Alternative on 10th Ave N and Washington as described. The Supplemental Final EIS focuses on the Build Alternative. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-8 -- Update column heading for Table 2-2 to past tense: "Alignment and Design Option Locations Considered." | Revised as suggested. |



Chapter 2 Alternatives

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-10 -- The Lowry Station discussion needs to be repeated in the Minneapolis section, or alternatively, a new section called Robbinsdale/Minneapolis should be created to accurately depict this as a station that is geographically in and serving both communities. | Additional text has been added to indicate that Lowry Ave Station serves both cities. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-10 -- Should include in bulleted list a station or not a station at Washington Avenue and West Broadway, and a subsequent paragraph describing this decision point. Also include in Figure 2-5. | This section describes the alignment and design options from summer 2023. The W Broadway Station is listed in Table 2-5 "Elements of the Build Alternative" and on subsequent figures including Figure 2-7 and Figure 2-8. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-10 -- Should include in bulleted list a vehicle or no vehicle bridge across 21st Avenue North across I-94, and more context about this decision point. | This section describes the alignment and design options evaluated in the Supplemental Draft EIS. The N 21st Ave bridge is discussed in the section that follows called "Alignment and Design Decisions" under the subheading "N 21st Ave and W Broadway Ave." |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-12 -- Please include, in the one or two stations between Knox Avenue North and I-94 discussion, the concept that it is not the tracks that provide opportunity/benefit to the community, but the stations. This was a major part of that decision-making process. | Thank you for your comment, this narrative is not included in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-12 -- Please include, in the Lyndale Avenue North and East of I-94 discussion, some positives in why East of I-94 was selected in addition to negatives about Lyndale Avenue North (e.g., employment opportunities, serving the North Loop neighborhood, etc.) | Thank you for your comment, this narrative is not included in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-12 -- In the West Broadway and 21st Avenue North discussion, local traffic cannot be routed through alleys. Restate to say "retain access" or similar. | Thank you for your comment, this narrative is not included in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-12 -- In the West Broadway and 21st Avenue North discussion, please remove "flyover" from "would require a flyover bridge." It requires a bridge. | Thank you for your comment, this narrative is not included in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-13 -- Section 2.4.1 - Does the No Build 252/94 Easy Pass assumptions include an Easy Pass Lane all the way into downtown Minneapolis, and does this assume there would be lane added, not converted? | The Hwy 252/94 project is preparing a Draft EIS and is not a programmed project; a preferred corridor alternative for I-94 has not been selected. No Hwy 252/I-94 corridor alternatives are currently under consideration that would require the addition of a lane along the portion of I-94 within the BLE Project area. The elements to be considered for I-94 in the EIS are described in the Scoping Decision Document, which is published on the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) website: https://www.dot.state.mn.us/metro/projects/hwy252study/index.html . |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-13 -- Table 2-3: First bullet under Minneapolis should use West Broadway rather than CR81 for consistency. | The term CR 81 is used consistently in this document for the portion of the road between the City of Robbinsdale/City of Minneapolis border and US 169 in City of Brooklyn Park. Revised as suggested at this location. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-13 -- Table 2-3: Under Other Features, include mall description for 21st Avenue North | The mall is described in Row 4 Column 4 as "Transit/pedestrian/bicycle mall on 10th Ave between Washington Ave and N 5th St." |



Chapter 2 Alternatives

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-13 -- Table 2-3: Lowry Station needs to be recognized as a Minneapolis station (in addition to Robbinsdale). | A note has been added stating "this station serves Robbinsdale and Minneapolis." |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-14 -- Table 2-3: Other features in Minneapolis need to acknowledge transit mall along 21st Avenue North. | The mall is described in Row 4 Column 4 as "Transit/pedestrian/bicycle mall on 10th Ave between Washington Ave and N 5th St." |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-14 -- Table 2-3: Items not carried forward should include the Washington Avenue and West Broadway station. | The W Broadway Station has been added to the Project and is described and evaluated in this document. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-14 -- Table 2-3: Items not carried forward should include a LRT, pedestrian, and bicycle only 21st Avenue North bridge over I-94 | This column is no longer reflected in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-14 -- Table 2-3: Items not carried forward includes elevated Lowry Station. Nothing in the text speaks to that. Should this be included in the design process description? | Elevated Lowry Ave Station has been added to Table 2-3 and text describing the design process was included in the section above called "Evaluation of Alignment and Design Option Decisions." |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-14 -- Table 2-3: In Minneapolis, refer to CR81 as West Broadway (and include CR 81 in parenthesis if desired). | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-17 -- Section 2.4.2.4 talks about the station near Penn Avenue as 'new' - these are all new. Please remove the word 'new'. | New is used consistently throughout the document to distinguish from the existing LRT stations because the Project is an extension of an existing LRT. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-17 -- Include a potential or future station at Washington Avenue and West Broadway in description of station locations. This is in alignment with how environmental documents have included potential stations in past projects. | Revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-17 -- Section 2.4.3: Aren't we beyond August 2023 level of design? | Yes, the design has continued to advance. The Supplement Draft EIS was based on an earlier conceptual design in order to complete the environmental analyses. Since the publication of the Supplemental Draft EIS, the design has advanced to 30 percent. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-17 -- There are bridges shown at Olson Memorial Highway, 6th Avenue North, 7th Avenue North and Lowry Avenue on the map that are not included in Table 2-5. | Table 2-5 was revised to indicate that additional connections to Target Field Station were considered. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 2-17 -- Map labels need updated (e.g., includes "Vertical Circulation" at Lowry Avenue Station) | Figure 2-7 has been revised as suggested. |



Chapter 2 Alternatives

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis City Council | Concern about how thoroughly this alignment has been studied because it is a relatively recent change to the proposed route and whether other options, including those utilizing government owned right of way have been sufficiently studied and may have fewer negative impacts on residents, businesses, the school, and traffic flow. | Chapter 2 describes the alternatives development and analysis process, which was initiated in 2020, included extensive public outreach and was supported through the work of a Corridor Management Committee, Community Advisory Committee, and Business Advisory Committee. The current alignment has been evaluated in accordance with NEPA and Minnesota Environmental Policy Act requirements in the Supplement Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Mary | Green | | I prefer electric buses to BLRT. | Thank you for your response. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | Move BLRT off West Broadway Ave and onto Lowry Ave so it goes past Upper Harbor Terminal. | The Supplemental Final EIS describes the Preferred Alternative in Chapter 2. This alternative will be advanced into final design. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Active Transit

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Individuals | Cynthia | Baxter | | The proposed Blue Line along 10th Avenue would be detrimental to bike and pedestrian traffic. | The Project includes pedestrian and bike improvements throughout the Project corridor, including two new transit and bike malls on 10th Ave N and N 21st Ave, both in Minneapolis. Pedestrian conditions, impacts and mitigation are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS and Bicycle conditions, impacts, and mitigation are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Pedestrian sidewalks and bikeways are shown on the Conceptual Engineering Drawings in Appendix A-E of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Robert | Henjum | | I would also like to see a more about pedestrian crossings but overall I think it is a good idea for the neighborhood and the other communities. | Thank you for your comment. Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS provides additional information on pedestrian crossings. |
| Individuals | Ben | Werner | | I didn't see this specifically highlighted, but having bike trails or routes also arrive at stations is another way to increase the potential benefit. | Bicycle conditions, improvements, impacts, and mitigation are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Bikeways, including connections to stations, are shown on the Conceptual Engineering Drawings in Appendix A-E of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Brandon | Detvongsa | | We (Brooklyn Park) would like to see investment in other infrastructure (bike lanes, east/west bus service, sidewalk improvements) to bolster the success of the rail and of our community as a whole. | Improvements for other modes can be found in Supplemental Final EIS Chapter 3, Section 3.1 (Transit), Section 3.2 (Pedestrian Conditions), Section 3.3 (Bicycle Conditions) of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | MPRB strongly supports efforts by the Project and City of Minneapolis to ensure multiple pedestrian and bicycle crossings of the corridor and Broadway Avenue, specifically between the Penn and James Stations. MPRB also appreciates incorporation of MPRB's and the City's recommendations for implementation of a portion of the Northside Greenway alongside the James Avenue Station and extending toward North Commons Park. These crossings and trail connections, however, are not adequately described nor supported in the SDEIS. | Updated analysis documented in Chapter 3, Sections 3.2 and 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS includes evaluation of all crossing locations and analyzes change in travel times. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 3 - 13 The narrative here about the multi-use trails only suggests improvements in pedestrian comfort. However, the introduction of an at-grade light rail crossing will create an additional barrier than what exists today. This paragraph should recognize this potential impact alongside potential benefits. See main letter for additional information | Updated analysis documented in Chapter 3, Sections 3.2 and 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS includes evaluation of all crossing locations and analyzes change in travel times. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 3-14 No reference to at-grade crossing creating a potential barrier. See main letter for additional information. | Updated analysis documented in Chapter 3, Sections 3.2 and 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS includes evaluation of all crossing locations and analyzes change in travel times. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 3-14 No reference to north side greenway, nor of ped/bike crossings between Penn and James. See main letter for additional information. | Updated analysis documented in Chapter 3, Sections 3.2 and 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS includes evaluation of all crossing locations and analyzes change in travel times. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 3-14 Without a better understanding of the impacts of a new at-grade light rail crossing, MPRB would not agree with the statements in this section. See main letter for additional information. | Updated analysis documented in Chapter 3, Sections 3.2 and 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS includes evaluation of all crossing locations and analyzes change in travel times. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 3-19 Comments here echo those made for the pedestrian section. See main letter for additional information. | Updated analysis documented in Chapter 3, Sections 3.2 and 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS includes evaluation of all crossing locations and analyzes change in travel times. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Active Transit

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 3-19 No reference to at-grade crossing creating a potential barrier. See main letter for additional information. | Updated analysis documented in Chapter 3, Sections 3.2 and 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS includes evaluation of all crossing locations and analyzes change in travel times. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 3-19 No reference to north side greenway, nor of ped/bike crossings between Penn and James. See main letter for additional information. | Updated analysis documented in Chapter 3, Sections 3.2 and 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS includes evaluation of all crossing locations and analyzes change in travel times. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 3-19 Without a better understanding of the impacts of a new at-grade light rail crossing, MPRB would not agree with the statements in this section. See main letter for additional information. | Updated analysis documented in Chapter 3, Sections 3.2 and 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS includes evaluation of all crossing locations and analyzes change in travel times. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 11-3 The description of the Build Alternative for these three factors does not accurately reflect the potential impacts of an at-grade light rail crossing of trails and the Grand Rounds Parkway near the Lowry station area. This analysis must be incorporated into the understanding of effects and benefits. See main letter for further discussion. | Additional analysis was conducted in coordination with MPRB and is documented in Chapter 8 of the Supplemental Final EIS and the Amended Draft Section 4(f). |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>The proposed Project includes changes to the pedestrian environment around LRT stations and adjacent to the Project alignment. For example, in the City of Brooklyn Park, the Project includes reconstruction of 33 existing intersections with ADA-compliant pedestrian facilities. Nine new ADA-compliant intersections would be added, and 3 new pedestrian roadway crossings would be installed where no crossing currently exists. The results of the pedestrian level of traffic stress analysis show an improved and acceptable level for pedestrians for the Build Alternative except for 85th Ave N at W Broadway Ave, where pedestrian conditions would be improved but still uncomfortable.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why some crossings would remain uncomfortable for users. Discuss obstacles that preclude improvements to increase the level of walkability at these crossings. What changes might be considered if the uncomfortable crossings are not used by pedestrians? 2. Discuss proposed changes alerting drivers to pedestrian crossings (e.g., crosshatch markings at crosswalks, traffic cameras, social media blitz, increased traffic fines, etc.). 3. Commit to adding signage at all crossings to increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety. 4. Similarly, explain why some intersections are predicted to operate over capacity. Analyze obstacles that preclude improvements to reduce peak hour congestion. Discuss whether project elements incorporated into the 2040 build conditions modeling could be incorporated to reduce congestion. | <p>Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS includes updated analysis includes crossing locations and change in travel times.</p> <p>Design will include signing and striping to manage safety for new crossings and improve existing crossing locations with the Project.</p> |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 20 -- In Table A2-7, the row which details Bicycle Conditions should include mention of the proposed bike facility along 21st Avenue North. | A two-way, sidewalk-level cycle track would be installed on N 21st Ave in the City of Minneapolis. Signals would be installed at intersections between James Ave N and N 3rd St as shown in Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Active Transit

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Narrative refers to pedestrian and bicycle customers; this project will influence much more in walking/biking conditions than only those that pertain to customers of the LRT; recommend referring to larger impacts in neighborhoods this project goes through (e.g. look at impacts in Project Area, like for vehicles, vs. for customers). | The analysis presented in Chapter 3, Sections 3.2.3 and 3.3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS considers impacts and benefits to the bicycle and pedestrian network, including for transit riders to reach stations as well as those traveling in and through the Project corridor. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | A more wholistic description of changes to pedestrian experience with the introduction of Light Rail on West Broadway would more accurately describe the long-term impacts of the pedestrian experience, versus focusing on intersection-level changes. | Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS includes updated analysis includes crossing locations and change in travel times. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | A more detailed analysis of pedestrian crossings eliminated, impacts, and mitigation along West Broadway west of James Avenue North to the city limits is necessary. | Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS includes updated analysis includes crossing locations and change in travel times. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Please share maps of Pedestrian- and Bicycle- Level of Stress maps that were used in this section. | Maps showing the results of these analyses have been added to Chapter 3, Sections 3.2.3 and 3.3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Figure A3-6 does not show northern limits of work and walksheds in Minneapolis; the Lowry Ave station must be reflected as a City of Minneapolis station (as well as Robbinsdale). | A Figure has been updated in Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS to show walksheds. Impacts at Lowry Avenue Station are presented as occurring both in the City of Minneapolis and the City of Robbinsdale. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Narrative needs to look at not just station related changes, but generally, ped access between major destinations along West Broadway. Are we bringing a community together, or making it harder to cross? Improving safety even if level of stress is still high? Is level of traffic stress right measure, when we know plans show moving from a more dangerous street type (4 lane undivided) to a safer on (one lane in each direction, typically with signalized intersections and/or ped median refuge)? We need to zoom out a bit and look at (and reflect) the big picture. | Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS includes updated analysis for crossing locations and change in travel times. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Narrative should highlight preserving the long-term potential of opening up Dupont, including for pedestrians. | The project will avoid placing signals and special trackwork at this crossing in an effort to not preclude the potential future connection of Dupont across N 21st Ave. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Refer to real numbers vs. 'slight reduction in legal crossings'. | Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS has been updated to more accurately describe changes to pedestrian facilities in the Project area including quantification of crossings. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Narrative should highlight new pedestrian crossing over 94 at 21st Ave N. | Updated analysis in Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS includes crossing locations and change in travel times and are shown in Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Active Transit

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Figure A3-7: Legend says Hennepin County bike routes; in Minneapolis, those are defined by Minneapolis, not HC. | Appendix A-3 Transportation in the Supplemental Draft EIS included Figure A3-7, this appendix is not included in the Supplemental Final EIS however this figure is represented in the Supplemental Final EIS in Chapter 3, Section 3.3 and the legend changed to remove reference to Hennepin County in Minneapolis. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Figure A3-10: Eliminate the various options not being pursued and include planned bicycle improvements (e.g., Northside Greenway connection at James station); complicates what is being looked at. | Eliminated routings have been removed from figures in the Supplemental Final EIS. Planned bicycle network improvements are detailed in text in Chapter 3, Section 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Narrative talks about removing bike access on 21st Ave N - this is the opposite of what is being proposed. Please update. | Narrative in Chapter 3, Section 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS reflects new construction of dedicated bicycle facilities on N 21st Ave. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Table A3-14: Add info about Northside Greenway at James ad Queen Ave bike boulevard at Penn Stations. | These facilities are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 4-17 -- Section 4.2.3.1, Minneapolis section: In the first sentence "with the addition of a bicycle facility" implies that the bicycle facility is part of the impact, which doesn't seem to be the intent. | Text was revised based on comment in Chapter 4, Section 4.2.3.1 Minneapolis in the Supplemental Draft EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 4-18 -- Section 4.2.3.1, Minneapolis section: This section needs a more detailed discussion of pedestrian crossings along the corridor | A more detailed discussion of pedestrian crossings has been added in Chapter 4, Section 4.2.3.1 Minneapolis in the Supplemental Draft EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pgs 6-10 and 6-11 -- Also note the need for additional bike parking facilities at and near stations to accommodate additional bicycle trips to and from transit. | Bicycle racks will be provided at LRT stations for the Project. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis City Council | Concern that impacts or alternatives to an at-grade crossing of light rail over the Parkway and associated pedestrian and bicycle trails have not been sufficiently studied. More detailed information is needed about impacts to the safety of bikers and pedestrians and minimizing disruption to the Grand Rounds. | Updated analysis includes crossing locations and change in travel times in Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Megan | Peralez | | Rogers had Dayton Mobile Hope trailer park and there is no safe bike trail to Eastman Nature Center. | This area is outside of the project area. |
| Individuals | Megan | Peralez | | 81 does not safely connect bikers from trails in Elm Creek to Maple Grove Parkway; Eastman to Target | This area is outside of the project area. |
| Individuals | Megan | Peralez | | French lake road between Dayton River Road and French lake road needs sidewalks and bike trails. People walk dogs along road! | This area is outside of the project area. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Transit

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|-------------------------|---|--|
| Individuals | Matthew | Adamson | | Metro Transit needs to move away from the 'honor system' of ticketing and have stations that are protected and have some sort of fare collecting assess point | Station ticketing for the Project is based on current Metro Transit policies which require fares. While the system does not currently include gates, riders are expected to pay fares upon entering the platform, and fares are periodically checked by Metro Transit staff. |
| Individuals | Clark | Macbeth | | I would like to see better bus transit in Maple Grove, servicing the Blue Line. | Metro Transit's Network Now service planning includes proposed service changes throughout the Project area by 2027. Additional service planning and route adjustments will occur prior to Blue Line Extension operations, and coordination around bus infrastructure will continue into final design and construction. |
| Individuals | Bill | English | North Job Creation Team | Consider a circular transportation system that could be minority owned and could circulate throughout the whole north side around the Upper Harbor Terminal redevelopment. | Metro Transit's Network Now service planning includes proposed service changes throughout the Project area by 2027. Additional service planning and route adjustments will occur prior to Blue Line Extension operations, and coordination around bus infrastructure will continue into final design and construction. |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>Transportation indicates effects are anticipated to the fixed-route bus service</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Short-term, construction-phase effects to bus operations are anticipated, including temporary stop relocations or closures, route detours, or suspension of service on segments of routes as noted in Table 3-3, LRT Station Amenities and Connections to Local and Express Bus Service. Clarify which bus routes would be suspended and whether suspension would be temporary or permanent. This information should be part of the NEPA process, informing reviewers of the level of effects associated with the proposed project. 2. Analyze the impact to users where routes will be suspended permanently (e.g., whether nearby routes exist, distance between existing and alternative routes, capacity for nearby buses to accommodate additional passengers, etc.). 3. Analyze the cumulative impact to riders from proposed permanent route suspensions. 4. The SDEIS indicates the Council would follow federal and local procedures for route modifications or suspension of transit service, which would include a Title VI analysis to determine how service changes would affect low-income populations and BIPOC communities. Due to the nature of bus service planning, it is typical to conduct a Title VI analysis in advance of major service changes. The Council has codified procedures consistent with federal rules for when such an analysis is triggered, how the process is conducted, and how the results are shared with the public. However, the SDEIS states this work would be done at a future date when a final service plan is developed, likely 12 to 18 months before the start of operations. An impact analysis focused on major bus service changes should be part of the NEPA process, informing reviewers of the level of effects associated with the proposed Project. 5. Explain the process for community engagement to discuss changes to bus service. In particular, discuss communication with linguistically isolated groups. Commit to including notices at the stations in languages other than English to ensure linguistically isolated riders can easily use transit lines. | Metro Transit's Network Now service planning) includes proposed service changes throughout the Project area by 2027. Additional service planning and route adjustments will occur prior to Blue Line Extension operations, and coordination around bus infrastructure will continue into final design and construction. However, ridership estimates are based on existing known and approved service changes at the time the ridership projections are performed. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Transit

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Lowry Avenue was considered a promising option for the Blue Line Extension but West Broadway was selected as the preferred alternative; as part of providing an integrated transit network serving North Minneapolis, and support of bringing riders to the Blue Line Extension, the City supports advancing plans for a Bus Rapid Transit Line along Lowry Avenue. | Thank you for your comment. The Project is designed to integrate into the existing transit system and to leave open possibilities for future transit expansion. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | With the conversion of 10th Ave to a transit mall, more details on impacts to both Metro Transit buses that travel to/from new bus garage and Fire Trucks using Station 4 needs to be documented, including number of buses that will regularly use the transit way and/or other diversions of bus traffic to get to and from the Metro Transit North Loop bus garage. | The Project has coordinated with Minneapolis Fire Department for use of 10th Ave N as needed for fire trucks in emergency as required and additional routing options for the fire department is provided with 8th and 9th Ave N connections. Mitigation for roadway connections of 3rd St N and 4th St N are recommended to improve connectivity for vehicles and bicycles. Metro Transit will coordinate with the Project to preserve access and connectivity to its bus garage, the North Loop Garage. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The bikeway on James Avenue from James Avenue station should not end midblock but extend through the intersection of Golden Valley Road, linking to North Commons Park. | Ongoing coordination on bikeway design will continue with the City of Minneapolis through final design. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Please analyze school bus operations along the corridor, both during construction and in the build condition. Drop-off and pick-up zones, especially near schools will need to be identified. This should include a school bus operations and access plan for the Twin Cities International School. | A construction mitigation plan will be developed for the project including detours for school bus operations for the Twin Cities International School during construction. Ongoing coordination on access will continue with the City of Minneapolis through final design. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 11-3 -- Project does more than just build out multi-use paths. Include more general bikeway improvements/facilities. | Additional information is presented for Pedestrian facilities in Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Additional information is presented for bicycle facilities in Chapter 3, Section 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | Hollies | Winston | Brooklyn Park | The City of Brooklyn Park has previously communicated the importance of identifying and implementing east-west bus routes that connect to each of the five planned stations in our city. We understand that Metro Transit will conduct a future study to plan connecting bus routes, but we believe there is some urgency to complete this work so that final engineering can take into account the facilities necessary to serve bus riders. Section 3.1 of the SDEIS, which analyzes travel demand modeling and ridership forecasts for the project, assumes that the future stations will be served only by existing bus routes in Brooklyn Park. We reiterate here our request that opening day connecting bus routes be planned earlier in the process. | Metro Transit's Network Now service planning includes proposed service changes in Brooklyn Park, such as a proposed new micro service (on-demand service within a defined zone) and improved east-west connecting routes. Additional service planning and route adjustments will occur prior to Blue Line Extension operations, and coordination around bus infrastructure will continue into final design and construction. However, ridership estimates are based on existing known and approved service changes at the time the ridership projections are performed. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-------------|---|--|---|
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | The route destroys our present roads and will impact emergency vehicle mobility for North Memorial Hospital. | The Project team has coordinated with North Memorial Hospital and will continue the coordination through design and construction. Also, please see response to FRC 9. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Donna | Sanders | West Broadway Business and Area Coalition | West Broadway is too narrow to accommodate the LRT going both ways. | W Broadway Ave has adequate width to accommodate the LRT in both directions for the Build Alternative presented in Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS. Also, please see response to FRC 9. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Justen | Pohl | Enticing Entertainment | The loss of street parking will severely impact our performers, staff, and clients, who depend on these spaces for convenient access to our venue. We request that you preserve Street Parking: Ensure that adequate street parking remains available for our business, enabling easy access for our performers, staff, and clients. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 9. |
| Individuals | Dominique | Wilson | | I do not understand park and ride. | A park-and-ride is a parking area provided adjacent to a transit station. Park-and-rides are useful for trips where accessing a transit station takes too long, is too difficult, or is otherwise undesirable by walking, biking, or by using other transit. Park-and-rides are especially useful for stops in suburban or auto-oriented environments and can be surface parking lots or structured parking lots. |
| Individuals | Christina | PRIBULA | | This will negatively impact traffic on 81, my neighborhood | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 9. |
| Individuals | Kathy | Borisevich | | I'm concerned about access to our neighborhood. There are only two ways in and out, and they both are off of county rd. 81. If anything happens we could be stuck. | Access to CR 81 from all neighborhoods and side streets will be maintained or modified to ensure continued access for the Build Alternative presented in Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Lili | Johnson | | It will cause traffic problems for the elderly at Copperfield Hill, and the other senior living along Bottineau and the other residents | Access to Copperfield Hill will not change, with 40th Ave remaining a signalized intersection as shown in Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS. Also, please see response to FRC 9. |
| Individuals | Jesse | Christensen | | This project will create a very difficult situation for people in the community because it will more car traffic so much more congested. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 9. |
| Individuals | Ronald | Williams | | The elimination of parking spaces to make way for the train is a serious problem, and can negatively impact local businesses. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 9. |
| Individuals | Lisa | Crockett | | LRT, and long-term construction, will totally wipe out the Black Business District on Broadway because it will eliminate parking. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 9. |
| Individuals | Linda | Higgins | | Lowry Avenue should not have an at-grade crossing, the existing design would negatively affect cars, bikers and pedestrians. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 6 and FRC 9. |
| Individuals | Matt | Klopp | | I do not support the blue line extension on 81 it will hinder traffic. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 9. |
| Individuals | Brad | Sutton | | The route does not realistically take into account the pinch point along 81 between Birdtown Flats (36th and 81) and the west side of the lake, which is often full of parking. | No permanent parking impacts would be expected to occur to the area on the west side of Crystal Lake. The Project design maintains four lanes of vehicular traffic on CR 81 through this area. Please see the Traffic Operations Technical Report in Appendix A-3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Additional information on parking is presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Dr Tara | Watson | | Property owners, patrons and residents are concerned about Met Council and Hennepin County's plan to remove over 800 parking spaces without the County's plan to replace that parking. This creates a parking desert and loss of business setting a business up for failure. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 9. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Organizations and Businesses | Dr Tara | Watson | | Businesses along West Broadway Avenue are concerned about the lack of answers they have received from Met Council and Hennepin County to plan for loading and unloading their goods, and how emergency vehicles and assisted transportation options like Metro Mobility will be able to operate on a single-laned corridor, with a train, and with no shoulders to pull over. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 9. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Kristel | Porter | West Broadway Business Association | Property owners, patrons and residents are concerned about Met Council and Hennepin County’s plan to remove over 800 parking spaces without the County’s plan to replace that parking. This makes it impossible to guarantee these new property owners would be able to pay back the loans for their projects | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 9. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Kristel | Porter | West Broadway Business Association | The traffic impacts are poorly understood by Met council, particularly how traffic and parking strain will negatively affect businesses. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 9. |
| Individuals | Zeke | Rice | | Please ensure that the cumulative impacts associated with closing N 10th Ave between Washington Ave and N 5th Street, are adequately analyzed. Specifically, N 10th Ave is one of two direct routes between Olson Memorial Highway/N 7th Street and Washington; the other being N 6th Ave. If N 10th Avenue is closed to vehicles, there will be a direct resulting increase in traffic on N 6th Ave as the only remaining direct route. The stretch of N 6th Ave between Olson Memorial/N 7th and Washington includes several existing residential buildings (two condominiums, two apartment buildings), two apartment buildings nearing completion, and several other businesses, all of which result in a significant pedestrian environment. | A new roadway connection at 9th Ave N has been included in the Project design, see Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS. The updated Traffic Operations Technical Report in Appendix A-3 includes side-street analysis and the design includes mitigations. The Project includes roadway connections to preserve access and mobility in the vicinity of 10th Ave N. A summary of these improvements is listed in Chapter 2, Section 2.4.3.4 and shown in Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Zeke | Rice | | If the proposal to close N 10th Ave is approved, I would like to see the Metropolitan Council and the FTA work with the local transportation agencies to implement measures to calm the resulting traffic increase on N 6th Ave, including the addition of traffic signals or stop signs, and other pedestrian-friendly improvements. | 6th Ave N within the project area will include sidewalks on both sides approaching the intersection with 7 th St N. Signal timing modifications will be implemented to accommodate additional traffic demand. Pedestrian improvements are described in Chapter 3, Section 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS and shown in Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Stephen | Dent | | 901 N 3rd Street is the Bassett Creek Condos. The only access to the building's garage is through the alley. One must enter from 10th street as the alley does not go through to any other street. This would greatly devalue the building as entering our own garage will be difficult both while the light rail line is under construction but also because of the way the road is planned. | Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS illustrates the extension of 8th Ave N between 5th St N and 3rd St N and an alley connection to 8th Ave N for access to the Bassett Creek Condos’ garage. |
| Individuals | Danika | Okerstrom | | I’m concerned for emergency vehicles that frequently run up and down 81. Traffic would be diverted to residential neighborhoods. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 9. |
| Individuals | Brian | Hansen | | Closing down 10th for basically bike lanes, aka a 'transit mall' shifts the current level of traffic in the neighborhood onto more residential/neighborhood streets. I see 10th ave as a more major road relative to 4th and 5th. At least one direction of vehicle travel should be maintained along 10th, Northbound specifically. It necessarily shifts traffic through neighborhoods. I'm sure available bike lanes and sidewalks can accommodate the need for bike lanes. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 9. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|----------------|-----------|---|--|--|
| Organizations and Businesses | Donna | Sanders | West Broadway Business and Area Coalition | Your outreach has been appalling, community members opinions have fallen on deaf ears, specifically questions about how lanes are going to accommodate emergency vehicles, buses, and autos. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRCs 9 and 10. |
| Individuals | Tonya | Strauss | | Another concern is the potential impact on alternative traffic routes due to the Washington Avenue traffic backing up because of the LRT. Navigating traffic on Washington is already a challenge, and people often resort to using the River Road to avoid it. However, even the River Road is starting to experience congestion during rush hour times. It's important to consider that people prefer driving their cars over using LRT. Therefore, it's crucial to refrain from pursuing the 10th Avenue route to avoid exacerbating the traffic situation on Washington Avenue and the River Road. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 9. |
| Individuals | Charles & Anne | Hedlund | | Traffic will be bad along Bottineau Blvd where there is already a high volume of car traffic and ambulance service. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 9. |
| Individuals | Kevin | Raymond | | The light rail would reduce 81 to one lane, but 2 lanes is needed to support the amount of traffic that relies on 81. | CR 81 would have two lanes of vehicle through traffic in each direction between 30th Ave N in Minneapolis and 73rd Ave N in Brooklyn Park. The Project would reduce County Road 81 (W Broadway Ave) to one lane in each direction between 30th Ave N and Lyndale Ave N in Minneapolis, please see response to FRC 9. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Warren | McLean | Northside Economic Opportunity Network | There should be 75 million dollars put aside for a parking structure. | The Council has engaged with potentially affected business owners on parking impacts through surveys, door knocking, and meetings. The Council would compensate property owners through the property acquisition process, consistent with state and federal law, which includes the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (Uniform Act). See Chapter 4, Section 4.3 for additional information regarding the Uniform Act. At Penn Ave and W Broadway Ave, the Project will acquire a private parking lot currently in use for a commercial property and convert that lot to public parking to mitigate for the reduction in off-street parking at an adjacent public lot. |
| Individuals | Jonathon | Wescott | | I'd like to see the implementation of more gated crossings and the removal of the signalized intersections to properly prioritize the train as at any given crossing the train will have more people on it than any intersection would have cars waiting in it. | The LRT system is being designed in accordance with current safety standards and includes LRT signal prioritization. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | North Memorial Hospital | Even with controlled crossings on the tracks, a new, controlled intersection on Lowry, and EMS vehicles equipped with signal pre-emption, there will remain delays that are not present now for EMS vehicles. Of more concern are the thousands of patients a year who arrive in critical condition being transported in their own vehicle. Any delay in their arrival hurts the chances for survival. We appreciate the potential for eastbound Lowry EMS traffic routing to the Abbott intersection, however, there remain concerns about the Lowry at-grade crossing and undue delays for the many private vehicles coming in emergencies. It should be noted that both the 55411 and 55412 zip codes are in the top three for patient visits to the ED. It stands to reason that Lowry would be the primary route to take when coming to Robbinsdale Hospital. | Coordination with North Memorial Hospital will continue as design progresses, to identify emergency vehicle routing and signage for the Lowry Station area. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|-------------------------|--|---|
| Organizations and Businesses | | | North Memorial Hospital | Abbott Intersection – Tracks will also cross at-grade at Abbott. Signal pre-emption for EMS exists there now. Enhancing that operation to account for trains appears sufficient. We appreciated the Project Team’s work on that crossing. | Comment noted. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | North Memorial Hospital | Frontage Road Slip Ramp – The Project Office provided several designs for this change. None look to be of great concern. But we want to better understand the provisions made for left (eastbound) turns there. | The Frontage Road intersection with Lowry/Oakdale would include a side-street stop control with a shared left/right-turn lane. See Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS for design plans. |
| Government Organizations | Adam | Bell | City of Crystal | <p>The SDEIS conclusions are based on the 2040 forecast, which is flawed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Actual 2023 volumes exceed the 2040 forecast volumes in the Bass Lake Road-Wilshire Blvd. segment. - Actual 2023 volumes have reached the 2040 forecast volumes in the 47th-Hwy 100 ramps segment. - The 2040 forecast shows a higher volume on Bottineau Blvd. north of Bass Lake Road than south of Bass Lake Road, which is contrary to the historical and current reality. - City staff have repeatedly expressed concerns to project staff about the 2040 forecast and whether it should be used as a basis for concluding that Bottineau Blvd. would function adequately and safely with four lanes instead of six. - The forecast, model, and simulation need to be updated, recalibrated, and revised. Only then can the project’s impact on vehicular traffic be correctly evaluated. | The traffic analysis has been updated and is based on the 2050 forecast. Please see the Traffic Operations Technical Report in Appendix A-3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | Adam | Bell | City of Crystal | <p>The SDEIS does not specifically evaluate the traffic shift from Bottineau Blvd. to West Broadway due to the lane reduction on Bottineau.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This need is supported by the future diversion of 1,000 AADT from Bottineau Blvd. to the parallel segment of West Broadway in the no-build forecast. - It is likely that this diversion will be greater due to the project and its reduction of lanes on Bottineau Blvd. from six lanes to four. - The city is concerned about the diversion of traffic from an existing high-speed limited access road to a low-speed road of substandard condition and configuration, as described in the City Council’s July 16, 2024, letter to the project. - The traffic shift needs to be specifically evaluated in the revised forecast, model, and simulation. Only then can the project’s impact on West Broadway be correctly evaluated. | The traffic analysis has been updated based on the 2050 forecast and includes analysis of side streets. Please see the Traffic Operations Technical Report in Appendix A-3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------------|--|---|
| Government Organizations | Adam | Bell | City of Crystal | <p>The SDEIS does not evaluate cross-street delays.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The SDEIS states that all intersections in Crystal would operate at or below capacity but does not break out the level of service for each approach, the signal phasing and timing assumptions, or how they compare to current settings at each of the intersections. - Project staff have acknowledged that Bass Lake Road delays would increase substantially due to the proposed interchange. - This is especially concerning due to the prospect of the county potentially increasing cross-street delays as a way to “solve” delays on Bottineau if they worsen over time. - The cross-street delays and signal phasing/timing assumptions need to be included in the SDEIS. Only then can the project’s impact on cross streets be correctly evaluated. | <p>The traffic analysis has been updated based on the 2050 forecast and includes analysis of cross-street delays. Please see the Traffic Operations Technical Report in Appendix A-3 of the Supplemental Final EIS.</p> |
| Government Organizations | Adam | Bell | City of Crystal | <p>The SDEIS does not specifically evaluate the impact of the lane reduction on the existing southbound queuing problem north of the 47th Avenue signal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing backups during the a.m. peak typically extend to 50th Avenue and occasionally extend through the Corvallis intersection. And this is with three southbound lanes. - The project proposes to eliminate the third southbound lane except for a short segment from Lakeside to 47th Avenues, which is approximately half the length of the existing a.m. peak queue. - It is a reasonable assumption that the project’s significant reduction of road space will cause the southbound queues to extend further north and occur more frequently than in the existing condition. - Due to the proposed interchange at Bass Lake Road, southbound traffic will be transitioning from a wide-open, freeway-style, 1½ mile long segment south of 63rd Ave. to traffic signals with congestion and queues. - Southbound traffic would be cresting the bridge over the CPKC when it would first see the slowed or stopped queue, with little time to react. Having a third lane start just 1,000 feet north of 47th does not address this real-world traffic safety problem. - The SDEIS must specifically evaluate the southbound queuing problem. Only then can the project’s impact on traffic movement and safety be correctly evaluated. | <p>The traffic analysis has been updated based on the 2050 forecast and includes analysis of side streets. Please see the Traffic Operations Technical Report in Appendix A-3 of the Supplemental Final EIS.</p> |
| Government Organizations | Adam | Bell | City of Crystal | <p>The SDEIS claims a loss of only 7 off-street parking spaces at Crystal Business Commons (5500 Lakeland).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This may have been based on an earlier plan to move the Adair cul-de-sac onto the existing private stormwater pond and use public right of way for private parking. - The project is now proposing to keep the Adair cul-de-sac basically where it is today, which would mean the elimination of a lot more than 7 spaces. - The SDEIS needs to quantify and evaluate the effects of the most recent plan on Crystal Business Commons and any other private property. Only then can the impacts on parking be correctly evaluated. | <p>Both on-street and off-street impacts are documented in the Supplemental Final EIS. Additional data collection on current use of existing parking has been performed and the survey results are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.5.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS.</p> |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | Request inclusion of specific verbal recognition of the multiple planned crossings of the corridor to be constructed, appearing throughout the narrative, such as on Page 3-13 or in Table 3-8. | Updated analysis is documented in Chapter 3, Sections 3.2 and 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS and includes evaluation of all crossing locations and an analysis of change in travel times. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | Extension of the project limits along James and Knox Avenues southward to and including crossings of Golden Valley Road, to ensure direct connection to North Commons Park from the James Avenue Station and the proposed Knox crossing. MPRB is requesting inclusion of the Golden Valley Road intersections because Hennepin County is a light rail project partner, Golden Valley Road is a Hennepin County road, and discussion/negotiation now will be easier in the midst of this major project than a potentially three-agency agreement after the fact. | The Project does not extend past Golden Valley Road (CR 66). Refer to Appendix A-E for Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Draft EIS for design details and project limits adjacent to Golden Valley Road. <u>The Project includes improvements to pedestrian and bicycle connections from the James Ave Station to North Commons Park.</u> |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | Page 2-10 MPRB does not believe that the "interchange would remain functionally similar to existing conditions." The addition of the "slip ramp" could reduce traffic on Parkways, and this should be recognized as a benefit. The at-grade light rail crossing of the parkway and associated trails, however, could have negative impacts, which are not discussed here. The main letter discusses the Lowry station design in greater detail. | The LRT guideway at the interchange will include automatic gate arms to maximize safety for all modes, especially due to the limited sight lines approaching the crossings. A new traffic signal at Lowry Ave/Theodore Wirth Pkwy will also be installed in addition to the slip ramp from southbound CR 81. Preemption will be provided for emergency response vehicles. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 3-24 This narrative should include more about the "slip ramp" and how that changes traffic movements in the station area, and potentially reduces traffic on MPRB Parkways. It should also discuss the at-grade light rail crossing and its impact on vehicular travel on the Parkway. See main letter for additional information. | Slip ramps are no longer proposed at Lakeland. Airport Road access will be similar to existing conditions. See Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | The SDEIS indicates the Minneapolis alignment would cross I-94 on a new N 21st Avenue bridge. Numerous vehicular and pedestrian bridges, roadway realignments and reconstructions, and lane additions are also proposed. Recommendation: Discuss coordination with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Minnesota Department of Transportation, and Hennepin County road authorities concerning the proposed Project. EPA recommends summarizing coordination with and including letters from these agencies in Appendix A-3, Traffic and Aviation Documents. | Coordination with FHWA and partner agencies is documented in Chapter 9 of the Supplemental Final EIS. An Interstate Access Modification Agreement (IAMR) with FHWA is summarized in Chapter 3, Appendix A-3 IAMR Summary in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | Chapter 3, Transportation, indicates the loss of parking has been raised as a concern, and parking utilization studies would be completed to better understand parking needs and identify locations to preserve parking. The SDEIS is not clear when such studies would be completed. Recommendation: Complete parking utilization studies for each city and identify locations to preserve and/or create new parking before issuing the SFEIS. The loss of parking and related impact to users and businesses is a connected action and should be analyzed in the SFEIS so reviewers can understand proposed effects. | A parking utilization survey was completed in November 2024 and the results are summarized in Chapter 3, Section 3.5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | Chapter 4, Community and Social Analysis, indicates reconfiguration of 10th Ave N to create a transit mall or one-way vehicular traffic and the closure of 21st Ave N to vehicular traffic with the addition of a bicycle facility between I-94 and James Ave. The SDEIS does not appear to analyze the effects from street closures, in addition to the loss of parking, in Minneapolis. Recommendation: Analyze the effects of street closures. In particular, discuss which street(s) drivers will likely use as alternatives and the forecasted Level of Service on the alternatives when traffic is permanently redirected. | The traffic analysis has been updated and includes an analysis of side-streets affected by street closures. The results are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.4 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-1 -- Table 3-1: 3.4 - Project is looking at all intersections, not just signalized, at least in Minneapolis, correct? | All intersections regardless of control-type were evaluated. See the Traffic Operations Technical Report in Appendix A-3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-1 -- Table 3-1: 3.5 - Please write out LOD and describe what it is. | Updated text to say Project's Limits of Disturbance. LOD included in Abbreviation and Glossary document in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-3 -- Figure 3-1: Please add D Line label in north Minneapolis near project area. | Figure 3-1 was updated to include the D Line location and label in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-3 -- Figure 3-1: Why have a 2026 year in title/not extend to 2030 per when opening of BLRT is supposed to be? And also include H Line. | The reference to 2026 was removed from the title of Figure 3-1. H Line has been added to the figure in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-4 -- Figure 3-2: Where is Route 14? A zoomed in version of the transit map of North Minneapolis would help here. | Figure 3-2 has been updated to show Route 14 including an inset map to provide further details in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-5 -- The operating phase/long term impacts section only talks about transit trips; there are many other long term operating impacts. Are those in other sections? Reference them here. I know this is focused on transportation; what about lane changes, etc. with transit malls and otherwise altering character of West Broadway? | Chapter 3 provides information for other modes of transportation and transportation impacts and has been updated to reflect additional analyses since the publication of the Supplemental Draft EIS was published. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-5 -- Table 3-3: Lowry Avenue Station referred to as North Memorial Lowry - I think the correct name is just Lowry (in other areas); please adjust. | Table 3-3 has been updated in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-6 -- Table 3-3: Update projected weekday daily boardings with latest ridership model, based on 2050 population and employment forecasts that reflect increased development potential in Minneapolis per city's comprehensive plan. | Table 3-3 has been updated to reflect the updated ridership projections in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-5 -- Please provide additional detail describing the different ridership model assumptions that could explain differences in station level ridership between the models. | Text updates in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS describe the changes to the assumptions used in the ridership (STOPS) model. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-6 -- Wouldn't long-term impacts to local service (e.g., changes to the Route 14) potentially be a long-term adverse impact? | Additional service planning and route adjustments would occur prior to Blue Line Extension operations, and coordination around bus infrastructure would continue into final design and construction. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-7 -- Do you have a map of the PLTS to show? | The figure has been added to Chapter 3 in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-7 -- Section 3.2. Consider including the City of Minneapolis Vision Zero High Injury Streets Network in describing the pedestrian facilities and challenges in the project area. | Chapter 3 in the Supplemental Final EIS has been updated to describe safety improvements on N 7 th St and West Broadway: two streets on the Minneapolis Vision Zero High-Injury Streets Network. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-7 -- The PLTS does not seem to include a relevant metric for analyzing the effect on comfort levels of pedestrians adjacent to LRT or crossing LRT facilities. This should be incorporated in the analysis as there are many locations along the alignment where sidewalks are immediately adjacent to LRT tracks and where pedestrians cross LRT tracks | Updated PLTS analysis does include consideration of comfort levels of pedestrians crossing of the alignment and is described in Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-9 -- When the Lowry Avenue station description and analysis reflects that the location is shared between Minneapolis and Robbinsdale, walkshed, etc. will change. Will this change ridership forecast or other data points for that station? | The updated ridership analysis reflects the correct station location and ridership from the City of Minneapolis and the City of Robbinsdale in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-9 -- When including narrative about improved pedestrian experience, please include transit mall on 21st Avenue North (not just 10th Avenue North). | Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS text has been updated to include the 21st Avenue North pedestrian improvements. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-11 -- Regarding this sentence: "Additional minor improvements on West Broadway Ave west of Logan Avenue North and Washington Avenue North between Broadway Street NE and Plymouth Avenue would remain uncomfortable for most users." Sidewalk improvements and ADA ramps will be improved along the entire stretch, correct? This will be much more comfortable than what exists currently. Also, inclusion of boulevards, etc. will help with pedestrian environment and comfort. | Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS text has been updated to reflect the pedestrian improvements. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-11 -- Regarding this sentence: "Additional minor improvements on W Broadway Ave west of Logan Ave N and Washington Ave N between Broadway St NE and Plymouth Ave..." Should be West Broadway not Broadway St NE, which is across the river. | Text has been revised as suggested in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-11 -- For Minneapolis section, please include summary of pedestrian changes (i.e., number of crossings added/removed, intersection upgrades, etc.). This is included for the other cities. | Text has been updated as suggested in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pgs 3-11 and 3-12 -- Analysis should include turning radii at intersections; many of these intersections may have negative effects for pedestrians due to turning movement constraints as a result of center running tracks. | The preliminary design drawings show the required turning radii at intersections in Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pgs 3-11 and 3-12 -- Analysis described in the appendix does not accurately portray recent design modifications. Is this analysis based on the municipal consent plans? | The Supplemental Final EIS analysis is based on the Municipal consent plans. See preliminary design drawings in Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-12 -- Lyndale Avenue North: Pedestrian crossings have been closed at 21st Avenue North and Dupont Avenue North and 21st Avenue North and 6th Street North with the proposed design. Clarify why a traffic signal is an improvement for pedestrians. | The text has been updated to "Controlled signalized intersections improve the safety and level of comfort for pedestrians along the corridor" in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-12 -- Plymouth Avenue: There is an existing crossing at Washington Avenue North and Plymouth Avenue and 10th Avenue North today. Different rationale needed for this analysis. | The text has been updated to address this comment in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pgs 3-11 and 3-12 -- The summary of proposed changes in Table 3-7 does not use the metrics identified in section 3.2.1 as the methodology for the analysis. What is the change in sidewalk width, sidewalk surface condition, type and width of buffer between sidewalk and roadway, prevailing speed of vehicle traffic and number of vehicular travel lanes on the adjacent roadway and general land use of the area? These metrics are also not described in the appendix. | The metrics identified in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.1 of the Supplemental Final EIS and Supplemental Draft EIS were used to calculate the values in the table. Sidewalk and roadway geometry are reflected in the preliminary engineering drawings in Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS. Posted speed limits were assumed for the prevailing speed of vehicle traffic. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-12 -- Why are Penn Avenue changes listed as neutral? What is listed are all improvements. | Text in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS has been updated to address this comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-12 -- For Lyndale station, elimination of crosswalk at Dupont Avenue North is hard to consider an improvement. What about listing the 21st Avenue North transit mall for this and the James Ave station? | Text has been revised in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS to focus on improvements and connectivity with Project from Dupont to the station and other facilities |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-12 -- For Plymouth Avenue station - why talk about bikeway in pedestrian section? If including, mention bikeway connections at James and Lyndale stations. | Text in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS has been updated to address this comment and remove discussion of bikeway in pedestrian section. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-12 -- Section 3.2.4: Pedestrian mitigation area -- More needs to be said about crossing West Broadway with LRT. What sort of loss of access from a pedestrian perspective is there, etc. This summary area is an area where it is important to distinguish between the more urban Minneapolis section vs other parts of the alignment. | Text has been updated in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS to provide further details |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-12 -- Section 3.2.4: Says detour routes would generally be provided; wouldn't they always be provided? We request they are properly marked and provided per TAP street operations strategy 9: https://go.minneapolismn.gov/final-plan/street-operations/strategy-9 . | Text has been updated Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS to reflect requirements for detours. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-12 -- Include number of pedestrian crossings reduced per city. | The updated analysis in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS includes crossing locations and change in travel times. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-12 -- Detour routes need to be provided for short- and long-term sidewalk closures and should comply with new PROWAG guidance for accessibility. | Detour details will be included in the Construction Mitigation Plan for the Project. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-12 -- Can you add map of BLTS? | The figure has been added to Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-12 -- Shared traffic streets should only be considered bicycle facilities under certain conditions (e.g., low vehicular volumes, wayfinding for bicyclists, where traffic calming and reduction strategies are present). | Bicycle facilities were identified using published and publicly available resources. Shared streets identified by these resources are included as bicycle facilities in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-13 -- Isn't it standard to include bike parking at all LRT stations? Document says at many, but not all. | The text has been updated to indicate that stations would have bicycle parking Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-13 -- The BLTS does not seem to include a relevant metric for analyzing the effect on comfort levels of bicyclists adjacent to LRT or crossing LRT facilities. This should be incorporated in the analysis as there are many locations along the alignment where bikeways are adjacent to LRT tracks and where bikeways cross LRT tracks. | Bicyclists adjacent to the LRT would be separated by a vertical barrier and would not experience travel time delay. The BLTS analysis was updated in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS to reflect the travel times for those who would cross the tracks, based on the updated Traffic Operations Technical Report provided in Appendix A-3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-15 -- Inaccurate description about bike facilities being unknown on West Broadway and 21st Ave N (top paragraph). | Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS text has been updated to address this comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-16 -- There are planned bike improvements between 21st and Broadway that should be mentioned (curb protection Emerson and Fremont, and James), and links to Queen Bike Boulevard, planned Northside Greenway and North 2nd Street that are worth mentioning. | Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS has been updated to address this comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-16 -- Penn Ave in chart: Include rerouting of Queen Bike Blvd. | Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS has been updated to address this comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-16 -- Table 3-9; Penn Ave: "Vehicle-free" makes it sound like there were no vehicles in the turn lane; suggest updating terminology. | Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS was updated to address this comment. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-16 -- Table 3-9; Penn Ave: Not sure why eliminating McNair Avenue from intersection is a benefit for bicyclists. Suggest mentioning the new protected bikeway connection from McNair Avenue to Queen Avenue instead. Crossing at Newton Avenue is not clearly a bikeway improvement, since there's no bikeway on Newton Avenue. | Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS was updated to address this comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-16 -- James Avenue in chart: Change text to talk about bikeway improvements, including Northside Greenway routing and connections to North Commons park. | Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS was updated to address this comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-16 -- Lyndale Avenue in chart: Eliminating ped crossing at Dupont Avenue doesn't seem like an improvement. Consider including connections across I-94 and to City's 2nd Ave project. | Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS was updated to address this comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-16 -- Lyndale Avenue in chart: Protected/sidewalk grade bikeway needs to continue through intersection of W Broadway and Lyndale or this could be seen as neutral or negative (putting bicyclists on-street unprotected at a high stress intersection). | The change to bike facilities described in this comment was brought to the Design Resolution Team's attention. Right-of-way is constrained at this location, and design coordination with the City of Minneapolis will continue through Design Resolution Team meetings through advanced design. Refer to Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS for exhibits presenting this location. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-16 -- Plymouth Ave in chart: The crossing to access the station is a designed as a pedestrian crossing, not as a bikeway crossing, so should not be in this chart. Update summary text to reference the addition of a protected sidewalk-grade bikeway on Washington with the proposed project and intersection safety improvements for bicyclists at Plymouth/Washington and 10th/Washington. | Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS was updated to address this comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-16 -- Section 3.3.4 talks about short term bicycle closures and noting detours might not be provided; these will be needed. | Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS has been updated to address this comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-16 -- Detours for short-term and long-term closures must be provided for biking and walking. | Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS has been updated to address this comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-17 -- It says "Several roadways...would undergo modifications as part of the Project, and those are described in detail in Chapter 2." Where in Chapter 2 is this described? | Table 2-5 Roadway Projects in the City of Minneapolis in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS includes additional information on roadway modifications throughout the project. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-18 -- Need to share what forecasted growth rate was assumed for no build analysis. | Traffic forecasts were based on the Met Council regional travel demand model, not growth rates, therefore each street segment can have a slightly different rate of growth. Comparing the existing daily traffic volumes to the 2050 traffic volumes, the average annualized growth rate in Minneapolis is about 0.25% per year. Some individual street segments had much higher growth, but other segments showed a decrease in traffic (i.e. negative growth). |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-19 -- Impacts of Lowry Station-related traffic analysis should also be shared under Minneapolis, not just Robbinsdale. | Text had been added to the City of Minneapolis section indicating Lowry Ave Station straddles both borders and refers to City of Robbinsdale section for discussion of traffic effects in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-20 -- Recommend being clear that reconstruction of West Broadway is from western City boundary to Lyndale, and around intersection of Washington, and then will be coordinated with a reconstruction project to the river. | Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS has been updated to address this comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-20 -- Access from both Thomas Ave and 27th Ave on the north side are eliminated. | The Supplemental Final EIS Chapter 3, Section 3.4 reflects the design for Thomas Ave and 27th Ave access to CR 81 on the north side is closed; Thomas Ave and 27 th Ave on the south side would be restricted to right-in/right-out accesses to CR 81. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-20 -- Sheridan becomes a right in/right out in addition to through access being eliminated. | Comment noted, this is presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.4 of the Supplemental Final EIS. The design of the Sheridan Ave access to CR 81 on the north side is restricted to right-in/right-out. Sheridan Ave access on the south side is closed, with enhanced signing and striping for intersection with 26th Ave. See also Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-20 -- Operational changes at Queen and 24th seem to be about the station location, not to make room for LRT tracks as noted. | Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS has been updated to address this comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-20 -- Recent design concepts shared with city have shown vehicular access remaining at Logan Ave, including the left turn lane from W Broadway to Logan. This should be reflected in SDEIS. | Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS text has been updated to clarify that the left-turn is eliminated from the Logan Ave intersection with W Broadway from the south approach (there are two Logan Ave intersections with W Broadway). |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-20 -- Note access changes to Newton, Morgan, Illion, Knox, Girard, Fremont, Emerson, Dupont, Bryant, Aldrich, Lyndale, and 6th. | The text has been updated in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS to clarify that Westbound left-turns would be eliminated at Knox, Logan, Morgan, Illion. Other access changes are due to the transit mall along N 21st Ave, which is noted elsewhere in the report. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-20 -- Pedestrian and bicycle sections should include a detailed list of access and operational changes similar to Table 3-14. | A table has been added to address this comment in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-20 -- Eastbound I-94 exit ramp to West Broadway should include two lanes generally and no driveway access lane. | The text has been updated to address this comment in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-20 -- Regarding access on 10th Ave - text says "emergency bus access is retained" Will buses be using that street on a daily basis or only for emergencies? | Buses will use the street on a daily basis. The text has been updated in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-20 -- Note access changes to 18th Ave, 16th Ave, 15th Ave, 14th Ave, 12th Ave, 10th Ave, 3rd St, 4th St, 5th St; all east of I-94 | The text has been updated to clarify that left turns eliminated to and from 16th Ave, 14th Ave, 12th Ave from Washington Ave in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Transit mall will affect vehicular travel, excluding emergency vehicles, between 5th St N and Washington Ave. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-20 -- Table 3-15 title needs to be changed to include intersections exceeding and at capacity, per the previous paragraph. | Table 3-15 "Traffic-Related Changes in the City of Minneapolis" in the Supplemental Draft EIS has been updated and is Table 3-39 in the Supplemental Final EIS to reflect this change in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Please note the comment may intend to refer to Table 3-16 "City of Minneapolis Intersections Exceeding Capacity" in the Supplemental Draft EIS which has been updated in the Supplemental Final EIS and to Table 3-40 "City of Minneapolis Intersections at and Exceeding Capacity" per comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-20 -- Table 3-15 does not include all intersections that will be exceeding or at capacity according to following map (Figure 3-5) and information shared with Minneapolis Traffic and Parking staff through bi-weekly meeting series. | Table 3-15 in the Supplemental Draft EIS and Figure 3-5 in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS match and reflect changes. Figure 3-5 "2040 Afternoon Peak Hour Impacts to Intersections" in the Supplemental Draft EIS is Figure 3-9 "2050 Afternoon Peak Hour Impacts to Intersections" in Chapter 3, Section 3.5 of the Supplemental Final EIS does have some overlapping intersections, which do make it difficult to distinguish. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-20 -- Spell out LOD. | Acronyms are spelled out in the first instance of use and included in the Acronym List. LOD (Limits of Disturbance) is spelled out in Chapter 1 of the Supplemental Final EIS and the Abbreviations and Glossy document published with the Supplemental Final EIS and available online at https://metro council.org/Transportation/Projects/Light-Rail-Projects/METRO-Blue-Line-Extension/Environmental/Supplemental-Final-EIS.aspx . |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-20 -- Are parking impacts on West Broadway from Irving to Lyndale, and on connecting streets between 21st Ave and West Broadway included in this analysis? | Parking impacts have been updated to reflect the results of the parking survey conducted in November 2024 in Chapter 3, Section 3.5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-26 -- Table 3-18 does not include loss of parking in North Loop under the viaducts; should be included. | Table 3-43 includes parking impacts in the City of Minneapolis in Chapter 3, Section 3.5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-26 -- Table 3-18 does not include loss of parking on W Broadway between Irving and Washington for reconstruction; should be included. | Table 3-43 in Chapter 3, Section 3.5 of the Supplemental Final EIS presents the parking impacts in the City of Minneapolis and been updated to include W Broadway between Irving Ave to Lyndale Ave. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-26 -- Table 3-18 should include parking loss at the City-owned lot adjacent to Capri theater. | Table 3-43 in Chapter 3, Section 3.5 of the Supplemental Final EIS presents the parking impacts in the City of Minneapolis and been updated to include the adjacent parking lot to Capri Theater. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-27 -- Figure 3-7 does not include 8th and 9th Ave impacts on lots under the viaduct nor the parking loss along West Broadway and any connecting north/south streets between 21st Ave N and West Broadway; all should be shown. | The figure has been updated to address this comment in Chapter 3, Section 3.5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-27 -- Figure 3-7 should show entirety of Minneapolis, including Lowry station in northwest. | The figure has been updated to address this comment in Chapter 3, Section 3.5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-28 -- Figure 3-8 does not include the lot adjacent the Capri theater. Are there no impacts to the off-street parking spaces as part of the BLRT project? | Off-street parking impacts, including Capri Theater, for the City of Minneapolis are presented in Table 3-34 "Parking Impacts in the City of Minneapolis" in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS and presented in Figure 3-12 "Off -Street Parking Impacts in the City of Minneapolis" in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Additional details at this location are shown in the Conceptual Engineering Plans presented in Appendix A-E of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-28 -- Figure 3-8 should show Broadway Flats and City-owned parcels. | The figure has been updated to address this comment in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 3-29 -- Parking inventory and utilization studies have been completed. When will this information be made available to the public either through the environmental documentation or another venue? | The results of the parking utilization study, completed in November 2024, are summarized in Chapter 3, Section 3.5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The project should preserve the ability to remove the North Loop 3rd/4th Street viaducts, embankments, and ramps off I-94 into downtown, without the City being held financially responsible to move LRT infrastructure and traction power substations in the future. | Project will continue to coordinate with the City of Minneapolis through final design and construction in an effort to not preclude future changes to the viaduct. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | During construction, the project should develop a parking mitigation plan for neighborhoods, as well as dedicated off-street parking for construction crews to lessen the construction impacts on local residents and businesses. | The Construction Mitigation Plan will be developed as the Project advances to final design. Contractors, subcontractors and personnel will be required to park personal vehicles in dedicated off-street parking within areas controlled by the Contractor. Mitigation for construction related parking will identify city and county owned property or property acquired by the Project for construction crew parking. Additionally, the Project will, if additional parking during construction is warranted, develop agreements for daytime weekday leases of parking lots with capacity in the Project vicinity to provide construction crew parking or customer parking to minimize impacts on local residents and businesses. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Consider additional traffic and pedestrian safety measures along Washington Ave in the North Loop for better last-mile connections to the proposed Plymouth Ave Station, including a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon and a pedestrian refuge at the intersection with 7th Ave. | The Plymouth Ave Station includes two modified traffic signals at Plymouth Ave and 10th Ave, providing safe and controlled crossing opportunities for non-motorized users. Design of Oak Lake Ave/7th Ave N intersection is near the 7th St signalized intersection, which also provides a safe and controlled crossing, however, the Project does not have any proposed improvements at Washington Ave and 7th Ave |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Train crossing gates are proposed at Theodore Wirth Parkway, the project office should share the average traffic delays and anticipated number of daily gate closures. | The Traffic Operations Technical Report in Appendix A-3 of the Supplemental Final EIS, includes delay information at Theodore Wirth Pkwy and Lowry Ave. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | There is no Traffic Operations Technical memorandum for Minneapolis between Lowry Ave Station and I-94 - please provide a traffic operations technical memorandum for this area. | The Traffic Operations Technical Report s has been updated to reflect the current project and can be found in Appendix A-3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The City of Minneapolis applies a negative annual vehicle volume growth rate for traffic models in order to meet they City's Transportation Action Plan goal of reducing vehicle miles traveled by 1.8% per year. https://go.minneapolismn.gov/minneapolis-streets-2030 See Street Operations Action 3.1: Plan and design for zero or decreasing motor vehicle trip growth https://go.minneapolismn.gov/final-plan/street-operations/strategy-3 The City encourages the Blue Line Extension traffic team to apply a negative annual vehicle volume growth rate approach in its traffic model, and focus models on people throughput instead of vehicle throughput. | Forecast traffic volumes for the entire Project corridor were based on the Met Council's regional travel demand model. City's policies are not a basis for traffic forecasting and arbitrarily reducing forecast traffic volumes would potentially underestimate the traffic impacts of the BLE project. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Provide signal justification reports for all existing and proposed signalized intersections in the project area. | Traffic forecast assumptions are included in the updated The Traffic Operations Technical Report found in Appendix A-3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Additional analysis will be completed during future design phases. Signal justification reports are part of final design by the Engineering Design Team. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Total number of crossings across Broadway under no build and under proposed alignment needs to be clearly stated. | The updated analysis includes crossing locations and change in travel times are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | 3.2.5.2 narrative: In Minneapolis, pedestrian detours must always be provided, short or long term. | The text has been updated to reflect this comment in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Figure A3-7: Still are showing old routes; please update with the one route in Minneapolis currently being considered. | The Project Alignment and design options are now only discussed in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS in relation to the alternatives development process. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Table A3-11: Update to reflect not multiple options of alignment but the one proposed. | The Project Alignment and design options are now only discussed in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS in relation to the alternatives development process. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Table A3-14: Update to reflect not multiple options of alignment but the one proposed. | The Project Alignment and design options are now only discussed in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS in relation to the alternatives development process. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | 3.3.5.2 - Need to provide bicycle detours (short and long term) in Minneapolis per our Complete Streets Policy. | The text has been updated to reflect this comment in Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Figure A3-8: Eliminate the Lyndale Ave option from the map; this is not being pursued. | The Project Alignment and design options are now only discussed in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS in relation to the alternatives development process. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Table A3-23: Reflect City comments 12-124 in Chapter 3 on access changes. | Access changes are documented for the Project in Chapter 3. Table A3-23 has been removed, and Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS has been updated to discuss the alternative development process. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Narrative and Table A3-23: there is only one alignment in Minneapolis; update to reflect current proposed project. | Thank you for your comment. Table A3-23 in Appendix Chapter 3: Transportation in the Supplemental Draft EIS presented “Vehicle Access Improvements Shared by All City of Minneapolis Alignment Options.” Chapter 3, Section 3.4 of the Supplemental Final EIS presents the impacts of the Project for one alignment in the City of Minneapolis, and this is the Build Alternative. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Note access and neighborhood traffic circulation changes in East of I-94 alignment options. | Access and traffic circulation changes east of I-94 are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.4 of the Supplemental Final Draft EIS. Previously evaluated alignments and design options are presented in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Refer to Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS for exhibits of proposed changes to the roadway network. The Project includes additional connectivity improvements resulting from the City’s requests during the Municipal Consent process to address vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation impacts related to the Project. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | N 21st Ave options - all motor vehicle traffic is proposed to be removed from 21st Ave N. | Comment noted, all motor vehicle traffic is to be removed from N 21st Ave between Irving Ave N and 4th St N in the Build Alternative which is illustrated in the Conceptual Engineering Drawings presented in Appendix A-E of the Supplemental Final EIS.” |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | For SFEIS, update traffic analysis and mitigations options proposed in biweekly BPO-City Traffic IRT meetings. | Traffic analysis has been updated for the current Project and includes mitigation options proposed in BPO-City Traffic IRT meetings. See the Traffic Operations Technical Report in Appendix A-3 in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Narrative and Table A3-24: there is only one proposed alignment in Minneapolis; update to reflect current proposed project. | Thank you for your comment. Table A3-24 in Appendix Chapter 3: Transportation in the Supplemental Draft EIS presented “Vehicle Access Impacts Included in the East of I-94/W Broadway Ave Options: City of Minneapolis.” Chapter 3, Section 3.4 of the Supplemental Final EIS presents the impacts of the Project for one alignment in Minneapolis, and this is the Build Alternative. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Table A3-29 - Eliminate. Not an option being considered. | The Project Alignment and design options are now only discussed in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS in relation to the alternatives development process. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Section 3.4.5 - Needs to reflect that traffic impacts are not the sole criteria for determining mitigations. Street widening and vehicle capacity expansion run counter to the city's climate goals and transportation action plan goals. Changes to the Olson Memorial Hwy/N 7th St/N 6th Ave intersection should be coordinated with the city's North 7th Street reconstruction project and the MnDOT TH 55 project, which both seek to reduce vehicle capacity. Upgrades to active transportation facilities and bus transit service in this area should also be considered, such as dedicated bus lanes and protected bike facilities, to further the city's mode shift goals. | The Project will continue to coordinate with the City of Minneapolis and MnDOT to consider all modes as design advances in the area of this intersection. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Table A3-32 needs to include all corridors in Minneapolis - not just Broadway - including 21st, 10th, Washington, etc. | The Project Alignment and design options are now only discussed in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS in relation to the alternatives development process. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | City of Minneapolis parking narrative: Eliminate narrative on old options and describe actual impacts of proposed projects. | The Project Alignment and design options are now only discussed in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS in relation to the alternatives development process. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Traffic impacts along the corridor need to be mitigated. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 9. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 9-18 -- Flagging that 21st Ave bridge with vehicle traffic is not yet mutually agreed to with Minneapolis, pending ownership and maintenance decisions. | Two-way vehicular traffic is accommodated on the N 21st Ave Vehicular Bridge. Ownership and maintenance agreements will be coordinated with the Project, MnDOT and the City of Minneapolis. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 10-4 -- How does the anticipated reduction in vehicle trips as a result of the project affect the anticipated MVST growth? | Ridership results are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.1, Transit Conditions, of the Supplemental Final EIS. The Council projects the MVST revenues to increase at a rate of 3.0 percent per year from 2023 to 2041 and potential responses to shortfalls are presented in Chapter 10, Section 10.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Parking impacts in Minneapolis need to accurately describe changes to public and private parking (e.g., the anticipated impacts to parking on West Broadway from Irving Avenue North to Lyndale Avenue North and the impacts to parking in the North Loop area under the viaduct as a result of the proposed 8th and 9th Street extensions). Mitigation should consider adopted city parking policies and incorporate transit-oriented design solutions including structured and underground parking. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 9. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis City Council | Regarding vicinity of 10th Ave: Concern about access to and from the Fire Station and how that will impact response times. | The use of 10th Ave N is not prohibited for emergency response vehicles. Coordination will be ongoing with the City of Minneapolis to plan for connectivity. The Project has coordinated with the fire department for use of 10th Ave N as needed for fire trucks in emergency as required and additional routing options for fire department routing is provided with 8th Ave N and 9th Ave N connections. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--------------------------|--|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis City Council | Significant concern about how proposed plans will impact connectivity to the Grand Rounds. The Northside was only recently connected to the Grand Rounds in the same way that other areas of the city are connected. Northside residents deserve the same connection to trails and parks as other more affluent areas of the city. | Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS contains analysis of bike and pedestrian travel times along and across the Grand Rounds to destinations nearby. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis City Council | Regarding vicinity of 10th Ave: Concern about impact to traffic flow in the North Loop, especially on Washington Avenue and 1st Street North and 2nd Street North. A segment of Washington Avenue is set to have a BRT line which could potentially impact traffic flow and could have an impact on general deliveries for businesses and individuals living in the area and there is concern that the proposed light rail alignment will exasperate any congestion, traffic flow and accessibility issues that may occur. | The BLE Traffic Operations Technical Report is included in Appendix A-3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. The Project will continue coordination with METRO H Line BRT planning and design through construction and will continue to coordinate with the City of Minneapolis and property owners on access through construction. Traffic forecasting showed an anticipated increase of less than 500 vehicles per day on Washington Ave and an increase of approximately 1,000 vehicles per day on 2nd Street N due to the BLE project, therefore significant changes in congestion or delay on those streets are not expected. Bus stops were included in the traffic modeling, including the proposed H Line station at Washington Ave and 10th Ave N. The H Line ABRT alignment and travel time were not evaluated for this Project. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis City Council | Regarding vicinity of 10th Ave: Concern from the Twin Cities International School on how this alignment will impact traffic and cause backups with their school buses and parents dropping off and picking up students at the school. They also have concerns about noise, vibration, and the impacts those will have on the students and their ability to focus, concentrate, and learn. | Coordination with the City of Minneapolis and the Twin Cities International School will be ongoing to mitigate impacts to property and ensure connectivity through design and construction. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis City Council | Concern that 10th Avenue is 1 of only 2 roads that currently allow access between the North Loop and the “west loop” (6th Ave is the other). Eliminating vehicular traffic on 10th reduces access to and from the North Loop neighborhood as it connects to the city. | Mitigation to address the removal of vehicular traffic on a portion of 10th Ave N includes connections and improvements on 8th Ave N and 9th Ave N. The Project will continue to coordinate with the City of Minneapolis as design advances through Design Resolution Team coordination. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis City Council | Concern that eliminating vehicular traffic on 10th Avenue North will negatively impact access to and from many residential buildings including: The Redwell, 918 Lots, Basset Creek Lots/Basset Creek Business Center. In addition to access, concern that the proximity to a rail line creates concern regarding noise, vibration and property values for these homeowners and businesses. | Vehicular traffic on 10th Ave N is removed for LRT operations on a portion of 10th Ave N west of 5th St N. Mitigation to increase access and circulation for the residents on 10th Ave N includes roadway connections at 8th Ave N and 9th Ave N. Roadway connections are shown on the Conceptual Engineering Plans presented in Appendix A-E of the Supplemental Final EIS. Refer to Chapter 5, Section 5.6 and 5.7 and the Noise and Vibration Technical Report in Appendix A-5 of the Supplemental Final EIS for updated noise and vibration analysis. Refer to Chapter 4, Section 4.7 for economics analysis for the Build Alternative and Chapter 6 Cumulative Impacts in the Supplemental Final EIS for a presentation of impacts. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis City Council | Concern about future plans for I-94 viaducts and how those potential plans intersect with this project. There is significant concern on how future potential changes to the viaduct combined with the light rail would further add to access/traffic flow concerns throughout the North Loop area. MnDOT and Met Council are urged to coordinate to ensure the best outcomes for the community. | The Council will continue to coordinate with MnDOT and the City of Minneapolis through final design and construction to optimize the Project Alignment and minimize traffic impacts in the North Loop area. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| Government Organizations | Tim | Sandvik | City of Robbinsdale | Engineering/Planning Concerns – The City Council and City staff have continued to engage with residents and the project office to identify concerns, generally. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Recognition that a center-running, at grade line requires space such that alterations to the existing corridor would be detrimental. These include potential loss of access to frontage roads, loss of pedestrian facilities, loss of (water treating) landscaping, parking in commercial areas, and turning lanes. •Potential that the LRT will promote development/redevelopment that is heavily weighted towards high density residential over commercial, and further burden resident property taxes due to a lack commercial/industrial. | The Council will continue to coordinate with the City of Robbinsdale through final design and construction and address the concerns raised by residents. Also, please see response to FRC 7 Property values. |
| Government Organizations | Tim | Sandvik | City of Robbinsdale | Robbinsdale City Council considered several options when discussing a Park and Ride/Transit Station Location. Included in conversation were a parking facility providing additional parking for downtown during transit off-peak hours, the impact of traffic trip generation on local roads (not Hwy 81 or County Road 9), the potential size of the structure (relative to surrounding areas), and the incorporation of relocated (and potentially additional) bus routes/stops. Again, projected daily boardings include (roughly) 2,200 out of 3,500 will be coming from buses. This projection is met with skepticism without further data. During conversation, it was understood that some sites may not be available due to potential redevelopment. Further, Council as acknowledged, several questions remain about the need for a parking/park and ride facility at all (as noted, Council is requesting further information to justify the need for a park and ride). Ultimately, the City Council expressed favor that the project office consider the “US Bank” site (northwest corner of Hwy 81 and 40th Ave N) as the preferred site for any parking structure. | Comment noted. The US Bank site is still identified as the preferred site for the park-and-ride in the City of Robbinsdale. |
| Individuals | Mary | Green | | Highway 81 will be destroyed. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Figure A3-6 should not show the Lyndale or Broadway bridge options. | Figure A3-6 “Pedestrian Environment in the City of Minneapolis” is part of the Supplemental Draft EIS Appendix Chapter 3: Transportation which presented the Project alignment and design options considered before the selection of the Build Alternative. The Build Alternative is presented in Supplemental Final EIS, and the Pedestrian environment is presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Figure A3-6 should show the other station being talked about in Minneapolis - Washington @ Broadway, so we can see potential impacts. This is a more relevant piece to include since, at minimum, the alignment is preserving ability to build this (vs. older alignments that are no longer being considered). | Figure A3-6 “Pedestrian Environment in the City of Minneapolis” is part of the Supplemental Draft EIS Appendix Chapter 3: Transportation which presented the Project alignment and design options considered before the selection of the Build Alternative. The Project now includes a station at W Broadway and Washington Ave in the City of Minneapolis. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Table A3-4 needs to be updated to only reflect alignment being considered. | Table A3-4 “Current and Project Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress at Analyzed Segments” in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.4 of the Supplemental Draft EIS Appendix Chapter 3: Transportation presented the Project alignment and design options considered before the selection of the Build Alternative. The Build Alternative is presented in Supplemental Final EIS, and the Pedestrian environment is presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Table A3-8 needs to be updated to only reflect alignment being considered. | Table A3-8 “Summary of Pedestrian Service Changes at the City of Minneapolis Stations” in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.4 of the Supplemental Draft EIS Appendix Chapter 3: Transportation presented the Project alignment and design options considered before the selection of the Build Alternative. The Build Alternative is presented in Supplemental Final EIS, and the Pedestrian environment is presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Narrative needs to be updated to only reflect alignment being considered. | The alignment and design options have been deleted from the appendix and are now only discussed in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS, which reviews the decision-making process that resulted in recommending the Locally Preferred Alternative identified in the Amended Record of Decision (AROD). |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Narrative talks about options still under consideration; update to reflect project decisions to date. | The alignment and design options have been deleted from the appendix and are now only discussed in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS, which reviews the decision-making process that resulted in recommending the Locally Preferred Alternative identified in the Amended ROD. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Narrative - Update to reflect current project proposed alignment only. | Revised as suggested in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Narrative talks about 'all options in Minneapolis' - refine for project description as is. | Revised as suggested in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Table A3-32 needs to not include all the options, just the one proposed. | The alignment and design options have been deleted from the appendix and are now only discussed in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS, which reviews the decision-making process that resulted in recommending the Locally Preferred Alternative identified in the Amended ROD. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Figure A3-10 - Eliminate Lyndale option and focus only on proposed project. | The alignment and design options have been deleted from the appendix and are now only discussed in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS, which reviews the decision-making process that resulted in recommending the Locally Preferred Alternative identified in the Amended ROD. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Figure A3-11 - Eliminate old options and focus only on proposed project. | Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Final EIS focuses on the Build Alternative. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Washington and West Broadway station should be included in analysis, since one/two stations on 21st, West Broadway and Lyndale Ave N options were all analyzed. | The W Broadway Station has been included and analyzed in the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 3 Transportation – Traffic, Access, and Parking

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The City of Minneapolis supports regional investment in high quality neighborhood-based transit in the West Broadway corridor. We acknowledge the current SDEIS focuses on light rail transit and also recognize that bus rapid transit (BRT) could provide similar benefits to communities and businesses along the corridor if the project office considered alternative modes in the future. | Comment noted. Please see responses to FRC 2 and 5. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 11-3 -- Spell out PLTS. | This acronym is spelled out in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Acronyms are spelled out at first instance beginning with Chapter 1 and included in the Abbreviations and Glossary attachment to this Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Whenever referencing the Lowry Station, it needs to be referred to as both a City of Robbinsdale and a City of Minneapolis station. It is consistently referred to only in the City of Robbinsdale sections, and only shown in Robbinsdale maps, | The Lowry Station is described throughout the document as serving both the City of Robbinsdale and the City of Minneapolis in the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Land Use and Neighborhoods

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------------|---|---|
| Individuals | Danika | Okerstrom | | This will disrupt a peaceful, historical parkway in a quaint neighborhood. | Effects to historic resources have been analyzed in the Supplemental Final EIS, and ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate have been agreed upon in an amended Memorandum of Agreement. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Not provided | Yang | Asian Media Access | 'Eastern model' planning includes mixed use zoning, small businesses, and informal markets. | Thank you for your feedback, comment noted. |
| Individuals | Leo | Brosius | | Improves life for Americans and Immigrants. | Thank you for your feedback. Please see response to FRC 1. |

Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Socioeconomics

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|---|---|
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | West Broadway community, many of whom moved from Rondo after displacement events, do not want this extension, particularly because of the 636 properties that are set to be demolished. | <p>Thank you for your feedback. The Project anticipates a total of 28 relocations in the City of Minneapolis as a result of removing 14 residential buildings, 11 commercial buildings, two institutional buildings, and one undeveloped plot of land. The displacement events that occurred in Rondo impacted hundreds of properties in a time period before the Uniform Act was enacted and set requirements for the acquisition of real property and the relocation of persons displaced by the acquisition of such property.</p> <p>The Project is committed to anti-displacement and community prosperity. Property impacts include partial and full acquisitions. Acquisition of property required for the Project would be in accordance with the Uniform Act (Public Law 91-46), Title 42 United States Code § 4601 (the implementing regulations); FTA’s Circular 5010.1D Grants Management; and Minn. Stat. ch. 117. The objective of the Uniform Act is to provide fair and equitable treatment of people whose real property is acquired or who are displaced in connection with federally funded projects, to ensure that relocation assistance is provided, and to ensure that decent, safe, and sanitary housing is available within the displaced person’s financial means. The Council and Hennepin County and its partners are committed to mitigating the effects of the Project. Please see response to FRC 8, and updated property impacts that are located in in Table 4-14 in Chapter 4 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Acquisition and Relocations by property type (Residential, Commercial, Industrial, Institutional, Park and Recreational, Agricultural, and Undeveloped) are presented for the City of Minneapolis, including the West Broadway community.</p> |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Acquisition and Displacement

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------|------------|-------------|--------------|--|---|
| Individuals | Damian | Palacios | | Gentrification concerns are being used to stymie all possible development that could make the neighborhood better. Work needs to be done to make sure that new development does not displace current residents. | Thank you for your feedback. The Council, Hennepin County, and its partners are committed to mitigating against both direct and indirect displacements caused by the Project. While the Project is likely to induce development in surrounding communities, work is being done by the ACPP, the Council, Hennepin County, and its partners to ensure that the benefits of said development go to current Project corridor communities, and that Project corridor communities are not displaced. For more information, please see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | Craig | Whitcher | | I have strong concerns about this park area turning into a homeless encampment if vagrants are forced out of the downtown. | Thank you for your feedback. The Project does not anticipate impacts to unhoused individuals and will continue to monitor the presence of unhoused individuals in the Project area. See Chapter 4, Section 4.3 in of the Supplemental Final EIS for additional details. |
| Individuals | lee | guekguezian | | Displacement of Businesses and Residents: labeled in terms of “acquisitions,” but I think it could be helpful to know how many actual residents are being displaced. | <p>Thank you for your feedback. The Council and Hennepin County and its partners are committed to mitigating the impacts of the Project. Please see response to FRC 8.</p> <p>Not all property acquisitions would result in building removal. The Project anticipates 48 full parcel acquisitions in the City of Minneapolis, of which 28 buildings will be removed including 14 residential buildings and 11 commercial buildings, two institutional buildings will also be removed. The 2020 generalized land use data from the Metropolitan Council indicates that the one undeveloped property relocation/acquisition is classified as undeveloped. However, the parcel contains a residential house, suggesting that this may be an error in the data. Property impacts in the City of Minneapolis are presented in Table 4-14 in Chapter 4 of the Supplemental Final EIS.</p> |
| Individuals | Molly | Schlieff | | My biggest concern is that North Minneapolis is already in a struggling economic state and shutting down local businesses is going to have major impacts. | Thank you for your feedback. The Council, Hennepin County, and its partners are committed to mitigating the impacts of the Project. Mitigation measures to Project corridor businesses, including those in North Minneapolis, include relocation assistance to displaced businesses, business support during construction, public realm improvements, community investment, and workforce development programs which would lower impacts to nearby businesses. In addition to Project efforts the ACPP works in parallel to advance community prosperity and minimize displacement. Additional information about the ACPP can be found online at https://yourblueline.org/acpp-board . See Chapter 9 of the Supplemental Final EIS for additional details about engagement and outreach in North Minneapolis. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | Brandon | Detvongsa | | I am also nervous about the real-life impacts of the community here today. The question of whether or not our community will be displaced, will our community be safe from crime and traffic, and will the community be recognizable to the one we love. For us, what will the point be if our community is displaced and cannot enjoy the opportunities that might come from this extension | Thank you for your feedback. The Council, Hennepin County, and its partners are committed to mitigating the impacts of the Project. Mitigation to Project impacts relevant to the concerns mentioned in your comment include cultural placekeeping as a part of Project design, continued implementation of the Metro Transit Safety and Security Action Plan, and traffic engineering as a part of Project design. For more information on these topics, see Chapters 3 and 4 in the Supplemental Final EIS. Please also see response to FRC 8. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Acquisition and Displacement

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Organizations and Businesses | Justen | Pohl | Enticing Entertainment | We previously operated in the North Loop area but were forced to relocate due to extensive development that displaced our operations. We fear that the implementation of the Blue Line light rail will once again jeopardize our ability to function effectively. | Thank you for your feedback. The Council, Hennepin County, and its partners are committed to mitigating both direct and indirect displacement as a result of the Project. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | Genell | Renshaw | | It is misleading that the EIS shows that it will acquire people's yards and state that that is not an act of displacement, where in actuality they will likely have to acquire the whole lot. | Thank you for your feedback. The Council and Hennepin County and its partners are committed to mitigating the effects of the Project. The majority of permanent acquisitions for the Project are partial impacts that would require a portion of the parcel. As design advances, the Project will continue to refine property impacts along the Project Alignment considering modifications or adjustments to avoid property acquisitions. Additionally, the Council would work with property owners to retain ownership of partially impacted parcels. Compensation would be provided to property owners for all acquisitions mandated by federal law, the Uniform Act. Please see Chapter 4, Section 4.3 in the Supplemental Final EIS for more information. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Dr Tara | Watson | | We are concerned about Hennepin County and Met Council's plan to acquire 34 buildings (of which 27 are occupied) and to take 303 additional properties throughout the entire 13.4-mile route. This -would displace valuable members that make up the Cultural/business corridor of the Northside. | Thank you for your feedback. The Council, Hennepin County, and its partners are committed to mitigating the impacts of the Project. The Project will mitigate direct displacements through avoidance, and where avoidance is not possible, the Uniform Act. Community members displaced by the Project will be able to choose where to relocate, including within their communities. The Project has developed a series of mitigation strategies along the Project corridor to reduce impacts to corridor residents, businesses, and stakeholders, which are presented in the Supplemental Final EIS and the Draft Amended Record of Decision (ROD). Additional mitigation for both direct and indirect displacements are currently under development as a part of the work of the ACPP. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Kristel | Porter | West Broadway Business Association | We are concerned about Hennepin County and Met Council's plan to acquire 34 buildings (of which 27 are occupied) and to take 303 additional properties throughout the entire 13.4-mile route. Community members are feverishly working, down to the final hour, to figure out how to acquire funds to support an anti-displacement plan and to implement it. If this project gets support by our city before there are concrete promises made to the community by the Met Council and Hennepin County, and before adequate financial resources are acquired to prevent displacement, we will end up losing very valuable members of our community that make up the cultural beauty of the Northside | Thank you for your feedback. The Council, Hennepin County, and its partners are committed to mitigating the impacts of the Project. The Project will mitigate direct displacements through avoidance, and where avoidance is not possible, the Uniform Act. Community members displaced by the Project will be able to choose where to relocate, including within their communities. For more details about property acquisitions, please see Chapter 4, Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Business canvassing efforts and outreach to the properties that would be impacted has been conducted. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Kristel | Porter | West Broadway Business Association | The existing relocation assistance plan does not replace generations of community building. | Thank you for your feedback. The Council, Hennepin County, and its partners are committed to mitigating the impacts of the Project. Alongside anti-displacement programs under development by the Project and ACPP, cultural placekeeping will be conducted on built elements of the Project to reflect the many communities in the Project corridor. For more information on cultural placekeeping and cultural placekeeping design groups, please see Chapter 4, Section 4.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Additionally, please see response to FRC 8. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Acquisition and Displacement

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|---|--|--|
| Organizations and Businesses | Warren | McLean | Northside Economic Opportunity Network | There should be 250 million dollars put aside for a business disruption fund. | Thank you for your feedback. The Council, Hennepin County, and its partners are committed to mitigating the impacts of the Project. The Council has engaged with potentially affected business owners on impacts through surveys, door knocking, and meetings. General concerns from business owners are how a loss of parking spaces (on- or off-street) would negatively impact their business by making it more difficult for customers to access their business by car. Where off-street parking spaces would be lost but buildings and businesses remain, the Council plans to compensate business owners for the loss of off-street parking spaces. The Council would compensate property owners through the property acquisition process, consistent with state and federal law, which includes the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (Uniform Act). Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | Bill | English | North Job Creation Team | The Blue Line will provide transport to high paying jobs, but the businesses on Broadway and Plymouth need to be protected and provided resources. | Thank you for your feedback. The Council, Hennepin County, and its partners are committed to mitigating the impacts of the Project. The Council has engaged with potentially affected business owners on impacts through surveys, door knocking, and meetings. General concerns from business owners are how a loss of parking spaces (on- or off-street) would negatively impact their business by making it more difficult for customers to access their business by car. Where off-street parking spaces would be lost but buildings and businesses remain, the Council plans to compensate business owners for the loss of off-street parking spaces. The Council would compensate property owners through the property acquisition process, consistent with state and federal law, which includes the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (Uniform Act). Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | Candy | Bakon | | Thank you for listening to the anti-displacement committee | Thank you for your feedback. The Council, Hennepin County, and its partners are committed to mitigating the effects of the Project. |
| Individuals | Richie | Song | | The blue line extension is a feat of environmental justice. Relocation fees should be comprehensive, and people should be ensured they have a place to be before they get relocated. | Thank you for your feedback. The Council, Hennepin County, and its partners are committed to mitigating the impacts of the Project. Relocations and property acquisitions will follow the processes and requirements outlined in the Uniform Act. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | Northside Residents Redevelopment Council | Despite potential benefits of the Blue line extension, the project has the capacity to exacerbate displacement in the Near North and Willard Hay neighborhoods | Thank you for your feedback. The Council, Hennepin County, and its partners are committed to mitigating the impacts of the Project. The Project and ACP Board are developing strategies to mitigate indirect displacement impacts through anti-displacement measures. For more information about Project commitments, please see Chapter 4 of the Supplemental Final EIS and response to FRC 8. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | African Career & Educational Resources | Existing BIPOC business owners face difficult challenges securing an up to code, affordable, or stable lease. Without tenant ownership, the Blue Line project, particularly the increase in rents it is likely to bring, will further the instability these businesses face in securing an adequate and affordable space to operate. This will have profound repercussions on the quality of life of the business owners, as well as their families and communities. | Thank you for your feedback. The Council, Hennepin County, and its partners are committed to mitigating the impacts of the Project. The Project and ACP Board are developing strategies to mitigate indirect displacement impacts through anti-displacement measures. For more information about Project commitments, please see Chapter 4 of the Supplemental Final EIS and response to FRC 8. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 4-1 Would like to see the phrase "displacement and/or disconnection" included in line 2 column 3. | Thank you for your feedback. This language was added within the Community Character section of Supplemental Final EIS Chapter 4. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Acquisition and Displacement

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 4-22 The suggestion that there are no Park and Recreational parcel impacts is functionally incorrect. Even if the highway easement can be used for transit purposes, a park agency is still the underlying land owner and that land would be impacted. Furthermore, additional acquisition maybe necessary to create NEW parkland on which the Parkway will exist. We believe this chart needs to be modified to show some park and recreation data. See main letter for additional information. | This language is describing permanent impacts based on current level of design. Additional information about 4(f) properties and parkland is in Chapter 8 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | On May 3, 2024, FHWA published final revisions to the U.S. Department of Transportation’s implementing rule on the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (Uniform Relocation Act). To comply with the final rule, real property acquisition phases begun on or after June 3, 2024, should ensure that planning documents and recipient policies and procedures related to the acquisition of real property or the displacement of persons are updated to reflect the provisions found in the final rule. Indicate that the proposed Project will follow the most recent update of this Act. | Comment noted. The Project will comply with most recent update to the Uniform Relocation Act and reference has been incorporated into Chapter 4, Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | Create one chart with proposed commercial and residential parcel acquisitions (partial and full) and relocations, as well as lost parking spaces for each community, so reviewers can easily review these effects of the proposed Project (see chart at the beginning of this section). | Thank you for your feedback. Commercial and residential parcel acquisitions are detailed in Chapter 4, Section 4.3 and a parking loss study was done and information can be found in Chapter 3 Section 3.4 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | Patrick B. | Steinhoff | Malkerson Gunn Martin LLP | The 1962 Highway Easement, conveyed for “highway purposes,” may not be used as a transit line without an amendment of the easement instrument or a condemnation of additional easement rights by the transit authority. | The highway easement is a transportation easement and is not mode exclusive. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 4-22 -- Table 4-13 Acquisitions and Relocations Required for the City of Minneapolis. 27 relocations are identified as part of the 26 required full parcel acquisitions. The City recommends that the Project Office continues to collaborate with the City and Project Partners to identify opportunities for replacement properties in the city and along the project corridor. With all impacted tenants identified within EJ communities, a concerted effort is needed to ensure long-term tenancy of these tenants in their desired replacement properties. | The Council has committed to measures to mitigate the potential for direct and indirect effects of the Project related to displacement. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | City of Minneapolis staff have reviewed sections related to MPRB property. We have not identified major issues but defer to MPRB for determinations related to MPRB property. | Comment noted. Thank you for your feedback. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-13 -- Cumulative and individual acquisition impacts should seek to be lessened, not only cumulative. | Thank you for your feedback. The Council, Hennepin County, and its partners are committed to mitigating the impacts of the Project. The Project team will continue to coordinate with city to reduce impacts as design advances. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Acquisition and Displacement

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 7-50 -- Indirect and cumulative. While the City agrees with the determination in the draft that the adverse effects of indirect displacement of residents and businesses warrant mitigation commitments, the realm of mitigation commitments should range in beneficiaries that includes direct supports to individuals, businesses, and neighborhood/community level supports AND in investments in public betterments and site improvements on properties such as production of affordable housing units; construction of a supply of commercial-retail spaces; transit-oriented development; and supports for pre-development work. | The Council has committed to measures to mitigate the potential for direct and indirect effects of the Project related to displacement. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 8-1 -- Section 8.1 should include a brief outline of the terms in the table: "direct use" etc. | In the Supplemental Draft EIS, the Section 4(f) uses are described in Appendix A-8 which is referenced at the bottom of Table 8-2. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Continue to work with City and Project Partners to coordinate opportunities for potential replacement properties in the city and along the project corridor in advance of the amendment to the Record of Decision. | The Council supported the development of the Coordinated Action Plan for Anti-Displacement for the Blue Line Corridor and identified "Project actions" during the time between Supplemental Draft EIS and the Supplemental Final EIS. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | In Minneapolis there are 34 building acquisitions proposed, resulting in 27 relocations, identified as part of required acquisitions needed for the Project. Additional work is needed as part of mitigation commitments to support impacts from these takings, as well as construction-related and long-term impacts from the Project via the Supplemental Final Environmental Impact Statement (SFEIS) and Hennepin County-led work group on the development and implementation of corridor-wide anti-displacement strategies. | The Council has committed to measures to mitigate the potential for direct and indirect effects of the Project related to displacement. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | While the Project Office is required to adhere to federal law regarding the displacement and relocation process for impacted residents and businesses related to Project-related impacts, additional anti-displacement commitments that are needed include these desired outcomes from the May 2023 Anti-Displacement Work Group Recommendations Report: Direct housing cost assistance for low-income renters and homeowners; Increased resources for down payment assistance, shared equity models, and ownership opportunities; incentives and other mechanisms for the creation of affordable ownership units; Basic operating subsidies to small businesses; dedicated pool of attorneys to advise and represent business owners about their leases or other real estate option needs; Dedicated service providers for direct marketing support; Real-time advance notice of construction plans for residents and businesses (street & sidewalk closures, utility shut offs, etc.); Plan and resources to incorporate arts and culture in and around station areas that is representative of cultural importance in the area. | The Council has committed to measures to mitigate the potential for direct and indirect effects of the Project related to displacement. The Project is working closely with the ACPP consisting of community members, philanthropic representatives, and government representatives to identify strategies to minimize displacement and to support equitable development and community wealth building. Alongside the work of the ACPP, the Project is committing to mitigation measures outlined in chapter 4. Please see response to FRC 8. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Acquisition and Displacement

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--------------------------|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis City Council | Concern about how displacement funds will be directed to those in the most need, particularly those along 21st. Will affected people be given enough compensation to purchase another home in their neighborhood should they wish to stay? | <p>The Council has committed to measures to mitigate the potential for direct and indirect effects of the Project related to displacement. Loss of private residential property will be mitigated by payment of fair-market compensation and provision of relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Act. For residential displacements, the following will be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Relocation advisory services to displaced tenants and owner occupants ■ Minimum 90 days written notice to vacate prior to requiring possession ■ Reimbursement for moving expenses ■ Payments for the added cost of renting or purchasing comparable replacement housing <p>Please see response to FRC 8 for more information.</p> |
| Government Organizations | Hollies | Winston | Brooklyn Park | The SDEIS makes it clear that the project will have a greater impact on Environmental Justice communities than the population as a whole. Given that context, it is especially important that strategies for ensuring shared benefit are a core commitment of the project. The SDEIS documents the recommendations of the Anti-Displacement Working Group, indicating that additional work is necessary to refine the working group recommendations into mitigation measures for inclusion in the forthcoming Supplemental Final EIS (Section 7.4.2.6, Indirect and Cumulative Effects). While ideally this work would be complete and mitigation measures proposed in this SDEIS document, we look forward to working with Metro Transit, Hennepin County, the other corridor cities, and the Anti-Displacement Community Prosperity Board to ensure that the project makes a strong commitment to these strategies. | <p>Comment noted. The Council has committed to measures to mitigate the potential for direct and indirect effects of the Project related to displacement. The Supplemental Final EIS includes mitigation commitments by the Project. The Project team has worked with the city partners and community during the development of these mitigation commitments and will continue working with the city partners during the mitigation implementation phase.</p> |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Community Character

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------|------------|-------------|--------------|---|--|
| Individuals | Randy | Voelker | | Transit oriented development prospects are not guaranteed. | Thank you for your feedback. Transit-Oriented Development was based on Hennepin County Economic Development studies. These can be found here: https://www.hennepin.us/economic-development/programs/transit-oriented-development . |
| Individuals | Michael | Meehan | | Fabric of Robbinsdale would be forever altered as a result of the proposed eminent domain. | Please see response to FRC 2. Cultural placekeeping and design coordination with the City of Robbinsdale and community participants will inform design to reflect community input. |
| Individuals | Matt | Klopp | | It will lower property values | Thank you for your feedback. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | Cynthia | Baxter | | The proposed Blue Line extension would cut off North Loop, which is just beginning to fulfill its intended purpose of connecting North Minneapolis and Downtown. | Thank you for your feedback. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Belinda | Trombley | | This will break up our community. | Thank you for your feedback. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Richard | Sollberger | | This will destroy communities (like Rondo) | Unlike major highways that can create barriers, impede access to community resources within neighborhoods, and disconnect communities, light rail systems support community cohesion by improving the public realm and creating places where people naturally interact in station areas. Light rail also supports transit-oriented development that seeks to form cohesive neighborhoods offering a high quality of life. The Project would improve access between the neighborhoods to the east and west of I-94 that were largely cut-off from each other when I-94 was constructed. The Project also provides for safe pedestrian and bicycle crossing of the tracks at the roadway intersections along the Project Alignment and on new bridges that would improve connectivity. Also, please see the response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | lee | Guekguezian | | “The project is also anticipated to provide many benefits to connectivity and community character with increased access to reliable transit, new LRT stations, and new adjacent improvements to streets, including sidewalk, bikeway, and intersection improvements.” How was the definition of community character formed? | Methodology for community character is identified in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Susan | Weinberg | | Try to minimize negative environmental impacts to the greatest extent possible. | Thank you for your feedback. The Supplemental Final EIS addresses the potential social, economic and environmental impacts due to the Project and ways to mitigate those impacts. The Project team is in coordination with the regulatory agencies that have jurisdiction over the environmental effects of the Project to get their guidance and validation on ways to minimize and mitigate the impacts. Additionally, environmental assessment outcomes inform design advancement to minimize these impacts. |
| Individuals | David | Dirkers | | Downtown Robbinsdale is going to see increased traffic surrounding a large 500 stall parking garage which does not fit the character of the planned area. (2-20). | Thank you for your feedback. A reduction from 500 to 300 parking spaces is proposed at this park-and-ride based on the coordination with the City of Robbinsdale and updated regional park-and-ride analysis. |
| Individuals | David | Dirkers | | Many of the conclusions about community character, or what is considered a successfully mitigated impact are false, or poorly qualified. | Comment noted. Methodology for community character is identified in Chapter 4.2 |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Community Character

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|--------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Individuals | David | Dirkers | | This project, like other transit projects in the area will fragment and disrupt communities. | Thank you for your feedback. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Bill | English | North Job Creation Team | Consider how communities like Rondo have been broken up because of transit projects. | Thank you for your feedback. Unlike major highways that can create barriers, impede access to community resources within neighborhoods, and disconnect communities, light rail systems support community cohesion by improving the public realm and creating places where people naturally interact in station areas. Light rail also supports transit-oriented development that seeks to form cohesive neighborhoods offering a high quality of life. The Project would improve access between the neighborhoods to the east and west of I-94 that were largely cut-off from each other when I-94 was constructed. The Project also provides for safe pedestrian and bicycle crossing of the tracks at the roadway intersections along the Project Alignment and on new bridges that would improve connectivity. Additionally, please see response to FRC 2. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Not provided | Yang | Asian Media Access | The draft EIS considers individual prosperity more community prosperity. | Thank you for your feedback. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | Blue Line Coalition | Include information on the number of actual residents and businesses displaced, including demographic information as well as localized impacts on community character and cohesion with tailored mitigation strategies. Acknowledge the unique social and economic dynamics of each area, and recognize that the many communities and many cultures of residents along the proposed route are a major asset to be invested in and preserved. | Thank you for your feedback. Acquisitions, relocations, and cultural diversity of the corridor is discussed in Chapter 4, Section 4.3 and Chapter 9, Section 9.1 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 4-4 MPRB's Parks for All Comprehensive Plan, though not strictly a land use plan, should be included here as a jurisdictional guiding document. There are several areas of guidance and alignment in Parks for All, which warrant a broader narrative included in Section 4.1.2. | Thank you for your feedback. The Parks for All Comprehensive Plan has been added to the table in Chapter 4 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 4-7 Include MPRB's Parks for All, because we believe it was consulted. (If it was not consulted, please do so.) | Thank you for your feedback. This was consulted, added a reference in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 4-17, 18 These sections do not include any reference to the addition of a new at grade crossing of the Parkway and Grand Rounds trails being a potential impact on community cohesion. See main letter for additional information. | Thank you for your feedback. Chapter 4, Section 4.2 in the Supplemental Final EIS notes that "Impacts to visual quality and character are characterized as a neutral impact because of the Lowry Ave Station at-grade between the elevated northbound and southbound CR 81 bridges near Wirth/Victory Memorial Pkwy Regional Trail Victory Memorial Pkwy and Theodore Wirth Pkwy, roadway reconfigurations along W Broadway Ave and N 21st Ave (beginning north of the James Ave Station and continuing to the Lyndale Ave Station), and impacts made along 10th Ave N (see Chapter 4, Section 4.5)." The Supplemental Draft EIS was based on earlier level of design. Addition of the gate and potential impact on community cohesion is addressed in Chapter 4 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Community Character

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The SDEIS and future mitigation should provide a more comprehensive and coordinated analysis of the health costs and benefits of the project as done with the Health Impact Assessment (HIA) for the previous alignment in 2013. A HIA is a process for assessing the potential effects of a proposed policy, plan, or project on the health of a population and the distribution of those effects within the population. The overarching goal is to make the health impacts of decisions more explicit and help shape decisions to improve a population’s health. | Early Project planning activities focused on the need to maximize health benefits of the LRT system. Workshops and an advisory committee identified community health concerns and noted that benefits of the LRT would support increased physical activity due to walking to and from stations, lower rates of heart disease and reduced stress due cleaner air and better access to healthy food and essential services, and a decrease in the traffic collision risk. The Build Alternative incorporates the health-related goals of the committee and would provide affordable access to health care facilities, and safe routes for all modes of travel. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 4-14 -- Section 4.2.2.4, third to last sentence has a missing word | Chapter 4 in the Supplemental Final EIS text was revised based on comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 4-14 -- Section 4.2.2.4, second paragraph, first sentence has typo and is incomplete sentence. | Chapter 4 in the Supplemental Final EIS text was revised based on comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 4-18 -- Section 4.2.3.2, Minneapolis section: Construction phase (short-term) impacts should mention businesses. | Thank you for your feedback. Effects to businesses has been added to Chapter 4 in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis City Council | Regarding vicinity of 10th Ave: Concern about how the alignment will negatively impact the Salvation Army. This non-profit organization relies entirely on donations and sales from the thrift store. Salvation Army recently spent millions of dollars doing a renovation of their facility and provides a vital service to the community by running a successful program for people overcoming addiction. | Thank you for your feedback. The project design provides revised property access from 3rd Street N to mitigate access along 10th Avenue N. The nearby station access at Plymouth Avenue will enhance their customer base. Additionally, please see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | Mary | Green | | The project will fragment the community. | Thank you for your feedback. The Council and Hennepin County and its partners are committed to mitigating the effects of the Project Please see response to FRC 8. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Cultural Resources

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Organizations and Businesses | Kristel | Porter | | Regarding the Renaissance Architecture and Historical Investigation regarding Appendix A-4 Archeological and Architectural History Reports. You provided detailed maps for Brooklyn Park & Crystal but failed to provide any detailed maps for North Minneapolis and Robbinsdale. Why is that? | Two reconnaissance architectural history reports were prepared for the Supplemental Draft EIS, one covering Brooklyn Park and Crystal, and one covering Robbinsdale and Minneapolis. The detailed survey results maps for Robbinsdale and Minneapolis were included in the Supplemental Draft EIS Appendix A-4: Archeological and Architectural History Reports pgs. 123-168. |
| Individuals | David | Dirkers | | Relating to Robbinsdale; there are publicly owned parks & recreation areas in which an alternative form of transportation would produce a feasible and prudent alternative to this project & not subject these areas to adverse impacts | Thank you for your feedback. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Linda | Higgins | | Victory Memorial Drive is a unique asset, and it is unacceptable to alter it in the way suggested. | Effects to this resource have been analyzed in the Supplemental Final EIS, and ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate have been agreed upon in an amended Memorandum of Agreement. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | The 4(f) park resource near the Lowry Station area is consistently misnamed in project documentation. Though there are two different parkway “segments” of the Grand Rounds Historic District in this area, the parkland itself is one single park called Wirth/Victory Memorial Parkway Regional Trail. This is the nomenclature MPRB uses, and it follows the Metropolitan Council’s naming of this part of the regional system. | Thank you for your feedback. The Supplemental Final EIS text has been revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | With regard to Wirth/Victory Memorial Parkway Regional Trail and the Grand Rounds Historic District, two 4(f) resources under MPRB’s jurisdiction, the meaning of the 4(f) determination throughout the document is unclear, misleading, and includes multiple discrepancies. The Executive Summary, the entirety of Chapter 8, and portions of Appendix 8 say that a preliminary determination has been made. Table 8-1 notes that 4(f) “mitigation not required; impacts are de minimis.” However, in Section 8.9 of Appendix 8 (not to be confused with Chapter 8), regarding both park resources it is said that “at this time FTA cannot make a preliminary determination...; additional coordination with the Official with Jurisdiction [MPRB] is necessary.” These statements are in direct contradiction and should have been corrected prior to or immediately subsequent to the release of the SDEIS. | The Council acknowledges MPRB’s perspective of the discrepancy in the Supplemental Draft EIS and its appendices. These discrepancies have been corrected in the Supplemental Final EIS after continued coordination with MPRB, FTA and SHPO. The Supplemental Final EIS reflects the determination made through this coordination. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | The SDEIS should consistently discuss the impact of removing the Grand Rounds parkway from MPRB fee title lands, which can then open the doorway for specific mitigation efforts, should the current concept advance. This reality is mentioned on Page 69 of Appendix 8, but nowhere else in the document. The SDEIS needs to address Grand Rounds property jurisdiction as a project impact. | This has been refined in the Supplemental Final EIS. Additionally, the Council has coordinated with SHPO and MPRB and FTA has made their Section 4(f) determination, which is reflected in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page ES-13 The meaning of the 4(f) determination throughout the document is unclear, misleading, and includes multiple discrepancies. The Executive Summary, the entirety of Chapter 8, and portions of Appendix 8 say that a preliminary determination has been made. Other statements in Appendix 8 say that no determination can yet be made because further coordination is necessary. These statements are in direct contradiction and should have been corrected prior to or immediately subsequent to the release of the SDEIS, as requested by MPRB staff. This frustrating and avoidable issue is discussed at length in the main letter. | The Council acknowledges MPRB’s perspective of the discrepancy in the Supplemental Draft EIS and its appendices. These discrepancies have been corrected in the Supplemental Final EIS after continued coordination with MPRB, FTA and SHPO. The Supplemental Final EIS reflects the determination made through this coordination. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Cultural Resources

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 8-1 MPRB requests further clarification on 4(f) determinations. To suggest here that mitigation is not required and that impacts are de minimis at this stage of project design is fundamentally inaccurate. See the main letter for further discussion. | The Council acknowledges MPRB’s perspective of the discrepancy in the Supplemental Draft EIS and its appendices. These discrepancies have been corrected in the Supplemental Final EIS after continued coordination with MPRB, FTA and SHPO. The Supplemental Final EIS reflects the determination made through this coordination. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 8-2 The official name for the park resource to be impacted by the Project is Wirth/Victory Memorial Parkway Regional Trail. MPRB and the Metropolitan Council see parkland on both sides of Lowry Avenue as the same single park unit with this name. Though the segment south of Lowry (Wirth Parkway) and the segment north of Lowry (Victory Memorial Parkway) have very different characters and purposes, they should be collectively described with the accurate name. | Thank you for your feedback. The Supplemental Final EIS text has been revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 8-2 MPRB understands from discussion with project office staff that the FTA has not in fact yet made a de minimis determination for Wirth/Victory Memorial Parkway Regional Trail and Grand Rounds Historic District. If true, an additional column should be added to this table. See main letter for further discussion. | The Council has coordinated with SHPO and MPRB and FTA has made their Section 4(f) determination, which is reflected in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 8-4 Change park name to Wirth/Victory Memorial Parkway Regional Trail. | Thank you for your feedback. The Supplemental Final EIS text has been revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 8-7 MPRB believes it is too early to assume there will be no direct use, versus de minimis use. See main letter for further discussion. | The Council has coordinated with SHPO and MPRB and FTA has made their Section 4(f) determination, which is reflected in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 8-8, 9 Change park name to Wirth/Victory Memorial Parkway Regional Trail. | Thank you for your feedback. The Supplemental Final EIS text has been revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 9-18 Regardless of determinations of use under 4(f) and Section 106, and regardless of existing easement rights, an MPRB construction permit will be required for work within parkland areas. | Comment noted. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 11-3 The description of improvements with the Build Alternative is only true between Penn and James if adequate rail crossings are provided. This should be noted and affirmed in the narrative. See main letter for further discussion. | The rail crossings that were agreed upon by MPRB and FTA have been added to the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | App.8-1 This section references two properties where a "preliminary determination cannot be made without further coordination...." This is referring to Wirth/Victory and Grand Rounds Historic District, which creates extreme confusion because the entirety of Chapter 8 and portions of Appendix 8 say that a preliminary determination has been made. These statements are in direct contradiction and should have been corrected prior to or immediately subsequent to the release of the SDEIS. This frustrating and avoidable issue is discussed at length in the main letter. | The Council acknowledges MPRB’s perspective of the discrepancy in the Supplemental Draft EIS and its appendices. These discrepancies have been corrected in the Supplemental Final EIS after continued coordination with MPRB, FTA and SHPO. The Supplemental Final EIS reflects the determination made through this coordination. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | App.8-2 Change park name to Wirth/Victory Memorial Parkway Regional Trail. | Thank you for your feedback. The Supplemental Final EIS text has been revised as suggested. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Cultural Resources

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | App.8-2,3 Both Wirth/Victory Parkway and the Grand Rounds Historic District are noted as de minimis use, in contradiction to statements elsewhere in this document. Furthermore, MPRB strongly believes there has not yet been enough coordination to make a de minimis determination. See main letter for further discussion. | The Council acknowledges MPRB’s perspective of the discrepancy in the Supplemental Draft EIS and its appendices. These discrepancies have been corrected in the Supplemental Final EIS after continued coordination with MPRB, FTA and SHPO. The Supplemental Final EIS reflects the determination made through this coordination. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | App.8-5 Change park name to Wirth/Victory Memorial Parkway Regional Trail. | Thank you for your feedback. The Supplemental Final EIS text has been revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | App.8-20 Change park name to Wirth/Victory Memorial Parkway Regional Trail. Under the location column, the description of the Wirth Parkway portion is not correct. The southern terminus of Wirth/Victory Memorial Parkway is at Golden Valley Road. South of there, the park resource is called Theodore Wirth Regional Park and the parkway within in that area is not a separate park unit but a park road within Theodore Wirth Park. | Thank you for your feedback. The Supplemental Final EIS text has been revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | App.8-48 Change park name to Wirth/Victory Memorial Parkway Regional Trail. Park areas on either side of Lowry Avenue are not considered separate parks neither by MPRB not by the Metropolitan Council under the Regional Parks Policy Plan. Portions of the property description will need to be rewritten to accurately describe these park resources and their boundaries. | Thank you for your feedback. The Supplemental Final EIS text has been revised as suggested. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | App.8-48 MPRB is currently researching whether it believes Hennepin County an further discussion | Thank you for your feedback. Council will address this comment in a letter response. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | App.8-49 The easement over parkland was taken as an easement for "trunk highway purposes." It may not actually be a general transportation easement. This map should refer to it by its established legal name and not use shorthand that could suggest an inaccuracy in land rights. See main letter for further discussion. | Thank you for your feedback. Council will address this comment in a letter response. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | App.8-50 The statement that "parkways would generally be accessible to the public during construction" feels somewhat disingenuous. It is unlikely that modification and extension of highway bridges over the parkway, rail crossings of the parkway and trails, and construction of a station, with all the attendant equipment moving in the area, will allow passage through this construction site while active. MPRB would like a more honest understanding of park impacts during construction. | The Council has coordinated with SHPO and MPRB and FTA has made their Section 4(f) determination, which is reflected in the Supplemental Final EIS. The Supplemental Final EIS has been updated to include park impacts during construction. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | App.8-50 It is important here to distinguish between ongoing staff coordination (and the design opinions and guidance of staff) and the elected MPRB Commissioners. The second sentence should be revised to read:"...has been discussed with MPRB staff and appears to be, in staff's perspective, a viable concept in comparison to other design options discussed. Further coordination with staff and review by the Board of Commissioners is necessary." See main letter for further discussion. | Thank you for your feedback. The Supplemental Final EIS text has been revised as suggested. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Cultural Resources

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | App.8-50 This paragraph furthers confusion about the 4(f) determination by offering yet another description of the current reality. See main letterform further discussion. | The Council acknowledges MPRB’s perspective of the discrepancy in the Supplemental Draft EIS and its appendices. These discrepancies have been corrected in the Supplemental Final EIS after continued coordination with MPRB, FTA and SHPO. The Supplemental Final EIS reflects the determination made through this coordination. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | App.8-67,68 MPRB appreciates the acknowledgement that a property transaction may be required to maintain MPRB ownership of parkways. In MPRB's perspective, this would be a functional requirement. | Comment noted. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | App.8-67,68 This section does not discuss the impacts of the new at-grade lig impact, mitigation, or avoidance. See the main letter for further discussion. | Effects to historic resources, including the Grand Rounds Historic District, have been analyzed in the Supplemental Final EIS, and ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate have been agreed upon in an amended Memorandum of Agreement. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | App.8-78,79 The 2nd large bullet on page 78 and the 2nd large bullet on page 79 state that FTA cannot make a preliminary determination on two considered MPRB properties. This is a significant and confusing discrepancy within the document. See main letter for further discussion. | The Council acknowledges MPRB’s perspective of the discrepancy in the Supplemental Draft EIS and its appendices. These discrepancies have been corrected in the Supplemental Final EIS after continued coordination with MPRB, FTA and SHPO. The Supplemental Final EIS reflects the determination made through this coordination. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 4-25 through 4-29 -- Section 4.4.2 would benefit from a listing of the APE distances from the alignment and stations in feet. | The APE definition in feet from the alignment and stations are included in the Appendix A-4: Community and Social Analysis Section 4.4 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The Plymouth Masonic Building (HE-MPC-8090) at 1912 Emerson-1025-1035 West Broadway has previously been identified as NRHP eligible in a city study: "A Corridor Through Time" (2001). It is also in the 4(f) chapter. It is not shown on the maps or text on pages 4-25 through 29. | The Plymouth Masonic Building is eligible for the NRHP, however it is not located within the Area of Potential Effects for the Build Alternative, and therefore it is not included in Chapter 4 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The North Branch Library at 1834 Emerson Ave N is a NRHP landmark and is not shown on maps. It is within 200 feet of the alignment. | The Minneapolis Public Library, North Branch is NRHP-listed, however it is not located within the Area of Potential Effects for the Build Alternative, and therefore it is not included in Chapter 4 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 8-1 -- First paragraph, sentence three, should this be 6(f) rather than 4(f) as it relates to conversions? If not there needs to be an explanation of what 6(f) is | Added the following sentence to the Supplemental Final EIS “Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act governs parkland that has received funding from the LWCF and would be converted to a non-public use such as transportation right-of-way.” |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | This chapter has no list or discussion of 6(f) properties. | In the Supplemental Draft EIS Chapter 8, Section 8.4 discussed 6(f) properties which are Becker Park and Victory Memorial Parkway. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | City of Minneapolis staff have reviewed sections related to MPRB property. We have not identified major issues, but defer to MPRB for determinations related to MPRB property in this report and in Appendix 8 | Comment noted. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Cultural Resources

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 8-1 -- Table 8-1 lists Minneapolis Warehouse District as "no use". Is this correct? The project includes substantial changes to the district, such as adding train tracks, re-establishing 8th Ave. | The Project will include roadway reconstruction and sidewalk geometry changes within the limits of the Minneapolis Warehouse District and will temporarily occupy approximately 1 acre. At 8th Ave N and Washington Ave N there are planned traffic mitigations. The train tracks will be adjacent to the limits of the Minneapolis Warehouse District and the construction of 8th Ave N between 5th St N and 3rd St N is outside of the Minneapolis Warehouse District limits. The Council has coordinated with SHPO and FTA has made their Section 4(f) determination, which is reflected in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Plymouth Masonic and North Branch Library are listed in tables but not listed on maps. | The Table and maps in Chapter 8 includes Section 4(f) properties that are within the Area of Potential Effects for the Build Alternative (therefore Plymouth Masonic and North Branch Library are excluded), whereas Appendix 8 included 4(f) properties within a larger study area that was inclusive of all alignments and design options, and this includes Plymouth Masonic and North Branch Library in the property table. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Continue to partner with the City to identify cultural resources in the areas of potential impact and opportunities to minimize and mitigate Build Alternative impacts on those resources. | The Council is committed to continued coordination to minimize and mitigate Build Alternative impacts on cultural resources through consulting parties meetings and the Section 106 process. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | City staff have reviewed the 4(f) and 6(f) chapter and appendix and defer to the MPRB regarding no use, de minimis use, and constructive use determinations related to park properties. | Comment noted. |
| Government Organizations | John | Nelson | United States Department of the Interior | The Department concurs with the Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) preliminary determinations and recommends that coordination continue with all consulting parties and OWJ to ensure that impacts to 4(f) and 6(f) properties are considered along with ensuring that measures to minimize harm are included in project plans and documented in the final environmental document. | Comment noted. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis City Council | Concern that a train crossing would harm the historic nature and charm of the Victory Memorial Parkway which is an important memorial honoring Hennepin County residents who died in WWI. | Effects to the Grand Rounds Historic District, and Victory Memorial Parkway as part of that district, have been analyzed in the Supplemental Final EIS, and ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate have been agreed upon in an amended Memorandum of Agreement. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Economic Effects/Jobs

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| Individuals | Lili | Johnson | | I don't believe it will bring in any new business to my bar and restaurant near Lowry and the Parkway. Quite the contrary- I believe it will send people elsewhere that don't want to deal with the issues involved | Thank you for your feedback. Construction impacts will be mitigated through a Construction Mitigation Plan, Construction Communications Plan, and Construction Phasing Plan. The Council is continuing outreach and as design advances it continues to address parking solutions. Please also see response to FRC 2. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Thomas | Canfield | Salvation Army | The proposed blue line extension project will have a negative impact on our retail store, donation center and warehouse by shutting down traffic on 10th avenue. The retail store is our main source of funding for the rehabilitation center at this location. Construction of the project will also have a severe negative impact for this location | Thank you for your feedback. The project design provides revised property access from 3rd Street to mitigate access changes along 10 th Avenue. The nearby station access at Plymouth Avenue will enhance the customer base. Please also see response to FRC 8. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Rita and Scott | Endres | | Concerned their business might get impacted. | Thank you for your feedback. Construction impacts will be mitigated through a Construction Mitigation Plan, Construction Communications Plan, and Construction Phasing Plan. The Council is continuing outreach and as design advances it continues to address parking solutions for businesses to be impacted by the project. Please also see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | lee | guekguezian | | Recognizing and addressing the specific, localized impacts on individuals and small businesses is crucial. Ignoring these micro-level impacts not only risks exacerbating existing inequalities but also undermines the trust and cooperation of the community, which are essential for the project's long-term success and sustainability. | Thank you for your feedback. Due to increased access to pools of workers and customers, businesses may be able to find employees with skills that better match their job requirements, leading to improved productivity and increased output. Please also see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | Noah | Barton | | LRT has decimated the business corridor along University Ave in St Paul, we don't want to see the same problems along Bottenau Blvd. | Thank you for your feedback. The Council and Hennepin County and its partners are committed to mitigating the effects of the Project. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | Stephen | Wanca | | The blue line extension will help the economic development of the region, particularly to people who need it most. | Thank you for your feedback. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Kristel | Porter | West Broadway Business Association | North Minneapolis has been left out of our city's economy and has lacked support from our representatives to remove incompetent commercial landlords and make commercial space available to local developers that want to serve the needs of our residents for over 50 years. North Minneapolis Residents have been resourcefully operating without having their basic needs or wants met for decades. Now, we are in a time where amazing and thoughtful leaders from our community have been finally given the opportunity to acquire commercial land along West Broadway Avenue, by their own means. Only to find out, after they invested their life savings into the purchase or acquisition of a property and designing a development plan, they can't finance redevelopments on their properties due to funders denying funding, halting funding and even withdrawing funds from their fully baked proposals due to the uncertainty of this proposed BLRT project. | Thank you for your feedback. Please see response to FRC 8 and 9. Business Advisory Committee (BAC) serves as a voice for the business community inclusive of North Minneapolis businesses along W Broadway Ave. The BAC advises the Corridor Management Committee during the planning and implementation phases of the light rail line. Mitigation planning includes business support and is an important mitigation strategy and engagement will continue through final design and construction. Please see Chapter 4 Section 4.6 in the Supplemental Final EIS for more information on business mitigation plans. |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | Discuss efforts to provide training and employment opportunities to community members who reside in the project area. Consider the Pilot Local Initiative, which allows FTA to use geographic, economic, or other hiring preferences. This program allows flexibility to promote equitable employment opportunities and workforce development, particularly for economic or socially disadvantaged workers. | This is an initiative that will be adopted within the existing regulatory framework. This may be a way to spread economic benefits in the local economy as well as offer access to needed workforce. It is noted that this will require additional organizational and planning effort. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Economic Effects/Jobs

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 4-41 -- Economic Effects. Regulatory Context and Methodology. The methodology for determining economic impacts is not adequate and doesn't include an assessment that evaluates the relationship between the build alternative's impact on local economic development and the ability of existing households to maintain tenancy within the project area after the long-term impacts are realized. This analysis should supplement the second category of long-term economic impacts as it relates to operation of the transportation facility with relation to the activity of "increase in desirability of properties, resulting in increased in property values". The project office should re-evaluate the direct effects of the investment of the project, its relationship to increase in property values; and the ability of residents and businesses to continued tenancy within the project area. | It should be pointed out that increases in rental rates has been a nation-wide issue in the last few years across a wide range of properties, regardless of whether or not a property is near a transit station. Section 4.6 Economic Effects does recognize the possibility of the project leading to an increase in property values along the Project Alignment and pricing out/displacing of existing residents and businesses. There is no explicit relationship between an investment project and property prices and the ability of existing residents to remain in their homes. The actual impact of LRT projects is project-specific and can be evaluated only as expected impacts based on experience from other similar projects documented in the literature. Statistical analysis reported in the literature finds that in fact LRT projects increase property values and rental rates (although not always). However, the impacts tend to be highly localized and dissipate at distances of 0.5 to 1 mile from a station (and sometimes even beyond 0.25 miles distance from a station). At the same time, it should be pointed out that the project may offer opportunities for redevelopment of areas around stations with a focus on transit-oriented development (TOD) with affordable housing which could mitigate some of the effects around existing properties. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 4-42 -- Economic Effects. Study Area and Affected Environment. The application of the study area is not consistently applied across topical areas in Section 4.6 Economic Effects. o When looking at the impacts on economic development effects - this is analyzed at the Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington MSA. However, when looking at the effects on tax revenue and appreciation of property values - those impacts are hyper localized within the study area of up to 1 mile within the project alignment. While these effects may lead to a net positive benefit on the regional economic activity - the impacts related to the Build Alternative will be realized by communities within up to 1 mile of the project alignment. Additional discussion should be had on long-term economic impacts on communities within 1 mile of the alignment to alignment. | The application of the study area depends on the type of economic effect. Certain type of effects may be felt more broadly across the MSA/region. For example, during project construction businesses across the MSA may benefit from contracting opportunities related to the LRT project. On the other hand, other effects are more localized. Property value impact is one such example. Generally, studies do not find significant impacts of LRT for properties located further away from stations (beyond about 1 mile). |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 4-45 -- Economic Effects. Broader Economic Impacts. Operating-Phase (Long-Term) Mitigation Measures. This section does not adequately identify mitigations or long-term impacts. | Chapter 4, Section 4.6 of the Supplemental Final EIS does discuss a range of mitigation measures against possible negative impacts of construction and property values/rental rates increases. Other additional measures against negative impacts of construction could include: provide signage indicating affected businesses are open and directing to alternative parking/access; establish alternative access points to buildings where access will be more difficult; as design and construction advance, identify opportunities to reduce property impacts; schedule work with most impacts on access during times of low business activity (e.g., late evening, night, Monday morning), compensation for loss of parking, prepare a schedule and plan for communicating temporary access closures |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Economic Effects/Jobs

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 4-45 -- Economic Effects. Broader Economic Impacts. Design/Construction Phase (short-term) Mitigation Measures. The City would like to see further development of proposed mitigation commitments for construction phase impacts. The mitigation commitments should consider the criteria of beneficiaries that would be most likely to be impacted with consideration of minimize barriers for EJ communities to access these supports. Mitigations should range from direct supports to individuals and businesses, and range in scale of impact such as a city block or broader neighborhood-level investments. | See Chapter 4, Section 4.6 of the Supplemental Final EIS for information on economic effects mitigation commitments including; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction contract measures include requirements for maintaining business access during construction and potentially incentivizing construction contractors based on business owner feedback. Project communications measures include providing community outreach coordinators to act as liaisons between the business community and contractors, and development of a specific construction communication plan that could include “open for business” signs, signage directing to alternative parking and access points, or similar tools to communicate the status of the Project to area businesses, customers, and the public as to what could be affected and when. Parking assistance measures could include temporary and/or permanent improvements to off-street parking adjacent to or near the Project area businesses, other temporary and/or permanent parking improvements in the Project area, and compensation for loss of off-street parking. Business assistance mitigation as part of the project includes marketing and consulting support for local businesses during construction. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 7-41 -- Table 7-9. Review of Potential Adverse Effects by Topic. City staff does not agree with the following draft determinations of potential adverse effects for the following environmental categories: Economic Effects - We believe there is insufficient evaluation of this the environmental category: Economic effects. See comment above regarding Economic effects: methodology; study area and affected environment, and mitigation measures. | The analyses presented in this chapter for the Supplemental Draft EIS were prepared in compliance with Presidential Executive Orders (EO) that have been revoked. <p>EO 14148, <i>Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions</i>, 90 Federal Register 8237 (January 28, 2025) revoked EO 14096, <i>Revitalizing Our Nation’s Commitment to Environmental Justice for All</i> (April 2023).</p> <p>EO 14173, <i>Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity</i>, 90 Federal Register 8633 (January 31, 2025) revoked EO 12898, <i>Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations</i> (February 11, 1994).</p> |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Safety and Security

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|--|---|
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | Dangerous because it is all ground level. | Thank you for providing feedback. Metro Transit is addressing public safety and security on the transit system, please see response to FRC 6. |
| Individuals | Dan | Albertson | | There was a rider using drugs and I was scared last time I was on the train. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Randy | Voelker | | On street LRT Systems crash and accident/fatality prone. | Thank you for providing feedback. Metro Transit is addressing public safety and security on the transit system, please see response to FRC 6. |
| Individuals | Colleen | Meyer | | Light rail is a safety issue because of frequent accidents. | Thank you for providing feedback. Metro Transit is addressing public safety and security on the transit system, please see response to FRC 6. |
| Individuals | Colleen | Meyer | | Light rail harbors crime and drugs. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Colleen | Meyer | | Brooklyn park has already increasing crime levels, this extension would make it worse. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Brandon | Nerburn | | Concerns raised about negatively affected property values, and increased rates of crime, violent or non-violent offenses, as a reason to not support this project are ill founded at best and classist at worst. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Aaron | Lebuhr | | Light rail has safety threats, would like more policing. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. A police substation will be included in the park and ride adjacent to Downtown Robbinsdale Station to replace and enhance the existing facility and Robbinsdale Transit Center. Please see response to FRC 7 for more information. |
| Individuals | Michael | Meehan | | Our light rail is already the least safe in the nation. This might increase crime. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Nancy | Negrette | | This will introduce crime. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Patience | Stellmach | | Project should not move forward until there is a comprehensive safety strategy. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Patience | Stellmach | | I'm also willing to guess that more effort will be put into maintaining the cleanliness and safety of train stops in the suburbs as opposed to those in Minneapolis. | Thank you for providing feedback. Metro Transit is addressing public safety and security on the transit system, please see response to FRC 6. |
| Individuals | Gregory | Dumais | | The light rail in the city is unsafe, consider adding additional security measures. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Rita and Scott | Endres | | We have heard that drug use often happens on the train and at these stations. We are concerned that if this is the case, it may discourage our patients from coming to our clinic. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Barb | Kindle | | Until safety issues are addressed, this should not be made. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Barb | Kindle | | People do not feel safe riding or waiting for the trains in the city. | Thank you for providing feedback. Metro Transit is addressing public safety and security on the transit system, please see response to FRC 6. |
| Individuals | William | Anderl | | The train has killed many more people in the Twin Cities than buses have. | Thank you for providing feedback. Metro Transit is addressing public safety and security on the transit system, please see response to FRC 6. |
| Individuals | Mary | Pattock | | The Met Council is unable to maintain current LRT facilities and provide personal safety to LRT riders. Increasing its workload in these areas will only make things worse. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Safety and Security

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Individuals | Belinda | Trombley | | This will be unsafe, both because it introduces crime, there is already theft in my neighborhood. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | John | Isais Jr. | | It will bring more crime, noise and trash to Brooklyn Park. | Thank you for providing feedback. Metro Transit is addressing public safety and security on the transit system, please see response to FRC 6. |
| Individuals | Kari | Anderson | | Lake and Hiawatha in Minneapolis is unsafe. Safety should be the priority. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Alex | BOYER | | As a disabled Person I have ridden public transportation all my life. I do not feel safe while riding on trains or waiting for trains in Minneapolis. Busses tend to be safer. | Thank you for providing feedback. Metro Transit is addressing public safety and security on the transit system. Please see responses to FRC 5 and FRC 6. |
| Individuals | Maria | Nelson | | While the blue line is positive in theory, I have concerns about increased crime in surrounding areas that the blue line goes to/stops. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Christopher | Thanghe | | Trains are rampant with crime. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Joe | Klohs | | everyone will be able partake in the opportunities that will hopefully come from the project. | Thank you for providing feedback. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | Too much crime on rails. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | James | Holthus | | Existing trains in the metro area do not support ridership and are full of crime. Money would be better spent on addressing these problems. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address public safety and ridership through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7 for information on public safety and FRC 3 for information on ridership. |
| Individuals | Jacob | Mertens | | I fear that the train will bring crime to towns that aren't equipped to deal with it. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Hank | Not provided | | Security in existing train stops and on train routes is poor, and existing trains are unsafe. Crime in the neighborhood is already worsening. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | My only concern is the safety and cleanliness on the rides as there are often bad actors that cause messes everywhere. | Thank you for providing feedback. Metro Transit is addressing public safety and security on the transit system, please see response to FRC 6. |
| Individuals | Nunya | Bisness | | While I am a fan of expanding the public transportation network, I would much rather see money and mind power focused on dealing with the issues around crime and drug use on the light rail and at stops. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Pam | Sayler | | I believe this light rail line will bring additional crime to our area. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | I was initially excited to have this train available for trips to downtown and the airport. However with the reroute through North Mpls, increased crime and condition of the trains, I will no longer be riding this train. | Thank you for providing feedback. Metro Transit is addressing public safety and security on the transit system, please see response to FRC 6. |
| Individuals | Robert | Ellingen | | This project will bring crime and will not create revenue. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | I fear the train will bring more crime, which is already a worsening problem in north end of Brooklyn Park. My family has moved to avoid crime before, and if this line get's implemented we may have to move again. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Chris | Pierce | | I am worried about the safety of having fast moving trains move through town frequently. | Thank you for providing feedback. Metro Transit is addressing public safety and security on the transit system, please see response to FRC 6. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Kristel | Porter | West Broadway Business Association | Include a plan on how Met Council plans to address safety issues throughout their route and how they will provide resources to our city and surrounding cities to address any increase in safety issues. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Safety and Security

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Organizations and Businesses | Kristel | Porter | West Broadway Business Association | We cannot accept this plan until it addresses youth safety concerns. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. This response applies to the general public and youth as it relates to crossings of the LRT. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Kristel | Porter | West Broadway Business Association | Include a crash study along with a safety plan for pedestrians living and patronizing businesses around a dense at-grade light-rail route and how that will translate to North Minneapolis | The Project has been designed to integrate the light rail system into the roadway, sidewalk, and bicycle lane network in such a way that all modes would be accommodated safely. Metro Transit is advancing a number of strategic initiatives to improve public transportation, which are outlined in the Metro Transit Safety & Security Action Plan (see https://www.metrotransit.org/safety-library) and the Metro Transit’s Light Rail Transportation Agency Safety Plan (https://metrocouncil.org/Council-Meetings/Committees/Transportation-Committee/2024/02-26-2024/0226_2024_50-SW-attachment-2-RAIL-ASP.aspx). Also, please see response to FRC 6. |
| Individuals | Ron | Williams | | Crime on trains is a societal problem, not a problem in transit planning. | Comment noted. |
| Individuals | Ron | Williams | | The trains will not bring crime, and will stop for emergency vehicles. | Comment noted. |
| Individuals | Brandon | Detvongsa | | We (Brooklyn Park) want to make sure the investment addresses crimes, whether near or on stations and on the train. We want to make sure that these trains are safe for our community to use when it comes. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Individuals | Ron | Williams | | I do not feel unsafe on the trains even though people use them to do drugs. | Comment noted. |
| Individuals | Ron | Williams | | Engineers have been working to ensure that the train is safe for pedestrians. | Comment noted. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | North Memorial Hospital | This extension will introduce increased activity to a place that is served by The Robbinsdale Police Department and Fourth Precinct of the Minneapolis Police Department, both very busy police forces, as well as the transient Metro Transit police. North is concerned that law enforcement and security resources are robust and not diluted such that response times increase or preventive efforts wane. | Comment noted. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Government Organizations | Adam | Bell | City of Crystal | The SDEIS does not evaluate the impact of the project on public safety in general and local law enforcement agencies in particular. The SDEIS merely lists those agencies and the broad categories or services they provide. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The city is likely to see increased demand for police services based on the known reality of what happens at LRT stations in other jurisdictions. - Even a fully-staffed Metro Transit Police Dept. would frequently be delayed and sometimes totally unavailable, causing the Crystal Police Dept. to be the first responding agency at the Bass Lake Road station. - The SDEIS needs to evaluate the public safety impacts, including the increased demand for services from local first responders. Only then can the impacts on public safety be correctly evaluated. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. A police substation will be included in the park and ride adjacent to Downtown Robbinsdale Station to replace and enhance the existing facility and Robbinsdale Transit Center, which is just a couple stops away from Crystal. Please see response to FRC 7 for more information. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Impacts related to public safety and perceptions of public safety need to be identified and work to coordinate safety-related efforts and/or explicit links to existing Metro Transit public safety efforts need to be documented. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Safety and Security

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | 21st Ave N – Currently primarily a residential street, not a major commercial corridor. Please expand analysis on how to improve perception of public safety near stations and along 21st Ave N, and develop public safety mitigations along 21st Ave N. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Traffic safety is another key determinant of community health and economic opportunities. The project provides opportunities to redesign streets throughout the project area improve or add pedestrian and bicycle facilities, slow vehicle speeds, and provide safety improvements such as 4-to-3 or 4-to-2 roadway conversions to improve safety for all corridor users. In Minneapolis, almost half of the High Injury Streets are located within communities with large concentrations of poverty and a high percentage of residents of color (Racial Equity Framework for Transportation). Across the city, severe crashes occur on relatively few streets, identified as High Injury Streets (Minneapolis Vision Zero Action Plan). These streets include 9% of all streets in Minneapolis but are where 66% of severe and fatal crashes happened from 2017-2021. While only 28% of Minneapolis residents live in TEP census tracts, 43% of severe and fatal crashes occurred in these neighborhoods. With this project, the following High Injury Streets would receive major investment, that would be designed with safety for our most vulnerable users as a top priority: West Broadway from western city limit to Lyndale Avenue North; Washington Avenue North from West Broadway to 10th Avenue North; 7th Street North from Oak Lake Lane to 6th Avenue North. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Your comment has been noted. |
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | There is crime on the light rail. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council plans to address station area safety through multiple avenues. Please see response to FRC 7. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Visual/Aesthetics

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Individuals | Aaron | McMenamy | | I am a homeowner at the intersection of 40th Ave North and I live at the intersection of 40th Ave Bottineau Blvd. in Robbinsdale, the proposed station in the Median of Rte. 81, just South of the intersection with 40th Ave N will introduce sightlines into my backyard, violating my privacy. | Thank you for your feedback. Following the Municipal Consent process, the Downtown Robbinsdale Station location has been changed to north of 40th Ave N and is not anticipated to introduce sightlines into the back yards of properties located on the southeast corner of the 40th Ave N/CR 81 intersection. |
| Individuals | Aaron | McMenamy | | The proposed station at City 81 and 40th Ave N. would ruin existing privacy in my backyard. | Thank you for your feedback. Following the Municipal Consent process, the Downtown Robbinsdale Station location has been changed to north of 40th Ave N and is not anticipated to introduce sightlines into the back yards of properties located on the southeast corner of the 40th Ave N/CR 81 intersection. |
| Individuals | Lili | Johnson | | It will also ruin the aesthetics of the nicest part of Robbinsdale | Thank you for your feedback. This area of the City of Robbinsdale is highly commercial and already functions as a transit corridor. Bottineau Blvd where the project will be located isn't directly viewable from downtown Robbinsdale (W. Broadway Ave.) except at street intersections. |
| Government Organizations | Adam | Bell | City of Crystal | The SDEIS acknowledges that the intersection of Bottineau Blvd. and Bass Lake Road is a location of high visual sensitivity but concludes that the visual impact of the proposed interchange is neutral. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The visualizations in the SDEIS (KVP-07 and KVP-08) directly and obviously contradict this conclusion. - The proposed interchange would be a radical change to the visual landscape due to the bridges being visible from a wide area, including adjacent residential neighborhoods. - The correct conclusion is that the project will create an adverse visual impact in this location. | Reconsidering the impact of the interchange on visual quality and visual character from the specific perspective of very high sensitivity viewers such as nearby residents and Becker Park trail users leads us to modify our conclusion from neutral to adverse. Community input in the design process can help shape the design of the interchange, station and public realm to help mitigate adverse visual impacts. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 4-38 MPRB would request analysis of visual impact associated with one additional KVP, facing north FROM the project area to Victory Memorial Parkway. Though not a view of the trackway and station themselves, this view is one that could be impacted by project activities, namely the re-routing of the Parkway. The southern entrance to Victory Memorial Parkway, part of the Grand Rounds and a designated State Historic District, is inarguably a key viewpoint in the region and should be examined for potential visual impact. | Thank you for your feedback. Visual modeling is typically developed as part of the project design process. Continued MPRB input into the design process can help shape the design of the station, adjacent public realm and re-routed parkways while also utilizing project design modeling to assist them in exploring and evaluating a range of project impacts. |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | The SDEIS indicates construction-phase increased emissions will be mitigated through best management practices (BMPs) Recommendations: b) Chapter 4, Community and Social Analysis, analyzes visual and aesthetic effects of the proposed Project. To the extent feasible, Project facilities would be sited to avoid locations in proximity to residences, parks, or other sensitive visual receptors. However, where avoidance is not feasible, potential efforts to minimize visual intrusions could include screening using landscaping or walls. c) Stations would be designed to be aesthetically attractive and may incorporate landscaping and/or other built features such as walls or fencing to minimize visual intrusion as appropriate. | Thank you for your feedback. The Council has committed to BMPs see Chapter 4, Section 4.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 4 Community and Social Analysis – Visual/Aesthetics

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Public art must be integrated into project design. | Thank you for your feedback. Comment noted. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 4-37 -- Typo in Table 4-16 line KVP17, Capri rather than Capris. | Thank you for your feedback. The Supplemental Final EIS text has been revised based on comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pgs 16, 38, 41, and Table 3 -- Capri Theater rather than Capris. | Thank you for your feedback. The Supplemental Final EIS text has been revised based on comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Section 6.2.1, p 46, cutoff and shielded lighting fixtures are additional lighting mitigation strategies. | Thank you for your feedback. Comment noted. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 90 -- Does not have photo renderings for KPV 16-23 in Minneapolis. | Thank you for your feedback. KVPs 16 through 23 are included in the Visual Quality Technical Report, in Appendix A-4 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Viewsheds of Theodore Wirth Parkway and Victory Memorial Parkway should be analyzed based on the latest at-grade design concept. | Thank you for your feedback. The visual impact assessment for this area (KVP's 13,14) have been reviewed using the at-grade design concept as part of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-22 -- Table 6-4 Visual/aesthetics row, indirect impacts column. City of Minneapolis policy does not require that buildings are built to existing character, but in line with future land use and urban design policies. New larger scale development in station areas is not inherently a visual impact. | Thank you for your feedback. Comment noted. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-22 -- The "cumulative effects" column for visual effects references security needs, not visual effects. | Thank you for your feedback. The Supplemental Final EIS text has been revised to reflect visual effects. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 11-5 -- Include information on visual aesthetics related to TPSS and catenary infrastructure. | Thank you for your feedback. The Supplemental Final EIS text has been revised as suggested. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--|--|
| Individuals | Jeanette | Colby | | When will the long-term benefits of greenhouse gas reductions from the project outweigh the short-term greenhouse gas emissions and energy use? Green line construction does not seem energy efficient. | The long-term benefits of energy reductions from the Project would outweigh the short-term construction emissions within 5 to 10 years. See Chapter 5, Section 5.10 in the Supplemental Draft EIS for more details on Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Chapter 5, Section 5.11 in the Supplemental Draft EIS for more details on Energy impacts. |
| Individuals | Robert | Coleman | | Air quality is only affected by the construction, in fact, the better transit the Blue Line can offer along the corridor, the more ICE cars are taken off the road, and long-term, the air quality is much better. | Comment noted. See Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy in Chapter 5, Section 5.10 and 5.11 of the Supplemental Draft EIS for more details on benefits from the Project. The Project is projected to offset over 39,200 VMT in the year 2045 Build condition. That offset coupled with the adoption of Electric Vehicle (EV) technology and improved fuel efficiency would improve air quality over the long run. For more information, see Chapter 5, Section 5.10 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Robert | Coleman | | These temporary affects are not significant compared to the pollution caused by cars on a daily basis. | Temporary construction activity would have short term and localized air quality implications to adjacent neighborhood, but exceedances of ambient air quality standards are not anticipated. However, the Project is projected to offset over 39,200 Vehicle Miles Traveled in the 2045 build year. That offset coupled with the adoption of EV and improved fuel efficiency would improve air quality over the long run. For more information, see Chapter 5, Section 5.10 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Nick | Heid | | The climate impacts of this project isn't as notable as an all-electric bus fleet. What's the response to that? | The approach for the climate analysis considers how many vehicle miles are displaced because people are projected to drive less. It does evaluate differences between the Project and other forms of transit, i.e., light rail vs. electric bus. An updated Air Quality and energy analysis is presented in Chapter 5, Sections 5.10 and 5.11 respectively of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | John | Bowman | | It helps reduce car emissions and helps some many folks who might own or not own a car | Temporary construction activity would have short term and localized air quality implications to adjacent neighborhood, but exceedances of ambient air quality standards are not anticipated. However, the Project is projected to offset over 39,200 Vehicle Miles Traveled in the 2045 build year. That offset coupled with the adoption of EV and improved fuel efficiency would improve air quality over the long run. For more information, see Chapter 5, Section 5.10 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Also please see response to FRC 1 for more information on Project benefits. |
| Individuals | Stephen | Wanca | | This will help people get around in a climate friendly way. | Comment noted. Please see response to FRC 1 for more information on Project benefits. |
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | I support the light rail, it is good for the environment. | Comment noted. Please see response to FRC 1 for more information on Project benefits. |
| Individuals | Jenny | Lind-Sadow | | Concerns from neighbors include increased CO2 emissions due to longer travel times, worsened traffic and parking, potential harm to small businesses during construction, and doubts about the project's cost-effectiveness. | Comment noted. Please see FRC 2 for general concerns about the Project. Supplemental Final EIS Chapters present updated information on potential impacts and mitigation by individual environmental topic (Chapter 3, Section 3.4 Vehicular Traffic and Section 3.5 Parking; Chapter 4, Section 4.3 Acquisitions and Relocations and Section 4.6 Economic Effects; and Chapter 5.10 Air Quality). |
| Individuals | Richard | Adair | | This line will help with climate change. | Comment noted, please see response to FRC 1 for more information on Project benefits. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|--|--|
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>The SDEIS indicates construction-phase increased emissions will be mitigated through best management practices (BMPs)</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify specific BMPs to reduce construction-phase emissions. 2. Commit to applicable measures from the enclosed Construction Emission Control Checklist. 3. Per Executive Order 13045 on Children’s Health, EPA recommends FTA 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. 4. EPA recommends FTA assess the use of vegetative barriers adjacent to neighborhoods to address the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Even though the proposed project includes electric, rather than diesel-powered engines, particulates from brake wear are one source of traffic-related pollution. EPA research has demonstrated that well-planned vegetative barriers can reduce exposure to air pollution by up to 50 percent, and the combination of a solid fence with vegetation can result in the greatest protection. 5. EPA understands the need for consistency with FTA requirements, including safety requirements, which could be addressed during barrier design. EPA would appreciate the opportunity to discuss the use of vegetation to address the above issues. Please contact Kathy Kowal to connect with EPA scientists specializing in vegetative barriers for air quality benefits. | Comment noted. Recommended mitigation and BMPs have been incorporated into the Supplemental Final EIS where appropriate. |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>Mobile and Stationary Source Diesel Controls</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Purchase or solicit bids that require the use of vehicles equipped with zero-emission technologies or the most advanced emission control systems available. Commit to the best available emissions control technologies for project equipment in order to meet the following standards: 2. On-Highway Vehicles: On-highway vehicles should meet, or exceed, the EPA exhaust emissions standards for model year 2010 and newer heavy-duty, on-highway compression-ignition engines (e.g., long-haul trucks, refuse haulers, shuttle buses, etc.). 3. Non-road Vehicles and Equipment: Non-road vehicles and equipment should meet, or exceed, the EPA Tier 4 exhaust emissions standards for heavy-duty, non-road compression-ignition engines (e.g., construction equipment, non-road trucks, etc.). 4. Locomotives: Locomotives servicing infrastructure sites should meet, or exceed, the EPA Tier 4 exhaust emissions standards for line-haul and switch locomotive engines where possible. 5. Low Emission Equipment Exemptions: The equipment specifications outlined above should be met unless: 1) a piece of specialized equipment is not available for purchase or lease within the United States; or 2) the relevant project contractor has been awarded funds to retrofit existing equipment, or purchase/lease new equipment, but the funds are not yet available. | The light rail system runs on electric power and the Project is expected to reduce the VMT in the year 2045 Build Condition. See Chapter 5, Section 5.10 of the Supplemental Final EIS for more information. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|--|--|
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>Consider requiring the following best practices through the construction contracting or oversight process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish and enforce a clear anti-idling policy for the construction site. 2. Use onsite renewable electricity generation and/or grid-based electricity rather than diesel-powered generators or other equipment. 3. Use electric starting aids such as block heaters with older vehicles to warm the engine. 4. Regularly maintain diesel engines to keep exhaust emissions low. Follow the manufacturer’s recommended maintenance schedule and procedures. Smoke color can signal the need for maintenance (e.g., blue/black smoke indicates that an engine requires servicing or tuning). 5. Where possible, retrofit older-tier or Tier 0 nonroad engines with an exhaust filtration device before they enter the construction site to capture diesel particulate matter. 6. Replace the engines of older vehicles and/or equipment with diesel- or alternatively-fueled engines certified to meet newer, more stringent emissions standards (e.g., plug-in hybrid-electric vehicles, battery-electric vehicles, fuel cell electric vehicles, advanced technology locomotives, etc.), or with zero emissions electric systems. Retire older vehicles, given the significant contribution of vehicle emissions to the poor air quality conditions. Implement programs to encourage the voluntary removal from use and the marketplace of pre-2010 model year on-highway vehicles (e.g., scrappage rebates) and replace them with newer vehicles that meet or exceed the latest EPA exhaust emissions standards, or with zero emissions electric vehicles and/or equipment. | <p>Comment noted. Recommended mitigation and Best Management Practices (BMPs) have been incorporated into the Supplemental Final EIS where appropriate.</p> |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>We recommend FTA consider the following protective measures and commit to applicable measures in the SDEIS.</p> <p>Fugitive Dust Source Controls</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stabilize open storage piles and disturbed areas by covering and/or applying water or chemical/organic dust palliative, where appropriate. This applies to both inactive and active sites, during workdays, weekends, holidays, and windy conditions. 2. Install wind fencing and phase grading operations where appropriate. Operate water trucks for stabilization of surfaces under windy conditions. 3. When hauling material and operating non-earthmoving equipment, prevent spillage and limit speeds to 15 miles per hour (mph). Limit the speed of earth-moving equipment to 10 mph. | <p>Comment noted. Recommended protection measures have been incorporated into the Supplemental Final EIS where appropriate. Contractor requirements will consider the suggested measures to effectively control fugitive dust during construction.</p> |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>We recommend FTA consider the following protective measures and commit to applicable measures in the SDEIS.</p> <p>Occupational Health</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce exposure through work practices and training, such as maintaining filtration devices and training diesel-equipment operators to perform routine inspections. 2. Position the exhaust pipe so that diesel fumes are directed away from the operator and nearby workers, reducing the fume concentration to which personnel are exposed. 3. Use enclosed, climate-controlled cabs that are pressurized and equipped with high-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filters to reduce the operators' exposure to diesel fumes. Pressurization ensures that air moves from inside to outside. HEPA filters ensure that any incoming air is filtered first. 4. Use respirators as an interim measure to control exposure to diesel emissions. In most cases, an N95 respirator is adequate. Workers must be trained and fit-tested before they wear respirators. Depending on the type of work being conducted, and if oil is present, concentrations of particulates present will determine the efficiency and type of mask and respirator. Personnel familiar with the selection, care, and use of respirators must perform the fit testing. Respirators must bear a National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) approval number. | Comment noted. Recommended protection measures have been incorporated into the Supplemental Final EIS where appropriate. |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>We recommend FTA consider the following protective measures and commit to applicable measures in the SDEIS.</p> <p>NEPA Documentation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Per Executive Order 13045 on Children's Health, EPA recommends the lead agency and project proponent 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 in order to be protective of children's health. 2. Specify how impacts to sensitive receptors, such as children, elderly, and the infirm, will be minimized. For example, locate construction equipment and staging zones away from sensitive receptors and fresh air intakes to buildings and air conditioners. | Comment noted. Recommended protection measures have been incorporated into the Supplemental Final EIS where appropriate. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 5-72 -- Add Minneapolis Greenhouse Gases (GHG) reduction goals. | Reduction Goal has been added to Chapter 5, Section 5.10 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 5-77 -- Why would energy use for buses increase in build scenario? Include more information. | The energy analysis has been updated, and results are presented in Chapter 5, Section 5.11 of the Supplemental Final EIS. The energy analysis is based on the Twin Cities Regional Travel Demand Model that incorporated assumptions that the Project would increase the energy usage by buses. This assumption is no longer valid and the text in the EIS and the Twin Cities Regional Travel Demand Model is replaced by the calculation of light duty vehicle offsets provided in Chapter 5, Section 5.11 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | One of the largest impacts of transportation on the environment is greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), which contribute to climate change and results in extreme weather events, as well as localized health impacts. In 2021, on-road transportation accounted for 22 percent of the City's greenhouse gas emissions. These emissions along with other air pollutants has a cumulative effect on human health that can result in serious health problems such as heart attacks, asthma, high blood pressure, lung conditions, and low birth weights. The Blue Line Extension is expected to increase transit ridership and reduce GHG emissions in the communities adjacent to the project. BIPOC households are more likely to lack access to a car in Minneapolis, due in part to differences in income and access to affordable housing options, when compared to white households. According to IPUMS USA, there are over 28,700 households in Minneapolis without a vehicle in 2020. The racial/ethnicity breakdown of this group is 31 percent Black, 8 percent Latino, 5 percent mixed/other, 7 percent Asian or Pacific Islander, and 47 percent white. The Blue Line Extension will improve transit speed and reliability, offering significant benefits for households without access to a vehicle. | Comment noted. Please see response to FRC 1 for more information on Project benefits. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The anticipated traffic safety improvements from project-related street improvements and the anticipated reduction in greenhouse gases and the related benefits from reducing vehicle trips as part of improving transit services will most benefit those communities directly adjacent and nearby the proposed route. Safety and emissions reduction data for the project area would be needed to evaluate benefits and impacts. | The analysis included the ridership and Project VMT reduction and is presented in Chapter 5, Section 5.10 of the Supplemental Final EIS including additional information about expected CO2e reductions resulting from the Project. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis – Biological/T&E

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|--|---|
| Individuals | Nancy | Negrette | | This will damage wildlife. | Project impacts to wildlife for the Build Alternative are summarized in Chapter 5, Section 5.8 and additional details on the study area and methodology and regulations applied in analyzing impacts to wildlife are presented in the Biological Resources Technical Report in Appendix A-5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Potential mitigation activities have been identified for areas where the Project could impact aquatic resources, including BMPs for bank stabilization and reduced sedimentation. |
| Individuals | Lili | Johnson | | This line will displace wildlife in Crystal Lake in Robbinsdale | Project impacts to wildlife for the Build Alternative are summarized in Chapter 5, Section 5.8 of the Supplemental Final EIS and additional details on the study area and methodology and regulations applied in analyzing impacts to wildlife are presented in the Biological Resources Technical Report in Appendix A-5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Potential mitigation activities have been identified for areas where the Project could impact aquatic resources, including BMPs for bank stabilization and reduced sedimentation. |
| Individuals | River | Flom | | Impacting the Northern long-eared bat for example can be mitigated by cutting trees during certain months or ensuring that there are none living in the forest already | Project impacts to wildlife for the Build Alternative are summarized in Chapter 5, Section 5.8.4.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Additional details on the study area and methodology and regulations applied in analyzing impacts to the Northern Long-eared bat are presented in Section 2.2.1.1 Biological Resources Technical Report of the Supplemental Final EIS. Potential mitigation strategies include avoiding hibernacula, monitoring populations, avoiding tree clearing and grubbing. The Project is continuing to coordinate with the USFWS to ensure avoidance, minimization, and if necessary, mitigation of impacts. |
| Individuals | Steve | Wessman | | To keep 81 at current 2 lanes from highway 100 to Lowrey too much green space and sidewalks will be reduced or lost. | Benefits and impacts to pedestrian infrastructure and to parks and recreation areas continue to be refined as design advances. Pedestrian impacts are presented in Chapter 4 (Pedestrian) and Chapter 8 (parks and recreational spaces) of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Mary | Ambrose | | I am alarmed by the potential for environmental damage near Crystal Lake. I don't want to lose the trees on Bottineau Blvd. | Potential impacts to aquatic resources adjacent to the Project would be mitigated by maintaining the current elevations to the maximum extent practicable, restoring the disturbed land with suitable vegetation, and the application of "stabilizing" Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent disturbed land and sediment from washing into the lake. See Chapter 5, Section 5.9 Water Quality and Stormwater in the Supplemental Final EIS for additional discussion. The Council will coordinate replacement trees with local jurisdictions to mitigate for the loss of trees from the Project. Tree surveys will occur during final design to quantify the number and species of trees lost and development of a tree replacement plan. Project impacts to the biological environment are summarized in Chapter 5, Section 5.8 and additional details on the study area and methodology and regulations applied in analyzing impacts to wildlife are presented in the <i>Biological Resources Technical Report</i> in Appendix A-5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis – Biological/T&E

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | There is little to no narrative about impacts to the urban forest. As steward of Minneapolis’s public forest, MPRB would like to see more detailed information on street tree impacts and potential mitigations as the project progresses. | The Project will result in the removal of Individual boulevard trees. The only densely forested area that will be impacted is located at the far northern terminus where there is more natural habitat present. The Council will coordinate replacement trees with local jurisdictions to mitigate for the loss of trees from the Project. Tree surveys will occur during final design to quantify the number and species of trees lost and development of a tree replacement plan. Project impacts to the biological environment are summarized in Chapter 5, Section 5.8 and additional details on the study area and methodology and regulations applied in analyzing impacts to wildlife are presented the <i>Biological Resources Technical Report</i> in Appendix A-5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 5-59 The rusty patched bumblebee (<i>Bombus affinus</i>) is a Federally endangered species that should have been considered within the study area. Interactive maps on the US Fish and Wildlife website show the bee's range overlapping the project area, especially within and near Wirth/Victory Memorial Parkway Regional Trail. If there is some reason the bee has been excluded from analysis, that should be shared in the document. | Although the rusty patched bumblebee range overlaps with the Project, it was not discussed within the Supplemental Draft EIS on the basis that the species list provided by the USFWS through the Information for Planning and Consultation (IPAC) did not include it and no impacts were identified. The IPAC identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, which may occur within the boundary of the proposed Project and may be affected by the proposed Project. The species list fulfills the requirement for obtaining a Technical Assistance Letter from the USFWS section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) and was considered sufficient for the purposes of identification and evaluating impacts to only those species specifically identified in this review. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | Page 5-66 Under several policy documents, MPRB is interested in increasing wildlife habitat within Minneapolis parks. If there are opportunities even beyond the Project's limits of disturbance to increase forest habitat for bats and/or prairie/grassland habitat for butterflies and bees, MPRB would be a willing partner in that effort. | Thank you for your comment, the Council will consider opportunities for increasing wildlife habitat and will continue to engage with the MPRB. |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | The Build Alternative would impact approximately 10 acres of forested habitat suitable for Northern Long-eared Bat and tricolored bats and about 50 acres of meadow/prairie habitat suitable for monarch butterflies. Forested habitat would also be suitable for nesting of various migratory bird species. Mitigation for these effects will be considered, including potential limitations on tree clearing timing to avoid nesting/roosting periods. Recommendations Effects to these species can be minimized by following tree removal limitations provided by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Commit to remove trees during winter months as suggested by USFWS. | Discussion on timing of tree removal for forested habitat is included in the <i>Biological Technical Report</i> in Appendix A-5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis – Biological/T&E

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|--------------|--|--|--|
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | Blanding’s Turtles populations, a state-listed endangered species, should be managed to maintain suitable habitat. Recommendations: 1. Discuss minimization measures with the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MnDNR) (e.g., identify travel corridors, commit to placing silt fencing to prevent turtles from entering construction areas, create flyers with an illustration of a Blanding’s turtle for all contractors working in the area, consider culverts under rail lines between wetland areas or wetland and nesting areas, etc.). 2. Commit to all minimization measures provided by the MnDNR. | Discussions on the avoidance and minimization of impacts to the Blandings Turtle is included in the <i>Biological Technical Report</i> in Appendix A-5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 5-10 -- Table 5-2, Shingle Creek is also in Minneapolis. | Chapter 5 and <i>Water Resources Technical Report</i> in Appendix A-5 in the Supplemental Final EIS have been updated to include City of Minneapolis. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 5-65 -- Hennepin County and MnDOT should be included in the organizations with stormwater requirements. | Supplemental Final EIS content has been amended to include Hennepin County and MnDOT. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 5-76 -- Spell out and describe BMPs in the text the first time this is used. | This acronym is spelled out in Chapter 5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Acronyms are spelled out at first instance beginning with Chapter 1 and included in the Abbreviations and Glossary attachment to this Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Tom | Not provided | | Concerned about destroying trees and other plants. | The Council will coordinate replacement trees with local jurisdictions to mitigate for the loss of trees from the Project. Tree surveys will occur during final design to quantify the number and species of trees lost and development of a tree replacement plan. Project impacts to the biological environment are summarized in Chapter 5, Section 5.8 of the Supplemental Final EIS and additional details on the study area and methodology and regulations applied in analyzing impacts to wildlife are presented Appendix A-5 <i>Biological Resources Technical Report</i> of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis – Hazardous Materials

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| Individuals | Tonya | Strauss | | Another concern is the high risk of contamination along this route. Almost the entire route is marked pink (high risk), and it is filled with residential buildings and businesses. There are also many power lines along this route. Why not move this along a less populated route where noise and contamination risks are far from so many homes and businesses? | The areas identified in the Phase I ESA were suspected areas of contamination based on historical uses or known releases. A Phase II ESA was conducted to confirm or validate the results of the Phase I ESA which significantly decreased the number of areas within the Project with contamination present. The Project presents an opportunity for cleanup and management of the contaminated sites required for the Project which is a benefit for the Project corridor. Avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures of contaminated materials is discussed in Section Chapter 5, Section 5.5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Noise impacts to commercial and residential properties and proposed mitigation measures are discussed in Chapter 5, Section 5.6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | I am highly concerned with the environmental impact that this project will have and the extreme potential to disturb contaminated areas within our cities | Construction impacts and mitigation methods are presented in Chapter 5, Section 5.5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. The Project presents an opportunity for cleanup and management of the contaminated sites required for the Project which is a benefit for the corridor. |
| Individuals | Colin | Smith | | I am hopeful that the construction of the Blue Line Extension will in particular present an opportunity to responsibly identify and mitigate existing environmental concerns along the route (e.g. contaminated soils and other effects of past land use) | Implementation of the Project will result in a beneficial effect of removing pre-existing hazardous and contaminated soils, to meet MPCA risk-based guidance and/or the capping of known contaminated sites related to construction of the Project. See Section 5.5.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Natasha | Villanueva | | It appears from the contamination risk map that we are at medium risk. What does this mean for me and my family? How will we be protected? How will contamination be mitigated? Since the Northside has historically been a target of environmental racism, how are we ensuring this project creates a new precedent for responsive care of community health | Medium risk sites from the Modified Phase I ESA identified the potential for hazardous materials within a 500 feet buffer from the track lines based on earlier use of the area or any reported spills and leaks. The Phase II ESA quantitatively identified contaminants compared to regulatory limits to soil and groundwater. The Council will comply with state and federal regulation regarding the handling, transporting, and disposing of contaminated materials identified from the Phase II ESA and require Project contractors to follow the Response Action Plan (RAP). Implementation of the Project will result in a beneficial effect of removing existing hazards and contaminated soils and groundwater for the areas that are required for the Project. Please see Chapter 5, Section 5.5 of the Supplemental Final EIS for additional information. |
| Individuals | Lisa | Crockett | | This large construction project may help release contaminants from the ground into the air and water. More information of how Met council intends to mitigate this is needed. | Mitigation methods for hazardous materials contamination are discussed in Chapter 5, Section 5.5.4 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Kristel | Porter | West Broadway Business Association | This plan will increase the presence of hazardous materials within EJ communities. | The Project completed Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments, referred to as ESAs. Hazardous and contaminated sites uncovered through the Project's environmental assessments identified hazardous and contaminated materials present in existing soils and groundwater in the Project corridor due to past uses and/or spills and leaks. The Project does not anticipate introducing or increasing hazardous materials due to its construction or operation. Rather, the Project presents an opportunity to remove contamination as soils are excavated for Project construction. Please see Chapter 5, Section 5.5 of the Supplemental Final EIS for additional information. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis – Noise and Vibration

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|---|--|
| Individuals | Stephen | Dent | | In addition, the noise from the light rail will make living there difficult. There is no greenspace along 10th street to buffer the noise and I can already hear the clanging of the bells. Please reconsider this route | Where impacts have been identified that meet the FTA and/or Met Council criteria for mitigation, noise mitigation measures have been identified and are presented in Chapter 5, Section 5.6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Chris | Connaker | | The light rail project will continue to anger residents, change the character of our neighborhoods with a noisy, underused monstrosity, If I read these documents correctly, you have no mitigation options for any of this | The Supplemental Draft EIS presents potential impacts and provides an initial foundation for mitigation strategies. The Supplemental Final EIS commits the Project to the mitigation measures. Impacts and associated mitigation measures for community amenities, character, and cohesion are presented in Chapter 4, Section 4.2. Where impacts have been identified that meet the FTA and/or Met Council criteria for mitigation, noise mitigation measures have been identified and are presented in Chapter 5, Section 5.6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Rita and Scott | Endres | | Noise and vibration might impact business. | Where impacts have been identified that meet the FTA and/or Met Council criteria for mitigation, noise mitigation measures have been identified and are presented in Chapter 5, Section 5.6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. For vibration, mitigation has been identified at all locations with impacts and is presented in Chapter 5, Section 5.7 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Thomas | Reiner | | I live on the 3400 block of Abbott Ave N and I can see 81 from my living room window and I am concerned about Noise Pollution | Where impacts have been identified that meet the FTA and/or Met Council criteria for mitigation, noise mitigation measures have been identified and are presented in Chapter 5, Section 5.6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Belinda | Trombley | | This is going to be too loud. | Where impacts have been identified that meet the FTA and/or Met Council criteria for mitigation, noise mitigation measures have been identified and are presented in Chapter 5, Section 5.6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Tonya | Strauss | | People who live in quiet parts of the alignment do not want to live near noisy transit. | The noise assessment takes into account the existing noise levels in an area. In locations with lower existing noise levels, an impact would occur with less Project noise. Where impacts have been identified that meet the FTA and/or Met Council criteria for mitigation, noise mitigation measures have been identified and are presented in Chapter 5, Section 5.6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Craig | Whitcher | | My home's lot backs up to park area near the proposed end of the line. I don't want my properties value impacted by potential noise and visual pollution | Where impacts have been identified that meet the FTA and/or Met Council criteria for mitigation, mitigation measures have been identified. Noise impacts and mitigation are presented in Chapter 5, Section 5.6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Visual impacts and mitigation are presented in Chapter 4, Section 4.5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Robert | Coleman | | The vibration effects of light rail are greatly exaggerated, The only location it has a noticeable sound impact is on 21st Ave, but the number of units potentially affected by the sound is very minimal | Methodology and regulatory context for the evaluation of vibration impacts is presented in the <i>Noise and Vibration Technical Report</i> in Appendix A-5 and Chapter 5, Section 5.6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Brad | Sutton | | The noise impacts do not seem to take into account the frequent disruption from train horns and bells as they leave the 40th/81 and Lowry station. What mitigations will be put in place to accommodate residents along the lake, along 81, and in Copperfield Manor? | The noise impact assessment takes into account any bells used by the LRT vehicle entering and leaving stations. Where impacts have been identified that meet criteria for mitigation, noise mitigation measures have been identified and are presented in Chapter 5, Section 5.6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis – Noise and Vibration

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Organizations and Businesses | Kristel | Porter | West Broadway Business Association | North Minneapolis residents have been watching their history wiped away repeatedly by poor planning decisions, removing our historic buildings instead of finding creative ways to restore and reclaim these very valuable and precious resources that add charm to some of the most stable, vibrant and visited business corridors throughout our city. This light rail project would disturb the foundations of 31 locations considered to be historic by members of our community due to vibrations created through construction. | The Section 106 consultation process includes community input to determine how to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to historic and cultural resources. Construction vibration mitigation measures have been included in the assessment of the Project. These measures include providing construction specifications for vibration, utilizing alternative construction methods to limit vibration, conducting pre-construction surveys to document existing conditions in areas where high-vibration activities will occur, and monitoring vibration at sensitive locations. |
| Individuals | Mary | Ambrose | | My house is 50 feet from the proposed line and I fear the noise and vibration from construction and the line operation. I oppose the construction of this line | Noise and vibration impacts have been updated in the Supplemental Final EIS and are presented in Chapter 5, Sections 5.6 and 5.7 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Additional information in response to general concerns about the Project is also provided in FRC 2. Where impacts have been identified that meet the FTA and/or Met Council criteria for mitigation, noise mitigation measures have been identified and are presented in Chapter 5, Section 5.6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Matthew | Bruns | | I do not believe the SDEIS adequately addresses the impacts to the historic properties on N 10th Ave. the vibration studies were completed on the Redwell which is a modern building less than 10 years old rather than on the 100+ year old historic buildings in the neighborhood. | Additional noise and vibration measurement in the location identified has been conducted to confirm all potential impacts in this area. Results are presented in the <i>Noise and Vibration Technical Report</i> in Appendix A-5 and Chapter 5, Section 5.7 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Richard | Adair | | People are worried about disruption of operating a light rail. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Government Organizations | Adam | Bell | City of Crystal | The SDEIS concludes that four homes and 14 apartment units would be moderately impacted by noise, and none would be severely impacted. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The noise model was developed using noise measurements at 5906 Elmhurst Ave. N. and 5257 Xenia Ave. N. 5906 Elmhurst is 215 feet from the proposed LRT guideway. 5257 Xenia is 195 feet from the proposed LRT guideway, buffered by a concrete wall and opaque fence, and located at a lower elevation. Neither property is among the closest homes to the project. - The most directly impacted residential neighborhood is between Corvallis Ave. N. and 47th Ave. N., where multiple residences are within 100 feet of the proposed LRT guideway. - The noise model needs to be revised so that it includes at least one actual measurement location in the area of greatest potential impact, such as one of the single-family homes adjacent to Bottineau Blvd. in the vicinity of 48th-50th Avenues. Only then can the noise impacts of the project be correctly evaluated. | Additional noise measurement in the location suggested has been conducted to confirm all potential impacts in this area. Results are presented in the <i>Noise and Vibration Technical Report</i> and Chapter 5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 5-43 MPRB requests clarification on how parks are examined for noise impacts under FTA guidance. The Wirth/Victory Memorial Parkway Regional Trail area is designed as a passive space for traveling and rest, unlike more active parks in the corridor. | Under FTA guidance, only certain spaces within a park are considered noise sensitive. Active uses, such as bike paths, are not considered noise sensitive. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis – Noise and Vibration

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | Executive Order 13045, “Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks,” directs Federal agencies to identify and assess environmental health and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children and to ensure that activities address those safety risks. Children’s hearing, speech, and ability to learn can be affected. Recommendations: 1. Commit to noise mitigation methods included in Sections 7.1.2 and 7.2.3 to reduce effects from construction and operation. 2. Recommend FTA provide a method by which residents can request a noise and/or vibration analysis within one year of full operation of the proposed project with appropriate mitigation, as applicable. 3. Commit to noise mitigation for all schools in the project area within a distance of 50 feet, per the construction noise assessment methodology in Chapter 4. Consider mitigating noise for all schools within 100 feet of the project. | Where impacts have been identified that meet the FTA and/or Met Council criteria for mitigation, noise mitigation measures have been identified. There are no noise impacts identified to schools. For vibration, mitigation has been identified at all locations with impacts. See the <i>Noise and Vibration Technical Report</i> in Appendix A-5 of the Supplemental Final EIS for additional details. No schools are within a distance of 50 or 100 feet of the Project. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Noise and vibration from the LRT operations must be mitigated. | Where impacts have been identified that meet the FTA and/or Met Council criteria for mitigation, noise mitigation measures have been identified in Chapter 5, Section 5.6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. For vibration, mitigation has been identified at all locations with impacts in Chapter 5, Section 5.7 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 5-44 -- Section 5.6.2.1: There are 13 long term locations collected for noise measurements, not 12 as described in the paragraph. | Long-term impacts have been updated in Chapter 5, Section 5.6 (Figure 5-27 and Figure 5-28) of the Supplemental Final EIS and in the <i>Noise and Vibration Technical Report</i> of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 5-48 -- City of Minneapolis section 5.6.3, first sentence "between Target Field and 21st Ave N" Is this correct or is Lowry the northern extent of noise monitoring? | Language corrected in Chapter 5, Section 5.6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Will the specific properties impacted by noise and/or vibration be shared publicly at this stage? | The Supplemental Final EIS does not publish the physical address but impacted property owners have been contacted for mitigation analysis to determine mitigation opportunities. Location of impacts will be presented on figures in Chapter 5, Sections 5.6 and 5.7 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 5-52 -- The locations with vibration impacts should be summarized and a map provided in the chapter and not direct the reader to the appendix to see their results. | Potential vibration impacted properties will be identified in figures in the <i>Noise and Vibration Technical Report</i> and in Chapter 5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. The maps with noise and vibration impact locations are contained in Chapter 5, Sections 5.6 and 5.7 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 25 -- When determining where to locate the sensor relative to the "project location", how is project location defined? Is that from the edge of the tracks, centerline of track bed, etc.? | In this context, "Project location" refers to the Project Alignment and Project elements. There isn't a specific distance or reference point to use. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis – Noise and Vibration

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 34 -- Why was no location on 10th Ave N used for vibration testing? V-A is on the opposite side of the freeway trench and much more likely to have different ground conditions than the area around Washington and 10th Ave N, especially given the relative proximity to the river, urban context and concentration of underground utilities, including the Bassett Creek Tunnel and Xcel transmission line. This is also the area where deeper excavation may be required, given the existing underground utilities. | Comment noted. Vibration testing was completed on 10 th Avenue. Results are available in Chapter 5, Section 5.7 (Figure 5-30) and Appendix A-5 <i>Noise and Vibration Technical Report</i> of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 46 -- Table 6-7: Why are project impact noise levels so much lower than the reference noise levels on page 19? | The reference levels shown on page 19 represented the noise generated by one vehicle passing by at a specific speed and distance. A reference level is the building block for the model, which incorporates operational data, including the number of events, time of day of the events (day and night), and the actual distance and speed at each location to determine the Project noise levels. The Project noise levels are presented in terms of Ldn, which is a cumulative noise level, taking into account all the information above to present one noise level for a 24-hour period. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 60 -- If the construction-related vibration impacts can't be summarized until final design, what is the purpose of the SDEIS? How can the city be asked to provide municipal consent without knowing the potential impacts from construction on adjacent properties? There are many properties along the alignment that are very close to the alignment that could be permanently impacted or damaged by construction | Construction vibration has been assessed for a typical construction scenario. Actual vibration methods, equipment and durations will be determined by the contractor. The Supplemental Final EIS provides construction vibration mitigation measures as a part of the Project that the contractor will be required to follow. Construction vibration mitigation measures have been included in the assessment of the Project. These measures include providing construction specifications for vibration, utilizing alternative construction methods to limit vibration, conducting pre-construction surveys to document existing conditions in areas where high-vibration activities will occur for monitoring vibration at sensitive locations. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 67 -- The location for LT-13 appears to be on a second story balcony and is not 4-6 feet from the ground as described in the methodology. How does this impact noise levels experienced by ground floor residents? | The methodology is used whenever possible and is primarily for single family residences or other locations with first floor usage. At the location for LT-13, the receivers closest to the ground floor are on the second floor. Location and placement of the receiver is considered a part of the model to include accurate distance from the Project Alignment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 72 -- The location for LT-4 (2239 W Broadway Ave) appears to be behind a large tree. Wouldn't this dampen noise captured by the sensor? | The noise monitor was located next to a small tree, which would provide little or no shielding of noise from W Broadway Avenue. If there is a small amount of shielding, this would result in a slightly lower existing noise level. The existing noise levels determine the impact thresholds for the Project. The lower the existing noise level, an impact would occur with less Project noise. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 72 -- 1927 Morgan Ave is a parcel away from W Broadway (approximately 150' from the center of the street). How is this representative of other properties that front West Broadway? The elevation of the property and sensor is also higher than those properties adjacent to West Broadway. | The monitor was placed on the street side of the building on the parcel. The measurement was to characterize the existing noise levels for receivers along this segment of W Broadway. This building is typical or slightly further back from other sensitive buildings in the area, which would provide a similar or slightly lower existing noise level, compared with closer buildings. A lower existing noise level is slightly conservative and would increase the potential for noise impacts from the Project in the area. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis – Noise and Vibration

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 73 -- 2117 Dupont Ave is 2 to 3 parcels away from 21st Ave N (approximately 180' from the center of 21st Ave N). How is this representative of properties that front 21st Ave N? | The monitor was placed on the street side of the building. The measurement was to characterize the existing noise levels for receivers along N 21st Ave. This building is typical or slightly further back from other sensitive buildings in the area, which would provide a similar or slightly lower existing noise level, compared with closer buildings. A lower existing noise level is slightly conservative and would increase the potential for noise impacts from the Project in the area. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Will the specific properties impacted by noise and/or vibration be shared publicly at this stage? | The Supplemental Final EIS does not publish the physical address but impacted property owners have been contacted for mitigation analysis to determine mitigation opportunities. Location of impacts will be presented on figures in Chapter 5, Sections 5.6 and 5.7 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The locations with vibration impacts should be summarized and a map provided in the chapter and not direct the reader to the appendix to see the results. | Potential vibration impacted properties are identified in figures in the <i>Noise and Vibration Technical Report</i> and in Chapter 5 Appendix A-5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. The maps with noise and vibration impact locations are contained in Chapter 5, Sections 5.6 and 5.7 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis – Utilities

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 5-8, 9 The maps do not show the Wirth/Victory Memorial Parkway Regional Trail area, where major utilities may exist | Utility survey is ongoing and coordination with major utilities will continue to be refined as Project design advances. Existing utilities have been updated in Chapter 5, Section 5.1 and Appendix A-5 Appendix Chapter 5, Section 5.1 in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 5-4 -- Franchise agreements in the City of Minneapolis are with privately owned utilities, not those owned by the city. | Comment noted and language added to clarify in Chapter 5, Section 5.1 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 5-4 -- Would public and private utilities need to conform to MnDOT's Utility Accommodation on Highway Right of Way Policy for locations where the utilities are not location in MnDOT ROW, if so, why? If not, what are the applicable governing regulations? | Comment noted and language updated in Chapter 5, Section 5.1 of the Supplemental Final EIS to reflect that MnDOT policy is applicable only to MnDOT ROW. Utilities in City/County ROW will follow respective Utility Accommodation policies/practices. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 5-7 -- Figure 5-3: The utility lines are overlapping, many of them are not visible on this map. It should be adjusted to show where each of the types of utilities are located. | Chapter 5, Section 5.1 of the Supplemental Final EIS presents significant utilities and figures have been updated for clarity. Additional information describing individual utilities is presented in Appendix A-5 Appendix Chapter 5, Section 5.1 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 5-9 -- Maintaining current service levels for utilities may not be sufficient depending on how the project impacts development and density in the area. This should be evaluated to determine if higher levels of utility service are being driven by the project and therefore should be mitigated. | The Project does not include redevelopment. Proposed zoning or higher levels of utility service are outlined in the respective City Comprehensive Plans and are assumed to be addressed with future City Capital Improvement Projects. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The document suggests no long-term impacts to utilities are anticipated because the relocation and reconstruction of utilities would maintain current service levels. The project has the potential to drive redevelopment of the area around the project corridor, thereby increasing density. If this is the case, current service levels may not be sufficient for future conditions. Any anticipated increases to population densities along the corridor should be evaluated and mitigation of insufficient utility capacities should be provided for. | The Project does not include redevelopment. Coordination with City of Minneapolis regarding utility relocations as part of Project will continue into final design. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 7 -- Figure A5-3 does not provide the level of detail necessary to identify major utility locations. | Chapter 5, Section 5.1 of the Supplemental Final EIS presents significant utilities and figures have been updated for clarity. Additional information describing individual utilities is presented in Appendix A-5 Appendix Chapter 5. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Utilities and street infrastructure disrupted as part of the project must be replaced at the project's expense or through agreement with other utility providers such as Xcel. | Where public utility impacts are identified in the Supplemental Final EIS, the Project would be responsible for ensuring that in kind, improvements or betterments (standard project approach) are provided as mitigation. Coordination with impacted property owners will occur throughout design. Additional information on mitigation strategies is provided in Chapter 5, Section 5.1 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 15 -- Verify where or why utilities must conform to MnDOT's Utility Accommodation on Highway Right of Way Policy, especially if the utilities are not located in MnDOT ROW. Verify what the correct regulation for utilities is. | Comment noted and language updated in Chapter 5, Section 5.1 of the Supplemental Final EIS to reflect that MnDOT policy is applicable only to MnDOT ROW. Utilities in City/County ROW will follow respective Utility Accommodation policies/practices. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis – Utilities

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 15 -- If utility relocation design necessitates work outside of the identified project limits, how will this be addressed with approvals? It is likely utility work will occur outside of what is currently shown as the project limits. | All Project work is planned to occur within the LODs as described in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 16 -- It does not appear the utility impacts have been fully evaluated. The claim that the Lyndale Ave N to West Broadway option presents the greatest number of potential utility impacts does not seem justifiable. | The Lyndale alignment option has not been carried forward into the Supplemental Final EIS. Chapter 5, Section 5.1 and Appendix A-5 Appendix Chapter 5, Section 5.1 of the Supplemental Final EIS present updated information about significant utilities along the Project Alignment. Utility survey is ongoing and coordination with major utilities will continue to be refined as Project design advances. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 17 -- Maintaining current service levels for utilities may not be sufficient depending on how the project impacts development and density in the area. This should be evaluated to determine if higher levels of utility service are being driven by the project and therefore should be mitigated. | The Project does not include redevelopment. Proposed zoning or higher levels of utility service are outlined in the respective City Comprehensive Plans and are assumed to be addressed with future City Capital Improvement Projects. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Relocation or replacement of utilities including design (e.g., sizing, possible encasement) and location of the new facilities must be determined in coordination with city staff. The relocation process for the Xcel transmission line under 10th Avenue North must also include community engagement and improvements to the selected corridor in alignment with city plans and policies. | All utility work will be done in accordance with state law will be coordinated with City staff or the private utility owners. All Xcel transmission line work will be conducted in accordance with state laws regarding electrical transmission lines. See Chapter 5, Section 5.1 in the Supplemental Final EIS for more discussion on utilities. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis – Water Resources

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|---|--|---|
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | Worried about Crytal Lake park and water quality, related to contamination. | Potential impacts to aquatic resources adjacent to the Project would be mitigated by maintaining the current elevations to the maximum extent practicable, restoring the disturbed land with suitable vegetation, and the application of “stabilizing” Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent disturbed land and sediment from washing into the lake. See Chapter 5, Section 5.9 Water Quality and Stormwater in the Supplemental Final EIS for additional discussion which includes erosion control measures to prevent disturbed land and sediment from washing into the lake. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Laura | Jester | Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission | With the realignment of the METRO Blue Line Extension project, the project alignment no longer follows Bassett Creek in Theodore Wirth Park and there are no longer any floodplain impacts, and it appears there are no longer any wetland impacts within the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission (BCWMC) jurisdiction. | Updated potential floodplain and wetland impacts with the Project Alignment are presented in Supplemental Final EIS Chapter 5, Sections 5.2 and 5.3 respectively. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Todd | Shoemaker | Shingle Creek and West Mississippi Watershed Management Commissions | Coordinate with the watershed management commission regarding floodplain impacts at Shingle Creek north of Brooklyn Blvd. Future submissions should quantify these impacts and follow SCWMC’s Rules and Standards Rule F - Floodplain Alteration. Similarly, culvert crossing modifications at this location shall follow Rule H – Bridge and Culvert Crossings. | Project will continue to coordinate with SCWMC regarding floodplain impacts. All impacts to the 100-year floodplain are anticipated to be temporary because any fill within a floodplain will be offset with an equal amount of compensatory floodplain storage volume. Additional information is provided in Chapter 5, Section 5.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS and the <i>Water Resources Technical Report</i> in Appendix A-5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Todd | Shoemaker | Shingle Creek and West Mississippi Watershed Management Commissions | Implement or identify impacts to buffer strips for wetlands and water courses. The Commission requires a minimum of a 20-foot buffer strip measured around the ordinary high-water level of a water course or wetland. | Wetland buffer locations will be established during final design and permitting. Establishment of future Right-of-way will aid the Council in determining where buffers are achievable and if variance requests will need to be requested. Coordination on Buffers is anticipated during the Wetland Permit Application approval. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Todd | Shoemaker | Shingle Creek and West Mississippi Watershed Management Commissions | The SDEIS ranks potential contamination areas (Section 5.5) and high infiltration areas (e.g., karst features in Section 5.4). Consider these areas when siting infiltration practices or justifying alternative compliance under Rule D.3.g.2.i. | Adjustments to stormwater BMPs will be made to address areas of karst and contaminated sites in the Project area as the Project progresses. See Chapter 5, Section 5.4 of the Supplemental Final EIS for additional mitigation measures. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Todd | Shoemaker | Shingle Creek and West Mississippi Watershed Management Commissions | Due to potential groundwater impacts, no infiltration practices are allowed within the emergency response areas (ERAs), in accordance with the Minnesota Construction Stormwater Permit and Commission rules. | Design plans will be modified to avoid areas with groundwater impacts and will follow local and state requirements on infiltration practices. If stormwater ponds are required to be in contaminated areas, the stormwater ponds will be lined as outlined in a Response Action Plan (RAP). |
| Organizations and Businesses | Todd | Shoemaker | Shingle Creek and West Mississippi Watershed Management Commissions | Section 5.9.4.1 notes underground filtration practices as potential Best Management Practices (BMPs). However, underground filtration practices lack sufficient access for media maintenance or replacement and would not meet the Commission’s criteria for acceptable BMPs. | Additional soil data is required to determine if underground filtration BMPs would be necessary for stormwater management. If required, coordination will be performed to ensure the chosen filtration BMP aligns with the Commission's maintenance concerns and standards. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Todd | Shoemaker | Shingle Creek and West Mississippi Watershed Management Commissions | Section 5.9.4.1 outlines permanent Best Management Practice (BMP) options, including filtration and infiltration BMPs. However, the accompanying narratives do not address the necessity of pretreatment in relation to these practices. Future submittals should address pretreatment requirements to ensure proper functionality of filtration and infiltration practices. | A discussion of pretreatment has been provided within Chapter 5, Section 5.9 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Pretreatment would be provided upstream of BMPs using a variety of methods including (but not limited to): forebays, manholes with sumps, and proprietary treatment devices (i.e. SAFL baffles). |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis – Water Resources

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|---|--|--|
| Organizations and Businesses | Todd | Shoemaker | Shingle Creek and West Mississippi Watershed Management Commissions | The project anticipates impact to wetlands and notes potential mitigation could include the purchase of wetland banking credits within the Hennepin County area. Prioritize the sequencing under Rule G - Wetland Alteration: 1) mitigated by enhancing the impacted wetland; 2) mitigated within the sub catchment of the impacted wetland; 3) mitigated in the drainage area of the impacted wetland; 4) mitigated in the watershed of the impacted wetland; 5) mitigated through purchase of wetland bank credits. | As part of the wetland permit application, wetland sequencing will be addressed to satisfy the compensatory mitigation for all wetland impacts for the proposed Project. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Todd | Shoemaker | Shingle Creek and West Mississippi Watershed Management Commissions | Clarify the total impact of regulated wetlands reported in table 5-7. Table 5-7 reports 8.57 acres of wetland impact; however, this is the summation of the "USACE wetlands" column and "unregulated waters" column and does not consider impacts to "WCA" wetlands column. | The column titled "Jurisdictional Impacts: WCA (Natural Basins in acres)" summarizes impacts to WCA regulated wetlands. During the wetland delineation, it was indicated that WCA did not regulate Stormwater Basins nor Wet Ditches, while the USACE does not regulate Stormwater Basins only. The numbers in the columns highlight amounts regulated by each agency. The total acres (8.57) include natural basins, ditches, and stormwater ponds. The numbers add up between the USACE regulated basins (Natural and Ditches) and Stormwater. All impacts are accounted for in the table. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Todd | Shoemaker | Shingle Creek and West Mississippi Watershed Management Commissions | Justify wetland impacts reported in Figures 5-XX. For example, Figure 5-11 shows wetland impacts to the west side West Broadway at Shingle Creek; however, the national wetland inventory identifies seasonally flood basins within the disturbed area on the east side of Shingle Creek. | An onsite wetland delineation occurred in the fall of 2022 and an NOD was issued on 12/22/2022. During the delineation, no wetlands were identified on the east side of Shingle Creek. In this NOD, it is stated that "The Shingle Creek/West Mississippi WMC approves the wetland boundary & type application for the portion of the study area within the WMC, including the City of Crystal who waived WCA jurisdiction to the WMC." Onsite wetland delineations are considered more accurate than the National Wetland Inventory maps and have been used to complete the wetland impacts portion of the Project. |
| Individuals | Brad | Sutton | | There is no mention of the expected impact on Crystal Lake, only that remediation will take place to restore any damage to the lake. This EIS needs to address the potential impact on the lake and the specifics of the remediation efforts. | Potential impacts to aquatic resources adjacent to the Project would be mitigated by maintaining the current elevations to the maximum extent practicable, restoring the disturbed land with suitable vegetation, and the application of "stabilizing" Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent disturbed land and sediment from washing into the lake. See Chapter 5, Section 5.9 Water Quality and Stormwater in the Supplemental Final EIS for additional discussion. |
| Government Organizations | Adam | Bell | City of Crystal | The SDEIS does not discuss the potential impacts and risks to this water supply pipeline, which serves 70,000 people in Crystal, New Hope, and Golden Valley. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The SDEIS treats this piece of critical infrastructure as merely another "utility crossing," as if it's no more important than a regular water main serving a single block. - These risks include not only construction disruption or damage, but also difficulty of access for long-term maintenance. - The SDEIS needs to specifically evaluate the risks related to the JWC water supply pipeline. | Language updated to clarify potential utility impacts in Chapter 5, Section 5.1 in the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis – Water Resources

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------------|--|---|
| Government Organizations | Adam | Bell | City of Crystal | <p>The SDEIS states that additional stormwater facilities will be needed due to increased impervious surface but does not evaluate the location and impacts of those facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project team has indicated that they are looking at land outside the existing roadway footprint, currently used as landscape buffers, as locations for the additional stormwater facilities. - This would remove some of the limited screening and buffering that exists today and would negatively impact visual quality, noise, and so forth. - The SDEIS needs to evaluate these impacts. | Chapter 5, Section 5.9 Water Quality and Stormwater and Appendix A-5 Appendix Chapter 5, Section 5.9 in the Supplemental Final EIS include Best Management Practices and Mitigation for stormwater impacts including locations and facilities. Mitigation related to mitigation strategies such as visual quality are evaluated and coordinated as design advances with the cities where the stormwater impacts existing through design resolution team meetings and local permitting requirements. |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>The SDEIS indicates the Build Alternative would impact approximately 12 acres of floodplain. As design advances, opportunities to minimize impact would be explored and replacement flood storage areas would be integrated into the landscape. However, effects of mitigating for 12 acres of floodplain impact were not included in the SDEIS.</p> <p>Recommendations Mitigation for all potential effects as a result of the proposed Project should be proposed in the SFEIS. Mitigation has the potential to cause an unrelated impact (e.g., effects to parcels) and should be analyzed along with direct construction-related effects such as residential and business displacement and loss of parking spaces.</p> | Flood storage impacts to be determined as part of final design. Once volumetric impacts are defined mitigation measures will be analyzed and incorporated into the final design and presented in Chapter 5, Section 5.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>The SDEIS indicates karst may be found in Minneapolis between Lowry and Knox Avenue. The SDEIS does not describe potential impacts or typical BMPs for working in karst areas.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. EPA recommends the SDEIS clarify whether karst geology exists in the project area. The SDEIS should identify and discuss issues associated with the construction and operation of the proposed Project in karst terrain (e.g., a discussion of the potential effects to surface water quality and/or groundwater quality associated with hazardous materials spills). 2. Discuss why the proposed project cannot avoid karst features. 3. The identification and implementation of construction and stormwater-related BMPs for a karst environment are extremely important because of the physical and environmental sensitivity of karst features, flora, and fauna. If karst cannot be avoided, EPA recommends FTA commit to the following BMPs in karst areas, as applicable: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) All surface water runoff from the proposed project should be directed away from sensitive karst features. Spill prevention, control, and countermeasure plans should be developed and included in the SFEIS. b) A buffer of undisturbed vegetation at least 25 feet wide around the highest contour of all sinkholes in areas not directly in the footprint of new construction should be maintained. c) All areas affected by construction shall be mulched and seeded as soon as possible following construction. Interim measures to prevent erosion during construction shall be taken and may include the installation of silt fences, staked straw bales, sedimentation basins, and temporary mulching. | The Supplemental Draft EIS identified that portions of the study area are mapped as "active karst" based on the presence of underlying carbonate bedrock and less than 50 ft of cover. However, no mapped karst features (i.e. sinkholes and springs) or bedrock collapse hazard areas have been identified within a mile of the study area. Therefore, the recommendations outlined for identified karst features are not applicable. See Chapter 5, Section 5.5 of the Supplemental Final EIS for mitigation of the increased risk to groundwater resources from spills in karst areas. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis – Water Resources

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The City of Minneapolis requires that local stormwater policies and ordinances be adhered to such as the Chapter 54 Stormwater Management Ordinance. Stormwater management, wetland and flood plain mitigation must consider not only the specific area of impact, but broader impacts on the local area and regional system. Stormwater management areas should also consider and not preclude future development potential. | Comment noted. A stormwater management system would be designed to adhere to local stormwater management policies to the maximum extent practicable. Coordination with regulatory agencies would be performed to identify other areas of opportunity for stormwater management mitigation. See also Chapter 5, Section 5.9 of the Supplemental Final EIS for additional details on stormwater. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Private water service lines that require relocation or replacement due to the Project shall be paid for by the Project and follow City Standards for replacement. Any portion of any private water service line containing lead or galvanized iron that requires relocation or replacement due to the Project shall be replaced with Type K copper at the expense of the Project per Division WM3.17C.8. of the Supplemental Specifications For the Construction of Public Infrastructure In the City of Minneapolis, latest edition | Comment noted. Service relocation/replacement will follow applicable City standards. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 5-8 -- Impacts to Bassett Creek Tunnel should be identified and mitigated as necessary. | The Project corridor crosses the Bassett Creek Tunnel at 10 th Ave in Minneapolis. Tunnel has been identified as “Old Bassett Creek Tunnel” per input from the City of Minneapolis and is identified in the Conceptual Engineering Drawings in Appendix A-E of the Supplemental Final EIS. The Project is proposing to replace the existing tunnel within the 10 th Ave right-of-way (approximately 66LF) with a concrete box culvert designed to support LRT loads. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 5-8 -- Relocating manholes in conflict with the project area without relocating the associated sanitary or storm main may not be sufficient to provide adequate access. Additional mitigation where access to sewers occur may be necessary. | Language updated to reflect need for review with regard to accessibility/maintenance. Mitigations and relocations of specific utilities will be identified and coordinated as design advances. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 5-8 -- There is no mention of the impacts to the sanitary and storm sewer on 21st Ave N, which may be significant. Relocation of sanitary sewer off of 21st may eliminate public sewer access to properties that do not have frontage along the cross streets. | Additional locations and descriptions of utilities within the study area in Minneapolis have been added to Appendix A-5 Appendix Chapter 5, Section 5.1 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Mitigation and relocations of specific utilities will be refined and coordinated as design advances. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Large water mains adjacent to the light rail tracks will need to be cathodically protected under the tracks and isolated on either side of the future track alignment. Encasement of water mains may be necessary. Water mains underneath the track alignment should be inspected annually. | Language added to Chapter 5, Section 5.1 of the Supplemental Final EIS to clarify potential mitigation and inspection requirements. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The City of Minneapolis encourages the Blue Line Extension project to work with the City to implement Green Stormwater Infrastructure and Sustainable Landscaping. Green Stormwater Infrastructure is a set of green infrastructure practices that also capture and treat stormwater. They do this by infiltration, filtration, or detention. Sustainable Landscaping is a set of practices that work with natural environment. They help to sustain local habitat, conserve energy and water, and improve air and water quality and user experience. Examples include trees and native plants. Operations and maintenance agreements for implementing these practices along the alignment will need to be established. | Linear Green Stormwater Infrastructure (GSI) BMPs are planned as part of the Project to provide stormwater management along the Project corridor. Sustainable landscaping would be considered where appropriate during final design. Potential stormwater mitigation is presented in Chapter 5, Section 5.9 the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 5 Physical and Environmental Analysis – Water Resources

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 12 -- There are also private sanitary and storm sewer connection to the publicly owned sanitary and storm sewers. The project will likely have impacts on these that should be identified. | Sanitary, water, and storm utility information is updated in the Supplemental Final EIS and will continue to be refined as the Project advances to final design. Any temporary services or bypass will follow City standard specifications. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 12 -- MnDOT also owns storm sewer along the corridors, | MnDOT storm sewer is known and shown in Project design files. No impacts are anticipated to MnDOT storm sewer as part of this Project. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 12 -- Table A5-4 is not a complete list of sanitary sewers in the study area for Minneapolis. | Comment noted. The intent of the table is to show significant or critical sanitary sewers within the study area and not meant as an exhaustive list. Utility coordination will occur through final design and construction. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 12 -- Records do not suggest an 86" diameter brick sanitary sewer running under Lyndale Ave and 7th St N at 8th Ave N. Is this meant to be under 8th Ave N? | Location of brick sanitary sewer has been confirmed to be located under 8th Ave N and language has been updated in Appendix A-5 Appendix Chapter 5, Section 5.1 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 13 -- There is not a 60" diameter RCP crossing CR 81 at Logan Ave. | Project has confirmed that RCP does exist at this location. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 14 -- The 144" Bassett Creek Tunnel is not RCP | Comment noted. The tunnel is Brick/Cast In Place and language has been updated in Appendix A-5 Appendix Chapter 5, Section 5.1 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 88 -- Hennepin County and MnDOT should be included in the organizations with stormwater requirements. | Chapter 5, Section 5.9 of the Supplemental Final EIS has been amended to include Hennepin County and MnDOT. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Regulatory responsibility for the right-of-way will impact which stormwater management requirements will apply to different portions of the project and will need to inform conversations regarding long term ownership and maintenance responsibilities of any stormwater management BMPs. | Comment noted. Coordination with Cities will occur to ensure the appropriate agency for ownership and maintenance is identified. See also Chapter 5, Section 5.9 for additional details on Water Quality and Stormwater in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | This report should show aerial maps of the Minneapolis station areas and identify nearby wetlands, even if none are present in the station area. | Figures are included in Chapter 5, Section 5.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS to show locations of floodplains located near the Project Alignment in the City of Minneapolis. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | This report should show aerial maps of the Minneapolis station areas and identify nearby floodplains, even if none are present in the station area. | Figures are included in Chapter 5, Section 5.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS to show locations of floodplains located near the Project Alignment in the City of Minneapolis. |



Chapter 6 Cumulative Effects (Supplemental Draft EIS)

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-3 -- From the chapter, NCHRP's Report 466: Desk Reference for Estimating Indirect Effects of Proposed Transportation Projects, 10 which states that "development effects are most often found up to one-half mile around a transit station." This further supports the addition of station at Washington and West Broadway. | The W Broadway Station has been included and analyzed in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-3 -- Many of the resources of interest identified in the chapter are also impacted by tracks, not just the location of the station. | The methodology on page 6-3 indicates that indirect and cumulative effects are assessed by looking at Project effects and does not specify different Project elements (i.e., tracks vs stations). The Study Area shown on Figure 6-1 extends 1 mile around the track alignment and resources affected by the tracks were addressed in the analysis. See Chapter 6 for additional details and figure in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-7 -- Referencing "Politics and Freeways: Building the Twin Cities Interstate System" to define freeway "eras" seems arbitrary and not relevant. Who is "falling behind?" The rate at which highways were being built, the failure to acknowledge the disparate impacts to community with highway projects, etc.? | Text was added in Chapter 6 of the Supplemental Final EIS to make it clear that the "era of falling behind" relates to inequities experienced by communities of color, which still persist today. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-7 -- Section 6.1.3.1. Understanding that the time frame for this chapter is 1960 to the present it would still be worthwhile to include the east-west CP rail line and Humboldt Yards as a major barrier across the north side east to west north of the project. | Reference to the Minneapolis & Pacific Railway (CP Line) and Humboldt Yard has been added in Chapter 6 of the Supplemental Final EIS to define the past land use changes that physically divides the community. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-8 -- Timeline on top of page: I-94 was constructed through north Minneapolis in early 1980s. | The timeline has been revised to address this comment in Chapter 6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-8 --Harms associated with past projects section. This section could mention CP rail corridor and Humboldt Yards as well as TH 55 as major barriers. | Reference to the Minneapolis & Pacific Railway (CP Line) and Humboldt Yard has been added in Chapter 6 of the Supplemental Final EIS to define the past land use changes that physically divides the community. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-8 --Remove "unfortunate" from sentence: Transportation projects in the Project area, and in the Twin Cities Metro Area more broadly, have an unfortunate history of displacing residents. This makes it seem like this impact couldn't have been known before the projects were implemented. | Revised as suggested in Chapter 6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pgs 6-10 and 6-11 -- Pedestrian and bicycle use is expected to increase on more facilities than noted in the bullets. Add "pedestrian facilities along and adjacent to the alignment" and note bikeways in addition to trails (see TAP AAA map for reference). | The bulleted list has been expanded to address this comment in Chapter 6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pgs 6-10 and 6-11 -- Also note the need for additional bike parking facilities at and near stations to accommodate additional bicycle trips to and from transit. | The need for additional bicycle storage has been noted. Bicycle storage will be provided at LRT stations. |



Chapter 6 Cumulative Effects (Supplemental Draft EIS)

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-11 -- Update this sentence to note that spillover parking can also be an issue where there are no park and rides, especially for businesses and residents who currently utilize the existing parking resources: Spillover parking can result from a lack of park-and-ride lot capacity relative to demand for park-and-ride lot spaces and can affect both businesses and residences by limiting available parking spaces for residents, visitors, customers, and employees. | The text in Chapter 6, Section 6.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS describing parking indicates that spillover parking could occur at LRT stations where no park-and-ride lots are planned or if there is a shortage of park-and-ride spaces along the alignment or at a particular LRT station. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-12 -- Will identified "future stations" such as the Washington and West Broadway station be included in station area planning? | The W Broadway Station has been included and analyzed in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-12 -- Section 6.2.2.1 Land Use Compatibility. City, County, Met Council and FTA policy all call for TOD in station areas. TOD is mixed-use, mixed-income, multi-story development. This new construction makes ground floor commercial space higher rent, which can have a displacement effect. Mitigation is necessary for this factor including, but not limited to, TOD funding sources and the ADWG work. | Comment noted. The Council has committed to a number of mitigation measures that address the Project's indirect effect, which are included in Chapter 6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-13—Cumulative and individual acquisition impacts should seek to be lessened, not only cumulative. | The Council has advanced the design to minimize property impacts to the extent feasible and identified mitigation measures for both the direct and potential indirect effects of the Project with regard to displacements. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-15 -- Suggest rephrasing sentence to confirm that some businesses will be negatively impacted (i.e., necessary relocations due to project impacts): Although it is possible for individual businesses to be affected negatively, the overall (cumulative) result is expected to be positive, especially if anti-displacement measures and redevelopment are structured to benefit the community. | The text was revised as suggested in Chapter 6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-15 -- Community and Social Analysis. Economic Effects. Through the lens of analyzing cumulative effects - the project discusses the net positive effects on property values citing the METRO Blue Line (Hiawatha Line LRT). However, there is inadequate discussion of the median household incomes, disaggregated by race, of households along this alignment over time. The relationship of property values and household incomes over time needs to be further evaluated to understand the cumulative effects and inform discussions on impacts that could ultimately lead to the displacement of residents and businesses. | A summary of trends in household income, home values, and rents between 2018 and 2022 has been added to Chapter 4 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-16 -- Community and Social Analysis. Economic Effects. The relationship of induced development and displacement of residents due to development needs further exploration. For EJ communities, including low-income and high housing cost-burdened households, the prospect of displacement poses a greater challenge in finding housing options that are affordable at levels of moderate and low-incomes along the corridor. The displacement of these households will lead to an increase in demand for affordable housing - which will exacerbate an existing market condition that poses a challenge to increase the supply via new construction due to inflation, rising costs of construction materials, and rising cost of labor. | A summary of trends in household income, home values, and rents between 2018 and 2022 is available in Chapter 4 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 6 Cumulative Effects (Supplemental Draft EIS)

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-21 -- The Minneapolis Comprehensive Plan does not include plans to reduce parking availability for residents and businesses near stations, and because there are no Park and Rides planned in Minneapolis as part of the project, a different mitigation plan will be needed that is outside of the Regional Park and Ride System Report. | Park-and-ride facilities are typically only for the transit riders and cannot be used as a mitigation for parking loss. Table 6-5 in Chapter 6 of the Supplemental Final EIS has been updated to reflect the parking mitigation that would be implemented by the Council. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-22 – Table 6-4 Visual/aesthetics row, indirect impacts column. City of Minneapolis policy does not require that buildings are built to existing character, but in line with future land use and urban design policies. New larger scale development in station areas is not inherently a visual impact. | Comment noted and text in table has been revised as suggested in Chapter 6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-22 -- Will the project implement the recommended anti-displacement strategies? | The anti-displacement commitments and mitigation measures that would be implemented by the Council are described in Chapter 6, Section 6.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-22 – The “cumulative effects” column for visual effects references security needs, not visual effects | The text in the table has been updated to address this comment in Chapter 6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-22 -- Economic effects: These could impact residents and businesses, not just residents. | The text in the table has been updated to address this comment in Chapter 6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-23 –The project should provide planning and funding assistance to mitigate indirect impacts of development in the area that will create a need for additional or expanded utilities, especially if the project is relocating or reconstructing existing utilities as part of the project. | The planning and funding of utilities associated with transit-oriented development (TOD) would be the responsibility of the land developer. The Project’s direct effects on utilities (i.e., those that would need to be relocated to construct and operate the light rail) are discussed in Chapter 5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-24 –Why would the combined effects of the project and W Broadway reconstruction lower noise impacts? This was not explained in the preceding chapter text. | The sentence has been deleted since the W Broadway reconstruction is part of the Project, and direct noise impacts are presented in Chapter 5 in Chapter 6 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-24 – Is the project implementing BMPs to reduce the cumulative effect on water quality and stormwater from induced development? | Construction of any future transit-oriented development would be performed by private or public entities in accordance with City land use and environmental compliance requirements and would not be governed by the commitments made by the Council for the Project. |



Chapter 6 Cumulative Effects (Supplemental Draft EIS)

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-25 -- How did the analysis determine that there would be a decrease in congestion? And what was the analysis that was conducted that compared the improvement in air quality from fewer vehicles on local roads and the decrease in air quality from trips induced by additional development, and found that there would be an overall decrease? The way this conclusion was reached needs to be shown and quantified. | The Project would result in a decrease in VMT by private automobiles due to new riders on the transit system who would otherwise drive. This VMT reduction would occur in the Project corridor and on the region's roadways and result in a reduction in regional air emissions compared to the No Build Alternative. Future population and employment forecasts would be the same under Build and No Build conditions (i.e., the Project would not induce development in the region) but the Project has the potential to attract growth to the station areas where local land use regulations support higher density development. Without the Project, patterns of urban sprawl would be expected to continue, which would result in longer trips made by automobiles and increased congestion. Higher-density housing in and of itself is more energy efficient and less polluting compared to low density housing, and the benefits are multiplied when supported by energy efficient means of transportation. Quantitative analysis is not required when the incremental effects of a Project are beneficial, and cumulative effects should not be assessed based on speculative assumptions of future development. |
| Individuals | Andrea | Young | | Section 6.2.2.6 feels like it is contradicting to the work that is being done by the Anti-displacement working group. | This section is outlining the potential of LRT projects to result in increased property values and indirect displacement of residents and businesses. The section has been updated to reflect the mitigation measures that would be implemented by the Council and the ongoing work of Hennepin County and its partners, which are consistent with recommendations from the Anti-Displacement Working Group. |



Executive Order 14148 (Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, January 20, 2025) and Executive Order 14173 (Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, January 21, 2025) rescinded Executive Order 14096 (Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All, April 21, 2023), Executive Order 13990 (Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science to Tackle the Climate Crisis, January 20, 2021), and Executive Order 12898 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, February 11, 1994).

The Supplemental Final EIS and Supplemental Draft EIS included analysis under the rescinded Executive Orders; however, consideration of subject matter mandated by the rescinded Executive Orders is no longer required. Accordingly, the analysis under rescinded Executive Orders does not inform the determination reached in this Supplemental Final EIS and Amended ROD.

Chapter 7 Environmental Justice (Supplemental Draft EIS)

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---|--|--|
| Individuals | Jenny | Creary | | This plan has potential to displace communities, particularly people of color. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | Anndrea | Young | | In 7.2.1.1 it claims there are no homeless encampments in the area, however the homeless encampments in the Harrison neighborhood, which is considered as one of the EJ communities I believe, was still present during the time of this census report. News articles report that the encampments around 2nd in Girard were raided in October of 2022. | A Star Tribune news article published on October 6, 2022, indicates that the homeless encampment in the Harrison neighborhood was removed. As of the publication of the Supplemental Draft EIS and the Supplemental Final EIS, no homeless encampments have been observed in the study area. |
| Individuals | Cynthia | Baxter | | The people living in the one affordable housing structure would have light rail trains within feet of their homes. That seems cruel. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Donna | Sanders | West Broadway Business and Area Coalition | One more example of public transportation destroying a low income BIPOC neighborhood. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Mary | Pattock | | This will displace Black business owners. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Soren | Stevenson | Our Streets | This project is racial justice and disability justice in action. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | This reminds me of Rondo. | Unlike major highways that can create barriers, impede access to community resources within neighborhoods, and disconnect communities, LRT systems support community cohesion by improving the public realm and creating places where people naturally interact in station areas. LRT also supports transit-oriented development that seeks to form cohesive neighborhoods offering a high quality of life. The Project would improve access between the neighborhoods to the east and west of I-94 that were largely cut-off from each other when I-94 was constructed. The Project also provides for safe pedestrian and bicycle crossing of the tracks at the roadway intersections along the alignment and on new bridges that would improve connectivity. Also, please see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | lee | guekguezian | | Tension between individual vs. cumulative impact. They are relying a lot on "cumulative positive impact," without really concretely acknowledging the impact to individual residents and businesses. -This approach can obscure the nuanced and personal ways in which displacement and other adverse impacts affect individuals and small businesses. For example, while the cumulative positive impacts might include improved overall transit access and economic development, these benefits may not be evenly distributed or accessible to all community members. | Hennepin County and its partners, including Council staff, have established a plan to mitigate direct displacements required for Project construction and potential future indirect displacement in Chapter 4, Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. The plan seeks to maximize the benefits of the Project for current residents and businesses. Please see the response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | lee | guekguezian | | The ADWG report does not seem meaningfully integrated into the SDEIS. It is mentioned and linked, but there are many opportunities to cite its recommendations as mitigation efforts. (Chapter 6: "Project partners are exploring anti-displacement measures.") | The Supplemental Final EIS updates the text in the Supplemental Draft EIS to reflect the Coordinated Action Plan for Anti-Displacement for the Blue Line Extension Corridor published by Hennepin County and partners in August 2024 and the specific "Project actions" that the Council would implement as part of the Project in Chapter 9. |



Chapter 7 Environmental Justice (Supplemental Draft EIS)

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------|------------|-------------|--------------|--|--|
| Individuals | lee | guekguezian | | There seems to be a lot of assumptions around transit as an inherent good for communities, while it is more nuanced in reality, especially for people vulnerable to displacement. | Thank you for your comment. Efforts to mitigate communities and people vulnerable to displacement are presented in Chapter 4, Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. The plan seeks to maximize the benefits of the Project for current residents and businesses. Please see the response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | Olivia | Martin | | I worry about gentrification and possible negative impacts on low-income communities so I just urge the Council to always keep these stakeholders involved and ensure that BIPOC residents and business owners are supported in all ways possible. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | Genell | Renshaw | | This project will alter the character of communities to benefit new, higher-income residents. This can be seen in your needs assessment, particularly because you list transport to sporting events, concerts and the target headquarters as one of the benefits of this project, which is low priority for the people living along the alignment, while actively tearing down affordable housing and community assets, like churches. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Cheryl | Langston | | I oppose the light rail because it will lead to a situation like Rondo when 94 was constructed | Unlike major highways that can create barriers, impede access to community resources within neighborhoods, and disconnect communities, LRT systems support community cohesion by improving the public realm and creating places where people naturally interact in station areas. LRT also supports transit-oriented development that seeks to form cohesive neighborhoods offering a high quality of life. The Project would improve access between the neighborhoods to the east and west of I-94 that were largely cut-off from each other when I-94 was constructed. The Project also provides for safe pedestrian and bicycle crossing of the tracks at the roadway intersections along the alignment and on new bridges that would improve connectivity. Also, please see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | Jen | Salyers | | This train might displace the poorest members of our community in a way that bus transit wouldn't. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | Lisa | Crockett | | Eminent Domain has traumatized me before because of its impact on the cohesion of the Black community. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | Lisa | Crockett | | This project will fragment communities, just like Rondo. | Unlike major highways that can create barriers, impede access to community resources within neighborhoods, and disconnect communities, LRT systems support community cohesion by improving the public realm and creating places where people naturally interact in station areas. LRT also supports transit-oriented development that seeks to form cohesive neighborhoods offering a high quality of life. The Project would improve access between the neighborhoods to the east and west of I-94 that were largely cut-off from each other when I-94 was constructed. The Project also provides for safe pedestrian and bicycle crossing of the tracks at the roadway intersections along the alignment and on new bridges that would improve connectivity. Also, please see response to FRC 8. |



Chapter 7 Environmental Justice (Supplemental Draft EIS)

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Individuals | Richard | Adair | | It's been shown that a kid whose parents have a short commute have a higher chance at escaping poverty as an adult, this line will help those metrics. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Shoua | Salas | African Career Education & Resource , Inc | Resources need to be in place so that residents and businesses can tap into them before, during, and after construction. There doesn't seem to be anything concrete that's discussed or talked about for areas that are affected. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 8. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | Asian Media Access, Asian American Business Resilience Network | Prosperity is defined fairly narrowly in the report. Decisions have been made on individual prosperity, and ignore the prospect of community prosperity, especially in the decision on 21st Ave vs Broadway. It is very contradictory to define economic health as “not disturbing the current BIPOC business” without considering the future growth of the BIPOC business (Green Line completion is a good example of the short-term inconvenience, but long-term economic gains); the development potential of the station on 21st Ave is limited by residential zoning. | The rationale for the selection of the N 21st Ave design option in lieu of W Broadway Ave is provided in Chapter 2 Supplemental Draft EIS. This decision supported the objectives of the W Broadway Ave business community as a whole and was not based on individual prosperity. The N 21st Ave stations would provide convenient LRT access to businesses and the streetscape improvements on W Broadway Ave would support the economic health of the nearby businesses. Project decision-making relied on extensive public outreach, guidance from business and community advisory committees, and coordination with the cities through the Municipal Consent process. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Not provided | Yang | Asian Media Access, Asian American Business Resilience Network | The concept of equity should be based on cultural integration or from bicultural perspective, and should not be based on Western culture and lifestyles. | The Council acknowledges the diverse cultures that reside along the Project corridor. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | Asian Media Access, Asian American Business Resilience Network | The concept of livability is defined greatly by diverse cultures, and the report has reflected a very narrow focus, regardless equity has been emphasized a lot, but only narrowly defined as community engagement activities, without cultural integration effort to reach the true equity. | The Council will solicit input from the public throughout final design to refine station designs, architectural characteristics of elevated structures, landscape plans, cultural placemaking including incorporation of the role of art, culture and heritage, and other design commitments (see Chapter 4, Section 4.2 of the Supplemental Final EIS for description of Cultural Placekeeping Design Groups for the Project). |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | Blue Line Coalition | The SDEIS emphasizes cumulative positive impacts but fails to address the nuanced, localized effects of displacement on individuals and small businesses. It lacks concrete displacement prevention plans, adequate support for displaced entities, and long-term monitoring and adaptation strategies. The document's integration of community feedback is unclear, and specific anti-displacement measures are insufficiently detailed. Moreover, it does not fully address environmental justice concerns or the potential impact on the affordability of naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAH) along the corridor. | The analyses presented in this chapter for the Supplemental Draft EIS were prepared in compliance with Presidential Executive Orders (EO) that have been rescinded. EO 14148, Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, 90 Federal Register 8237 (January 28, 2025) rescinded EO 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation’s Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (April 2023). EO 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, 90 Federal Register 8633 (January 31, 2025) rescinded EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (February 11, 1994). |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | A more robust narrative, possibly in Chapter 7: Environmental Justice, about the park acreage disparity identified by Trust for Public Land, with reference to the potential impacts of the Project if connections are not retained and improved. | The Project's effects on parkland are discussed in Chapter 8 and Appendix A-8 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 7 Environmental Justice (Supplemental Draft EIS)

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 7-18 Many of the communities in north Minneapolis are disadvantaged in terms of park acreage available within a short walking distance. This should be recognized as an historic harm in some way on the map or in the narrative, even if this isn't specifically referenced in Justice40. See the main letter, topic D, for a discussion on park acreage disparity. | The analyses presented in this chapter for the Supplemental Draft EIS were prepared in compliance with Presidential EOs that have been rescinded. EO 14148, Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, 90 Federal Register 8237 (January 28, 2025) rescinded EO 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (April 2023). EO 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, 90 Federal Register 8633 (January 31, 2025) rescinded EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (February 11, 1994). |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 7-41 Existing disparity in park acreage accessible to north side residents could be exacerbated if connections to parks near the project are severed by the light rail line. This is an environmental justice issue. See the main letter for further information. | Project effects on parkland and mitigation measures that would be implemented by the Council as part of the Project are summarized in Chapter 8 and detailed in Appendix A-8 of the Supplemental Final EIS. The LRT tracks would not sever connections to parks; safe crossing locations are included in the design and the new service would provide enhanced access to parks. Chapter 3, Section 3.4 of the Supplemental Final EIS presents an updated traffic analysis, which analyzes cross street delay and describes the sidewalk and trail improvements included in the Build Alternative. Travel times to parks for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists is not expected to change substantially as a result of the Project and the investment in active transportation infrastructure would improve the safety and comfort of the trip along most routes. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 7-43 This section is another opportunity to discuss acreage disparity and critical connections to parks. See the main letter for further information. | Project effects on parkland and mitigation measures that would be implemented by the Council as part of the Project are summarized in Chapter 8 and detailed in Appendix A-8 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 7-45 Nowhere is there a discussion of the potential impact of an at-grade crossing of the Grand Rounds by a light rail line. No railroad crossings of the Grand Rounds exist today, and to propose the first within an EJ community must be examined for its potential impacts on community cohesion. See the main letter for further discussion. | The at-grade crossing of the Grand Rounds by the LRT was modified to grade separate the crossing as described in Chapter 2, Section 2.4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS and would not present a significant barrier to park access or adversely affect community cohesion. Chapter 3, Section 3.4 of the Supplemental Final EIS presents an updated traffic analysis that includes cross street delay and the modifications to the street, sidewalk, and trail network under the Build Alternative. Travel times to parks were analyzed for pedestrians and bicyclists and would not change substantially as a result of the Project. The investment in active transportation infrastructure would improve the safety and comfort of the trip along most routes. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 7-45 Because the proposed ped/bike crossings of Broadway Avenue between Penn and James are not listed nor discussed, there can be no assurance that the project will improve overall cohesion. See the main letter for further discussion. | The analysis of Project effects on bicyclists and pedestrians is presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2 and Section 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. The design includes safe crossing locations for bicyclists and pedestrians and community cohesion would not be adversely affected by the LRT tracks. |



Chapter 7 Environmental Justice (Supplemental Draft EIS)

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|---|--|
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discuss the relocation effort for residential relocations. In particular, discuss the method used to determine similarly-priced homes and/or apartments are available in the area. A community ombudsman could serve as coordinator for the relocation process. 2. Discuss how FTA will protect community cohesion through the relocation effort. In particular, consider working with property owners and residents who may be relocated to new locations that are consistent with existing community connections and services (e.g., churches, social clubs, schools, health clinics, etc.) with similar or better accessibility (e.g., walking, biking, bussing, driving, etc.). 3. Discuss how the following mitigation measures can be adopted: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Providing relocation assistance and translation services for residential (owners and renters) and non-residential displacements, and assigning a relocation consultant to provide one-on-one support and individualized assistance to meet the unique needs of each community member or family subject to relocation; b) For residents interested in staying within their current community, committing to compensating individuals such that they can relocate to a different residence within their neighborhood; c) Providing educational sessions and other resources for residents to ensure they are properly informed regarding the relocation efforts, compensation programs and other services available, as well as resources on essential knowledge for homeowners to mitigate potential effects of gentrification in the future (e.g., handling property taxes, disputing valuations, etc.); and d) Committing additional funds to invest in local affordable housing initiatives in the affected municipalities. 4. Consider and explain how FTA can duplicate the Gordie Howe Bridge Bridging Neighborhoods Home Swap Program created in 2017 for residents directly affected by the construction of the New Gordie Howe International Bridge between Detroit, Michigan and Windsor, Canada. The Program provided residents with the option to exchange their current home for one in another neighborhood at no cost. This program was designed for homeowners in the project area who wanted to relocate but were not offered a buyout to do so. 5. Discuss efforts to assist small businesses with relocation. 6. Discuss efforts designed to help local businesses survive during the construction period. Consider and explain ways FTA can help small businesses, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Duplicating the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's small business mitigation programs: the Business Interruption Fund and Eat Shop Play program, which provided financial assistance to small "mom and pop" shops and free marketing assistance, respectively; and b) Informing and assisting small businesses in seeking Small Business Administration loans – 7(a) loans and 504 loans. 7. Commit to working with community leaders to ensure linguistically isolated community members are continually informed about relocations, mitigation opportunities, etc. | <p>The Council has considered EPA's recommendations to mitigate the effects of construction and property acquisition and developed a mitigation program tailored to the affected community. The mitigation measures are described in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS.</p> |



Chapter 7 Environmental Justice (Supplemental Draft EIS)

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|--|---|
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>Gentrification can be a result of transit or highway projects in areas that experience greater economic investment following project implementation. As property values and rent prices steadily rise, community members are often pushed out of their neighborhoods and unable to access the new economic, health, education, and environmental benefits brought about by the transit project. FTA, the Council, and Hennepin County officials have an opportunity to explore mitigation measures to reduce the possibility of gentrification.</p> <p>Recommendations for the SFEIS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify members of the community most at risk from gentrification (e.g., renters, senior citizens, those who cannot receive benefits due to their immigration status, etc.). 2. Establish partnerships (e.g., Council, Hennepin County, etc.) that can produce a comprehensive framework to identify investments that align with a community-based vision. The framework can: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Identify displacement drivers; b) Address the supply of housing to ensure it meets current demand, anticipates future demand, and remains of good quality and reliability; c) Foster inclusive development, including access to high-quality job opportunities and training for existing residents; d) Identify, recommend, and encourage adoption of new development incentives without displacement; e) Engage developers to encourage development without displacement; f) Identify areas with the community for protection and enhancement; and g) Establish a comprehensive list of strategies that will engage the city and the community to work together to implement new incentives that avoid displacement. | <p>Hennepin County and the Council formed a partnership and established the ADWG to develop the framework via a community-based vision to minimize impacts to community cohesion and displacement pressures. Chapter 9, Section 9.1.2.6 has been updated to reflect the work that builds on the ADWG recommendations - a Coordinated Action Plan for Anti-Displacement for the Blue Line Extension Corridor, published in August 2024 and the "Project actions" that would be implemented by the Council as part of the Project.</p> |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>EPA acknowledges the history of disproportionate effects included in Chapter 7 of the SDEIS. In addition to past effects and those from the proposed Project, gentrification would increase the disproportionate effect of the Project on the underserved communities in the Project area. FTA has an opportunity to explore mitigation measures to reduce the possibility of gentrification.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analyze the cumulative impact from past actions in relation to the proposed Project. In particular, consider the potential effects of gentrification as seen with other transit projects. 2. Ensure mitigation measures reflect full consideration of historic effects faced by the community. For example, the loss of community benefits, effects to community cohesion, relocations, inability to move to certain areas, etc. from past projects, in addition to the possibility that gentrification will once again displace residents, should be analyzed. | <p>The analyses presented in this chapter for the Supplemental Draft EIS were prepared in compliance with Presidential EOs that have been rescinded.</p> <p>EO 14148, Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, 90 Federal Register 8237 (January 28, 2025) rescinded EO 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation’s Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (April 2023).</p> <p>EO 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, 90 Federal Register 8633 (January 31, 2025) rescinded EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (February 11, 1994).</p> |



Chapter 7 Environmental Justice (Supplemental Draft EIS)

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|--|---|
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>The SDEIS references the Blue Line Extension Anti-Displacement Recommendations Report (Report). While we commend the work of the Anti-Displacement Work Group (Work Group), the recommendations found in the Report are not protective because they are not implementable actions. It is unclear how these recommendations can be implemented through direct action.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discuss next steps by the Work Group to create and implement the recommended policies to protect the community (e.g., mandatory relocation assistance policy, limiting investor purchasing/corporate ownership, land disposition, rent stabilization, etc.). Without definitive policies to address displacement, gentrification may be a cumulative impact of the proposed project. 2. Discuss which entity(s) would be responsible for implementing the recommendations described in the Report. The previously-suggested ombudsman would be a suitable entity to ensure anti-displacement policies are being upheld after construction is completed and the full scope of the economic effects of the transit project is realized. 3. Until Report policies can be created, describe specific actions that will be provided to protect residents, particularly renters, from suffering the effects of socioeconomic change as a result of the proposed transit project. | <p>The analyses presented in this chapter for the Supplemental Draft EIS were prepared in compliance with Presidential EOs that have been rescinded.</p> <p>EO 14148, Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, 90 Federal Register 8237 (January 28, 2025) rescinded EO 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation’s Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (April 2023).</p> <p>EO 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, 90 Federal Register 8633 (January 31, 2025) rescinded EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (February 11, 1994).</p> |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain how community engagement will inform mitigation measures for unavoidable relocations, parcel acquisitions, and lost parking spaces. EPA recommends FTA consider creating a community advisory board consisting of representatives from each of the communities listed in Chapter 7, Environmental Justice and the Justice40 Initiative, to further this discussion. 2. Mitigation for proposed effects will likely require efforts beyond the construction phase. Discuss the method(s) FTA will pursue to continually engage the community in meaningful ways beyond the construction phase. To help ensure that community members are informed and have an equal opportunity to access the benefits of project mitigation, EPA recommends FTA consider designating a community ombudsman. This designee could be responsible for the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Inform impacted community members of available programs and resources; b) Work with individuals to assist them in pursuing benefits and completing the necessary materials; c) Follow up with individuals who are selected for benefits to ensure that they receive the benefits of the programs; d) Monitor and report the number of community members who utilize the programs; e) Monitor the amount and percentage of program resources utilized annually; f) Ensure ongoing monitoring and compliance as described in the SFEIS and Record of Decision (ROD); and g) Maintain a line of communication between community members and FTA, the Council, and local municipalities. | <p>The analyses presented in this chapter for the Supplemental Draft EIS were prepared in compliance with Presidential EOs that have been rescinded.</p> <p>EO 14148, Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, 90 Federal Register 8237 (January 28, 2025) rescinded EO 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation’s Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (April 2023).</p> <p>EO 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, 90 Federal Register 8633 (January 31, 2025) rescinded EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (February 11, 1994).</p> |



Chapter 7 Environmental Justice (Supplemental Draft EIS)

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|---|
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | Create a chart for the FSEIS with proposed mitigation measures designed to offset unavoidable disproportionate effects to underserved communities with the corresponding entity(s) responsible for mitigation. | Commitments and mitigation measures and the party responsible for implementation will be included in table format in the Amended ROD. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-8 -- Harms Associated with past projects section. This section could mention CP rail corridor and Humboldt Yards as well as TH 55 as major barriers. | The analyses presented in this chapter for the Supplemental Draft EIS were prepared in compliance with Presidential EOs that have been rescinded. EO 14148, Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, 90 Federal Register 8237 (January 28, 2025) rescinded EO 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (April 2023). EO 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, 90 Federal Register 8633 (January 31, 2025) rescinded EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (February 11, 1994). |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 6-8 -- Remove "unfortunate" from sentence: Transportation projects in the Project area, and in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area more broadly, have an unfortunate history of displacing residents. This makes it seem like this impact couldn't have been known before the projects were implemented. | The analyses presented in this chapter for the Supplemental Draft EIS were prepared in compliance with Presidential EOs that have been rescinded. EO 14148, Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, 90 Federal Register 8237 (January 28, 2025) rescinded EO 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (April 2023). EO 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, 90 Federal Register 8633 (January 31, 2025) rescinded EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (February 11, 1994). |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 7-4 -- Methodology. The evaluation of adverse and beneficial effects does not consider and adequately incorporate the past harms as part of the no-build baseline. City staff recommends a more comprehensive representation of these harms such as the disinvestments in housing in "Definitely Declining" and "Hazardous" classified neighborhoods, and the lack of multifamily housing options in "Best" and "Still Desirable" classified neighborhoods due to redlining; the impacting legacy of racially restrictive covenants on EJ communities' ability to build wealth through home and property ownership and the appreciation of those properties; and the existing built condition of highway and freeway expansion, and the interchanges, - and its relationship with vehicle crashes and injuries to EJ communities. | The methodology presented in this chapter for the Supplemental Draft EIS were prepared in compliance with Presidential EOs that have been rescinded. EO 14148, Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, 90 Federal Register 8237 (January 28, 2025) rescinded EO 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (April 2023). EO 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, 90 Federal Register 8633 (January 31, 2025) rescinded EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (February 11, 1994). |



Chapter 7 Environmental Justice (Supplemental Draft EIS)

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 7-21 -- Freeway Development section - I-94 in Minneapolis was built in North Minneapolis in 1980s. | <p>The analyses presented in this chapter for the Supplemental Draft EIS were prepared in compliance with Presidential EOs that have been rescinded.</p> <p>EO 14148, Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, 90 Federal Register 8237 (January 28, 2025) rescinded EO 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation’s Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (April 2023).</p> <p>EO 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, 90 Federal Register 8633 (January 31, 2025) rescinded EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (February 11, 1994).</p> |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 7-23 -- Include percentage of non-car households for Hennepin County and state. | <p>The analyses presented in this chapter for the Supplemental Draft EIS were prepared in compliance with Presidential EOs that have been rescinded.</p> <p>EO 14148, Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, 90 Federal Register 8237 (January 28, 2025) rescinded EO 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation’s Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (April 2023).</p> <p>EO 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, 90 Federal Register 8633 (January 31, 2025) rescinded EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (February 11, 1994).</p> |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 7-27 -- Section 7.3. This section should detail the engagement of communities along 21st Ave North, too. | <p>The details presented in this chapter for the Supplemental Draft EIS were prepared in compliance with Presidential EOs that have been rescinded.</p> <p>EO 14148, Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, 90 Federal Register 8237 (January 28, 2025) rescinded EO 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation’s Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (April 2023).</p> <p>EO 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, 90 Federal Register 8633 (January 31, 2025) rescinded EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (February 11, 1994).</p> |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 7-39 -- Update with latest Minneapolis Climate Equity plan goals. | <p>The analyses presented in this chapter for the Supplemental Draft EIS were prepared in compliance with Presidential EOs that have been rescinded.</p> <p>EO 14148, Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, 90 Federal Register 8237 (January 28, 2025) rescinded EO 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation’s Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (April 2023).</p> <p>EO 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, 90 Federal Register 8633 (January 31, 2025) rescinded EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (February 11, 1994).</p> |



Chapter 7 Environmental Justice (Supplemental Draft EIS)

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | A couple lines on Figure 7-8 are pointing to the wrong place (Locations with 1 and 3 mitigations got swapped). | The figures presented in this chapter for the Supplemental Draft EIS were prepared in compliance with Presidential EOs that have been rescinded. EO 14148, Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, 90 Federal Register 8237 (January 28, 2025) rescinded EO 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation’s Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (April 2023). EO 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, 90 Federal Register 8633 (January 31, 2025) rescinded EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (February 11, 1994). |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Is or should exposure to industrial pollution be a separate category under historic harms? | The analyses presented in this chapter for the Supplemental Draft EIS were prepared in compliance with Presidential EOs that have been rescinded. EO 14148, Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, 90 Federal Register 8237 (January 28, 2025) rescinded EO 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation’s Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (April 2023). EO 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, 90 Federal Register 8633 (January 31, 2025) rescinded EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (February 11, 1994). |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 7-45 -- Minneapolis section, first sentence, should be 21st Ave N rather than St. | The document has been reviewed for references to N 21st Ave. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 7-45 -- Minneapolis section: This section could also detail ped crossings strategy, especially west of James Ave N. | Pedestrian crossings and the Project effects on pedestrians and bicycles are described in Chapter 3, Section 3.2 and Section 3.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Adverse effects are not expected to result from the LRT crossings. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 7-47 -- Table 7-11 shows number of noise impacted properties. A map of the impacted properties should be included. | Coordination with affected properties is ongoing and can be shared with City staff. Figures with noise impacts are included in Chapter 5 Section 5.6 of the Supplemental Final EIS and Appendix A-5 Noise and Vibration Technical Report in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Project Office references the Anti-Displacement Working Group (ADWG) Recommendations Report for identifying policy changes and resource re-allocation to support anti-displacement initiatives. However, the Project does not clearly articulate the indirect-impacts and cumulative effects from the Build Alternative, and the possible mitigation commitments for keeping existing residents and businesses within the study area. | Mitigation tailored to the affected community are described in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Chapter 7 Environmental Justice (Supplemental Draft EIS)

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|--------------|--|---|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | While the project accurately identifies the Environmental Justice (EJ) and Disadvantaged Communities with the project area, it does not go far enough to evaluate impacts and consider the incomes of these communities along the project route compared to the general population of the Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) that is defined as part of the study area for 4.6 Economic Effects. | <p>The analyses presented in this chapter for the Supplemental Draft EIS were prepared in compliance with Presidential EOs that have been rescinded.</p> <p>EO 14148, Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, 90 Federal Register 8237 (January 28, 2025) rescinded EO 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation’s Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (April 2023).</p> <p>EO 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, 90 Federal Register 8633 (January 31, 2025) rescinded EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (February 11, 1994).</p> |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The SDEIS identifies anticipated impacts of the project on adjacent communities, including transportation, noise and vibration, property and business, and indirect impacts of the project. A commitment to mitigate these impacts and actions for how to mitigate the impacts will be included in the Supplemental Final Environmental Impact Statement (SFEIS) and is expected in Spring 2025. The identified impacts to the community must be mitigated or avoided to support and achieve racial equity. | The Council has committed to implementing cost-effective mitigation measures to address the effects of the Project. The mitigation measures and adverse effects that may remain after mitigation are described for each transportation and environmental category in Chapters 3, 4, 5 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Leo | Brosius | | The Project is a life safer for families and friends, reducing poverty, improving the lives of all Americans and immigrants. | Comment noted. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Tom | Not provided | | Concerned about businesses going under or being replaced by big businesses. | Please see response to FRC 8. |



Chapter 9 Process and Public Outreach

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|---|---|
| Individuals | Anndrea | Young | | Sec. 7.3.1.1. Heritage Park Neighborhood Association is not included in the list of current cohort members. | Heritage Park Neighborhood Association is included in Chapter 9 Table 9-1 and has been added to the cohort list. |
| Individuals | David | Dirkers | | Is there a link to the document as a whole? | The document can be reviewed as a whole document on the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board Environmental Review Projects Database at https://webapp.pca.state.mn.us/eqb-search/project-detail/259855?sild=259855-PROJ0000000001 . |
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | MET council doesn't have a plan to stop this project even if there is a no vote, seems corrupt. | Hennepin County and the Cities of Brooklyn Park, Crystal, Robbinsdale and Minneapolis voted to Approve the Project during the Municipal Consent Process in late September and early October of 2024. Additionally, please see response to FRC 10. |
| Individuals | Aaron | McMenamy | | The 42nd Ave Intersection station location is unpopular with local property and business owners. Further conversation with these stakeholders should ensue. | The Project design included coordination with stakeholders and the City of Robbinsdale which resulted in the Downtown Robbinsdale Station location changing to north of 40th Ave which is presented in the Supplemental Final EIS Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings. |
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | The Blue line extension should be put to a vote. Please pause the LR. | Thank you for your response. Hennepin County and the Cities of Brooklyn Park, Crystal, Robbinsdale and Minneapolis voted to Approve the Project during the Municipal Consent Process in late September and early October of 2024. Please see response to FRC 10. |
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | I feel as if the process to approve the BLRT does not include the community voice. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council acknowledges concern about public input into the planning process, please see response to FRC 10. |
| Individuals | Brandon | Nerburn | | Empirical responses to the concerns espoused by opponents of this project must be the crux of whether or not this project moves forward. | FTA and the Council have reviewed the comments received on the Supplemental Draft EIS and provided responses. |
| Individuals | Aaron | Lebuhr | | Please send out flyers to get more people's opinion on this project. | The Council conducted an extensive public outreach campaign using a wide array of community engagement tools. The events held are presented by year in Chapter 9 of the Supplemental Draft and Final EIS. Between August 2020 and June 2024, more than 800 events reached approximately 37,700 people, more than 30,000 postcards were mailed, and surveys were administered with 4,790 survey responses received. Since the publication of the Supplemental Draft EIS, community engagement has continued with a focus on understanding the needs of those most affected by the Project, and additional surveys have been administered. Chapter 9 describes the public coordination activities that have occurred prior to publication of this Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Michael | Meehan | | The Metropolitan Council's presentations have been characterized by polished brochures and smiling representatives, yet they have conspicuously omitted any discussion of the project's potential negative impacts. There is a clear lack of transparency and consideration for the well-being of the affected communities. | The Supplemental Draft EIS lists in detail a comprehensive list of potential impacts caused by the project and explores options to mitigate for these impacts. The Supplemental Final EIS lists project commitments to mitigate for environmental, social and economic impacts. Additionally, the Project has taken steps to incorporate input from communities along the Project corridor through extensive outreach efforts and public committees. Please see response to FRC 10 for more information about the Project's consideration of public input. |



Chapter 9 Process and Public Outreach

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-------------|--------------|--|---|
| Individuals | Chris | Connaker | | It's overly detailed, to make reading each piece and comprehending each piece in context, making it hard for community members to understand. | NEPA documents need to follow regulatory requirements and guidance documents that result in detailed analyses and use of technical language. The Executive Summary uses common language and presents the major findings of each EIS section. The Council acknowledges the technical nature of environmental review documents and offered a "Virtual Learning Session" and five "Office Hours" to help stakeholders understand the findings of Supplemental Draft EIS. |
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | Met Council does not listen to people. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council acknowledges concern about public input into the planning process, please see response to FRC 10. |
| Individuals | lee | guekguezian | | The disruption to daily life, social networks, and local economies that residents and businesses experience is often minimized or overlooked in favor of broader, aggregated outcomes. This can lead to a disconnect between the project's anticipated benefits and the lived realities of those most directly affected by it. | The Council has conducted extensive public engagement to understand the lived realities of those most directly affected by the Project in order to develop measures to mitigate adverse effects. The coordination with affected stakeholder began in 2020 during development of the Supplement Draft EIS. The measures to mitigate adverse effects developed in coordination with affected communities is listed in the Amended ROD. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Kristel | Porter | | Where is the community feedback data from Met Council's Outreach? | The Council website includes a Community Engagement page where community feedback from the outreach process can be reviewed. Additionally, an interactive website overview of engagement is available online at https://yourblueline.org/our-approach-to-engagement . |
| Individuals | Emily | Gahlon | | Met council is not trustworthy, The Minnesota Auditor of the Legislative Office determined that the Met Council failed to provide full transparency related to costs for the Southwest Light Rail corridor, did not hold contractors accountable, and failed to recognize adverse soil conditions that have plagued construction | The Council reports regularly on legislative, financial, and governance issues at twice monthly Council meetings. The public is encouraged to attend meetings to express their points of view on matters before the Council. |
| Individuals | randy | swanson | | Hold a referendum. | Two public hearings were held during the public comment period for the Supplemental Draft EIS. See Chapter 9 in the Supplemental Final EIS for a summary of engagement and coordination for the Project. Hennepin County and the Cities of Brooklyn Park, Crystal, Robbinsdale and Minneapolis voted to Approve the Project during the Municipal Consent Process in late September and early October of 2024. |
| Individuals | Nick | Heid | | I feel a summary of the information in common language broken into each section would be useful. If such a format exists, I may need help locating it. Public communication on climate and GHG considerations should be utilized more as pushback in my neighborhood is higher than I'm comfortable with. | The Supplemental Final EIS Executive Summary is written in common language and presents the major findings of each EIS section. Trips made on light rail are less polluting than trips made via gasoline powered automobiles. The light rail would be powered by electricity. Chapter 1 of the Supplemental Final EIS presents more information about the Purpose and Need for the Project. |
| Individuals | Nick | Heid | | There needs to be more public outreach in educational formats. I understand the want for listening sessions, but I do believe the facts are clear and there is much misinformation going around about various aspects of the project. | The Project Outreach and Engagement includes multiple formats aiming to educate through exhibits, drawings, plans, verbal communication, Q&A, Project Fact Sheets and a dedicated Project website available online at: https://metro council.org/Transportation/Projects/Light-Rail-Projects/METRO-Blue-Line-Extension.aspx . Chapter 9 Tables 9-3 through 9-6 are included in the Supplemental Final EIS to document the forms of public outreach employed. |



Chapter 9 Process and Public Outreach

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------|------------|-------------|--------------|--|---|
| Individuals | Faw | Cue | | There will be consequences to members of the Met Council for following the money if they railroad this project through against the publics wishes without putting it to a vote | Hennepin County and the Cities of Brooklyn Park, Crystal, Robbinsdale and Minneapolis voted to Approve the Project during the Municipal Consent Process in late September and early October of 2024. See also response to FRC 10. |
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | I don't trust Met Council to listen to the people they are supposed to serve. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council acknowledges concern about public input into the planning process, please see response to FRC 10. |
| Individuals | Paul | Tatting | | This project should not go forward until the Green Line is finished. | The design and construction of major infrastructure projects is a lengthy process. The Green Line Extension is expected to be operational in 2027- well before the Blue Line Extension is operational. Both these projects are independent of each other and follow their own schedules. |
| Individuals | Paul | Tatting | | Let MnDOT oversee the whole process from bids to constructions because they are more reliable than Met Council. | The Council reports regularly on legislative, financial, and governance issues at twice monthly board meetings. The public is encouraged to attend meetings to express their points of view on matters before the Council. |
| Individuals | Jesse | Christensen | | Please listen to the people and make a decision accordingly. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council acknowledges concern about public input into the planning process, please see response to FRC 10. |
| Individuals | Lisa | Crockett | | Met council is not listening to its people, and is obfuscating it's plans by making the EIS confusing. | NEPA documents need to follow regulatory requirements and guidance documents that result in detailed analyses and use of technical language. The Executive Summary uses common language and presents the major findings of each EIS section. The Council acknowledges the technical nature of environmental review documents and offered a "Virtual Learning Session" and five "Office Hours" to help stakeholders understand the findings of Supplemental Draft EIS. Please see response to FRC 10 for more information about the Project's outreach efforts |
| Individuals | David | Dirkers | | I feel that given the size & scope of this report; the public should have a significantly longer review period to dive into all of this detail | A 45-day public comment period on the Supplemental Draft EIS was held in accordance with federal requirements. NEPA documents need to follow regulatory requirements and guidance documents that result in detailed analyses and use of technical language. The Council acknowledges the technical nature of environmental review documents and offered a "Virtual Learning Session" and five "Office Hours" to help stakeholders understand the findings of the Supplemental EIS. |
| Individuals | Adam | Gustafson | | How can we have municipal consent without a full report? Stop this. | The Council followed the State of Minnesota municipal consent process with each of the cities along the Project Alignment. The steps in the municipal consent process are outlined in the Project Development page of the Minnesota Department of Transportation website at https://dot.state.mn.us . Hennepin County and the Cities of Brooklyn Park, Crystal, Robbinsdale and Minneapolis voted to Approve the Project during the Municipal Consent Process in late September and early October of 2024. See also response to FRC 10. |
| Individuals | Bob | Shull | | Everything is so distorted from what your report says will be the impact to what actually will be the outcome of putting light rail on this corridor. | The EIS follows accepted methodology and regulatory guidance documents to assess the potential impacts of the Project. |



Chapter 9 Process and Public Outreach

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|--|---|
| Individuals | Matt | Bruns | | The Met council has ignored the North Loop neighborhood in their community engagement. | <p>Thank you for providing feedback. Engagement events hosted in the North Loop neighborhood included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Supplemental Draft EIS Office Hours at the Metro Transit North Loop Garage on July 11, 2024 ■ Minneapolis Virtual Community Meeting to discuss the proposed North Loop and 21st Ave alignment options on November 14, 2023 ■ Community Update Meeting at the Metro Transit North Loop Garage on November 8, 2023 ■ BLE North Loop Community Meeting at The Neu Neu on October 18, 2023 ■ Minneapolis Community Meetings for East of I-94 at the Metro Transit North Loop Garage on July 25, 2023 ■ Minneapolis Community Meeting for East of I-94 at the Twin Cities International School on July 22, 2023, and July 27, 2023 <p>Engagement reports documenting events since October 2020 are available online at: https://metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Projects/Light-Rail-Projects/METRO-Blue-Line-Extension/Community-Engagement/Reports-and-Comments.aspx. Reports which summarize feedback, including results of a survey conducted with 476 responses for options east of I-94, are published online at: https://metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Projects/Light-Rail-Projects/METRO-Blue-Line-Extension/Publications-And-Resources/Engagement/Reports/Engagement-Summary-June-Aug-2023.aspx. For a discussion of the Council’s acknowledgement of concerns about public input into the planning process, please see response to FRC 10.</p> |
| Individuals | Matt | Bruns | | The project team has not listened to their own studies and feedback that note this route down 10th Ave is not conducive to LRT. Nor do they recognize their own survey that shows 60% of respondents prefer the 10th to 17th route along I-94 instead of the transit mall option. They have this information and are not sharing it. | <p>Thank you for your comment. The Preferred Alternative was advanced through the Municipal Consent process and impacts and mitigation measures are presented in the Supplemental Final EIS. Surveys help generate feedback and are part of a greater process for collecting information. The decision-making process for the Project is illustrated in Figure 9-1 of Chapter 9 in the Supplemental Final EIS. The Cities of Brooklyn Park, Crystal, Robbinsdale and Minneapolis, and Hennepin County voted to Approve the Project during the Municipal Consent Process. The Project will continue to work with the City of Minneapolis through Design Resolution Teams as engineering advances to final design. Please see response to FRC 10. Chapter 3 in the Supplemental Final EIS presents the results of an updated traffic analysis, which demonstrates that the intersections along this route would operate at similar or better levels of service under the Build Alternative compared to the No-Build conditions.</p> |



Chapter 9 Process and Public Outreach

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Individuals | Matt | Bruns | | At meetings with project team members they have stated that they are not here to discuss options or listen to us, they are here to 'tell us' what they are doing. This is not community engagement nor working with the impacted communities. | Since 2020, the Project has extended the reach of its communications and public involvement by directly contracting with multiple community and cultural groups. Each instance and phase of community engagement has a different approach. Some are meant to provide information; many seek public input, and some are open house events where stakeholders can find information for questions related to their specific situation. The outreach team and partners have hosted and participated in hundreds of in-person and virtual events resulting in nearly 38,000 points of contact with the public. From August 2020 to June 2024 there has been 4,790 survey responses, over 3,500 interactive map comments and 400 comments from comment forms. Please see response to FRC 10. For more information. |
| Individuals | Richie | Song | | Harrison and the Heritage Park neighborhoods, including Golden Valley, should continue to be involved in the project, including environmental justice for those communities. | The Council has committed to continued coordination with affected communities along the Project Alignment. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Shoua | Salas | African Career Education & Resource, Inc | A lot of small businesses I talk to, they have no idea that the Blue Line is coming through and I'm afraid that some of these businesses and residents have no idea of the impact of what's going to happen to them until it's too late. | The Council has performed door-to-door surveys of the businesses that would be affected by Project operation and construction and developed measures to minimize and mitigate adverse effects to the extent practical. See Chapter 9 for a description of outreach to businesses and the Amended ROD for a list of commitments and mitigation measures that were developed in coordination with affected businesses. |
| Individuals | Brandon | Detvongsa | | The Brooklyn Park community is very excited and also very nervous about this project, they really don't know what to expect. | The Council has committed to maintaining regular communication with the affected community throughout Final Design and Construction, see list of commitments/mitigation measures in the Amended ROD. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | Blue Line Coalition | Ensure community feedback is genuinely incorporated into final decisions through transparent reporting and community advisory boards. Provide regular updates to the community on how their input is shaping the project. | The Council will continue to report on community feedback from public outreach activities and engage with the Community Advisory Committee during Final Design and Construction. |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | Appendix A-2, Alternatives Development Process, demonstrate community support for the proposed alignment by including coordination with stakeholder groups in the project area. Discuss how public feedback received on the 2022 Route Modification Report Addendum pertaining to recommendations for additional stations and improved station access was addressed in the development of the Build Alternative. EPA recommends summarizing coordination with and including letters of support from stakeholder groups in Appendix A-4: Community and Society Analysis. | Stakeholder group coordination for the Project has been included by year in Tables 9-3 through 9-6 in Chapter 9 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Refer to Appendix CR Comments and Responses Received on the Supplemental Draft EIS for Comment Supporting the Project. A summary of the public and agency coordination that informed the design of the Preferred Alternative has been included in Chapter 11 to address this comment. Stakeholder support is captured in this appendix under "General Support." |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | 1. Include copies of all interagency coordination sent to, and received from Federal and state resource agencies, Tribes, and local municipalities. 2. Include a list of all Federal, state, and local permits that would be required to undertake the Preferred Alternative. | Chapter 9, Section 9.3 includes a list of permits and approvals and Appendix A-9 includes copies of all interagency correspondence. |



Chapter 9 Process and Public Outreach

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create an appendix that includes all comments received during the SDEIS comment period, including any applicable transcripts of comments from the public. 2. Create an appendix that includes all correspondence sent to and received from government agencies regarding the proposed project. 3. Create a chart that lists the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) All comments received during the SDEIS review period. b) FTA's response with a reference to the section that was changed as a result of the comment, if applicable. Include section and page number for ease of reference. c) Associated mitigation efforts with the responsible entity. | Appendix A of the Amended ROD summarizes the comments received on the Supplemental Draft EIS and provides FTA's responses. Letters and public hearing transcripts are included in Appendix A in full and a list of community members and organization who submitted comments is provided. The Introduction to the Supplement Final EIS describes the changes made to each section of the EIS and text additions are shown throughout the document. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The city requires an agreement with the Project Office on long-term ownership and maintenance to support proposed designs for the 21st Avenue bridge over I-94. | The Council will continue coordination with City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and MnDOT to determine long-term ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the 21st Ave bridge. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 9-2 -- Recommend spelling out all committees in 9.1.2.2. | The acronyms are spelled out in Figure 9-1 and defined in Chapter 1, Section 1.3.1 and in the Abbreviations and Glossary attachment to this Supplemental Final EIS – acronyms are spelled out at first occurrence only beginning in Chapter 1, Executive Summary is independent and acronyms are spelled out in this document and are repeated at first instance in subsequent chapters |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 9-7 -- Additional consideration/description of the intense engagement/focus on Minneapolis routing needs to be more explicitly mentioned in 9.1.3.5 - so much of what has been decided about Minneapolis has been during the September 2022 to now timeframe. | Summary tables of all Community Engagement Events have been included to present the intense engagement focus on Minneapolis routing needs from September 2022 to Present. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Please describe all the different types of engagement: listening sessions vs. community led vs. stakeholder interviews - what is the difference, etc.? Some sort of infographic would help. Or table with summary numbers? | Chapter 9, Section 9.1.4 describes the different types of engagement and summary tables and graphics have been added or updated. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 9-12 -- Is 9.1.4.5 referring to legislatively mandated quarterly meetings? If so, would be good to indicate as such. | Revised per comment to clarify these are legislatively mandated. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 9-17 -- Spell out OWJs. | Acronyms are spelled out at first instance (Chapter 8 for OWJ) beginning with Chapter 1 and included in the Abbreviations and Glossary attachment to this Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 9-18 -- Change 21st St bridge section to 21st Ave bridge. | Supplemental Final EIS text has been revised per comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Agency Coordination - No comments. Compilation of various letters between agencies. | Comment noted. |



Chapter 9 Process and Public Outreach

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|--|---|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Engagement Reports - No comments on this appendix. Compilation of all of the engagement reports and online comments | Comment noted. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis City Council | Concerns that public engagement regarding this portion of the alignment have been insufficient. | See Chapter 9 for a description of the extensive public engagement that occurred since August 2020 and response to FRC 10. |
| Individuals | Alexandra | Ko | | Met Council is not going to listen to public comments. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council acknowledges concern about public input into the planning process, please see response to FRC 10. |
| Individuals | Alexandra | Ko | | They failed to listen during the SWLRT running through Chain of Lakes. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council acknowledges concern about public input into the planning process, please see response to FRC 10. |
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | Met council will ignore those opposed to this project. | Thank you for providing feedback. The Council acknowledges concern about public input into the planning process, please see response to FRC 10. |
| Individuals | Michael | Connor | | I would like to obtain the most current plan of the BLRT. | Since publication of the Supplemental Draft EIS, the Project design has been developed to a 30% Design. The preliminary design plans are included in Appendix A-E of this Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Fred | Not provided | | This system should use a closed payment system. | Thank you for your comment. The fare payment system is standardized across the Metro Transit system to facilitate transfers. |



Chapter 10 Project Cost and Funding

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|--|--|--|
| Individuals | James | Mccluskey | | Existing Light Rail is not well maintained. Project is too expensive, money should be spent on improving existing transit. | Thank you for your comment. Please see responses to FRC 2, 4 and 6. |
| Individuals | Colleen | Meyer | | The project is too expensive. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 4. |
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | This project is a bad way to use funds. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 4. |
| Individuals | Michael | Meehan | | The financial implications of this project are deeply troubling. Southwest rail is already controversial, and this is more expensive. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 4. |
| Individuals | Christina | PRIBULA | | This is too expensive, 4 Billion dollars could solve every problem the metro has | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 4. |
| Individuals | Gregory | Dumais | | The project is too expensive. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 4. |
| Individuals | Mary | Pattock | | This is not the best use of funds, there should be a cost benefit analysis done. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 4. |
| Individuals | SCHURKEY | SWANKE | | This project should not go forward unless fares can cover costs. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 4. |
| Individuals | Belinda | Trombley | | This is too expensive. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 4. |
| Individuals | Christopher | Thanghe | | Upfront costs are too high. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 4. |
| Individuals | Jesse | Christensen | | This project is unwanted and expensive. Since the trains do not make money off of fares all the burden will fall on tax payer, who do not want it. | Thank you for your comment. Please see responses to FRC 2 and 4. |
| Individuals | Lois | Siljander | | The train will be continuously costly, even after construction. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 4. |
| Individuals | Danika | Okerstrom | | Money could be better spent on other projects. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 4. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 10-2 -- Construction costs assumed starting in 2026; but not starting until (at least) 2028 - adjust estimate? (10.1.2) | Construction costs are revised to 2027 per Project schedule discussion in the Supplemental Final EIS Chapter 10, Section 10.1 in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 10-3 -- Does the anticipated revenue from fares and MVST and regional sales tax cover the anticipated operating costs in full? | Anticipated revenue from fares, MVST, and the regional sales tax cover anticipated operating costs in full. If MVST revenues do not grow as anticipated, several sources of supplementary operating funding could be made available to the Council's Transportation Division and are identified in Chapter 10, Section 10.2 in the Supplemental Final EIS. The Council projects the MVST revenues to increase at a rate of 3.0 percent per year from 2023 to 2041. |
| Individuals | Alexandra | Ko | | The project is too expensive. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 4. |
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | The project is too expensive. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 4. |
| Individuals | Ellen | Olmscheid | | You are over budget. | Project funding sources are identified in Chapter 10, Section 10.1 in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | Met Council is not reliable in how it spends its funds. | The Council reports regularly on legislative, financial, and governance issues at twice monthly board meetings. The public is encouraged to attend meetings to express their points of view on matters before the Council. |



Design

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------|---|---|
| Government Organizations | Tim | Sandvik | City of Robbinsdale | At the risk of being redundant, I have attached letters sent to the project office in the spring of 2023 and the spring of 2024, as we continue to identify concerns with the project as proposed. As noted in my email sent July 26, 2024 (below), there remains disagreement as to whether or not resolution has been met through our ongoing conversations. We do understand that the project office feels some comments fall outside the project, but this highlights an ongoing frustration of our Council as to the timing of Municipal Consent. For example, we understand the preferred location for a park and ride will be included increased traffic on our side roads (West Broadway, Hubbard Ave, etc.) this will be to their detriment; however, when asking about mitigation for those issues, we are told its outside the scope of the project. Further, we have been told we will see updated ridership numbers in “summer of 2024” – it is now August, and we haven’t seen projections that justify the need for a 300-space park and ride in downtown Robbinsdale. | Thank you for your comment and your ongoing coordination efforts to support the Project’s design development. Project staff have worked diligently to address the concerns outlined in your March 2023 letter. The traffic analysis, which has been updated based on 2050 data, indicates that intersections in the City of Robbinsdale would operate at acceptable levels of service under the Build Alternative and no adverse impacts are anticipated to result. Chapter 3 describes the analysis result and identifies the mitigation measures that would be implemented by the Council. The ridership forecasts have also been updated and are presented in Chapter 2. The Council looks forward to continued coordination with you as work progresses on the final design and construction plans. |
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | Station placement is not ideal, particularly the Lowry station. | Station placements are determined by ridership models, reasonable spacing to ensure effective travel time, and based on coordination with both municipalities, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, and major facilities around the area. Lowry Station is located on the border of the City of Robbinsdale and the City of Minneapolis to serve both cities. |
| Individuals | Michael | Meehan | | The proposed rail layout offers little to no benefit for Robbinsdale merchants and appears to serve primarily the interests of North Memorial. | Station placements are determined by ridership models, reasonable spacing to ensure effective travel time, and based on coordination with municipalities. Lowry Station is located on the border of the City of Robbinsdale and the City of Minneapolis to serve both cities. Another station in Robbinsdale is located north of 40th Ave where many businesses are and would benefit those businesses. |
| Individuals | Maxwell | Holperin | | For the downtown/ North Loop section, please consider increasing pedestrian-only spaces around the station, to make it more pleasant to use the light rail. | Comment will be considered during design development. See Appendix A-E in the Supplemental Final EIS for pedestrian circulation and connectivity in the Conceptual Engineering Drawings at the current level of design. |
| Individuals | Matthew | Adamson | | Create stations that could eventually support future rail lines that connect outer suburbs rather than the hub and spoke model presently being used. | LRT guideway is a fixed transit system that is part of a larger transit network. See Chapter 3, Section 3.1 in the Supplemental Final EIS for additional details about the regional transit network and relationships to the Project and the Network Now planning effort that Metro Transit applies to developing regional transit connectivity. Station placements are determined by ridership models, reasonable spacing to ensure effective travel time, and based on coordination with municipalities. |
| Individuals | Brian | Hansen | | The alignment on through downtown Minneapolis along 10th and Washington does the same thing to people living nearby the route that was mentioned as the reason for other changes on I believe the Lyndale alignment. The Washington and 10th Ave intersection is a key intersection in the north loop area. | Thank you for your comment. The Preferred Alternative was advanced through the Municipal Consent process and impacts are presented in the Supplemental Final EIS. Stakeholder engagement will continue through design and construction. Chapter 3, Section 3.4 and BLE Traffic Operations Technical Report in Appendix A-3 of the Supplemental Final EIS presents the results of an updated traffic analysis, which includes traffic mitigation measures and considers cross-street delay, including at 10 th and Washington. |



Design

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|--|
| Individuals | Drew | Neubauer | | Expansion of bike infrastructure is also exciting, I would like to see a bike lane extended to the farmers market. | Comment will be considered during design development. Additional details about the bicycle conditions are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.3 of the Supplemental Draft EIS and bikeways and bike lanes are identified in the Conceptual Engineering Drawings shown in Appendix A-E of the Supplemental Draft EIS. |
| Individuals | Cecilia | Blackwood | | I feel as though using the junction at Broadway to send the tracks north along the proposed route would make more sense than the proposal to send the line north 22nd Ave and build a new bridge over 94 from Washington Ave | Thank you for your comment. Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Draft EIS and the Supplemental Final EIS describes the process and rationale to identify the Preferred Alternative. |
| Individuals | Thomas | Reiner | | The land itself is very marshy. When they built the Hy-Vee they had to basically install a French drain under the entire parking lot to keep it from sinking. | Thank you for your comment. Engineering design includes geotechnical boring collection for subsurface conditions to inform constructability and design specifications. See Chapter 5, Section 5.4 for additional information about soils in the Project area and Section 5.4.4.2 for mitigation related to geotechnical conditions. |
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | The Lowry station, among other stations, is poorly positioned. Specifically because it is made to service a hospital, and the path to the hospital is long and inclined, making it difficult for people with mobility issues to access the hospital. | Station placements are determined by ridership models, reasonable spacing to ensure effective travel time, and based on coordination with municipalities. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Jo | Kanne | | I love the idea of trains, but they don't have the flexibility to get people exactly where we need to be and can be a little less accessible. So having a safe place to do transfers is even more important than for busses (where I can just walk 2-3 blocks to the next stop if there is a problem) | LRT guideway is a fixed transit system that is part of a larger transit network. See Chapter 3, Section 3.1 in the Supplemental Final EIS for additional details about the regional transit network and relationships to the Project and the Network Now planning effort that Metro Transit applies to developing regional transit connectivity. Bus connections are identified in Chapter 3 Table 3-3 of the Supplemental Final EIS for Project LRT stations. |
| Individuals | Josh | Cramer | | I would respectfully request that a pedestrian bridge be considered for the crossing of HWY 81 around 41st Ave to connect the two major retail centers of downtown Robbinsdale. It would make crossing safer for riders, and for pedestrians and cyclists of all kinds | Improved bicycle and pedestrian crossings of CR 81 are included in the Project, though a pedestrian bridge at this location is not under consideration at this time. |
| Individuals | Travis | Joseph | | I would like to Native flowers and bushes plant to help feed pollinators. I also like those rain gardens instead of storm drains. This would benefit pollinators. It also helped clean ground water and slow runoff. Instead of planning, non-native species, grass or cement on the Boulevards. | Thank you for your comment. Vegetation and landscaping plans will be developed as design progresses. Vegetation and landscaping implemented are subject to maintenance agreements with local entities. |
| Individuals | Ben | Werner | | I think two stations, rather than one at Emerson-Dupont is preferred. The more stations, the broader impact. | Station placements are determined by ridership models, reasonable spacing to ensure effective travel time, and based on coordination with municipalities. Thirteen LRT stations are included in the Project and are presented in the Conceptual Engineering Drawings shown in Appendix A-E of the Supplemental Draft EIS. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Justen | Pohl | Enticing Entertainment | Moreover, the absence of a designated loading and unloading area for our box truck will create significant challenges for our event logistics, potentially disrupting our business and hindering our ability to serve the community. We request that you preserve Loading Zone: Designate a specific loading and unloading zone for our box truck to facilitate seamless event preparation | Comment will be considered during design development to provide vehicle access. |



Design

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|---|--|--|
| Organizations and Businesses | Laura | Jester | Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission | For clarity, all references to “Bassett Creek” and “Bassett Creek Tunnel” should be changed to “Old Bassett Creek Tunnel” as only the Old Bassett Creek Tunnel crosses the project alignment. Examples of where this change should be made are in Section 5.3.2.2 Waterways and Public Waters (including Table 5-6) and Section 2.3.3 in Appendix A-5 (including Table 2-2); there may be other locations in the SDEIS where this change should be made. | Comment noted. The references to “Bassett Creek” and “Bassett Creek Tunnel” are revised to “Old Bassett Creek Tunnel” in the Supplemental Final EIS Section 5.3.2.2 and Table 5-6, Section 2.3.3 of the Appendix A-5 (including Table 2-2), and in Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Laura | Jester | Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission | The Minneapolis Page 6 drawing in Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings should show and label the location of the Old Bassett Creek Tunnel. | Labels will be added for the Old Bassett Creek Tunnel to the Conceptual Engineering Drawings shown in Appendix A-E of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Laura | Jester | Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission | Separate from the SDEIS, the BCWMC Engineer also performed a preliminary review of the 30% design drawings. Layout 2 of 23 of the design drawings shows a blue shaded line that should be labeled as the “Old Bassett Creek Tunnel.” | Labels will be added for the Old Bassett Creek Tunnel to the Conceptual Engineering Drawings shown in Appendix A-E of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Laura | Jester | Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission | Through the BCWMC Engineer’s preliminary review of the 30% design drawings, we heard that there are plans to modify the Old Bassett Creek Tunnel as part of the METRO Blue Line Extension project. The BCWMC is less concerned regarding the Old Bassett Creek Tunnel because the City of Minneapolis and MWMO manage the Old Bassett Creek Tunnel infrastructure. However, the BCWMC has some interest because the Old Bassett Creek Tunnel serves as an overflow for Bassett Creek during high flows. In 2000, the BCWMC, MWMO, and the City of Minneapolis entered into a joint and cooperative agreement that defines the responsibilities of the parties with respect to the New Bassett Creek Tunnel and the Old Bassett Creek Tunnel. The agreement requires accommodation of a 50 cfs overflow from Bassett Creek to the Old Bassett Creek Tunnel during the 100-year flood. | Comment will be considered during design development. |
| Individuals | Susan | Weinberg | | I personally favor a pedestrian/bike bridge over 81 (Bottineau Blvd.) connecting Robin Center to the rest of Downtown Robbinsdale. | The Downtown Robbinsdale Station will be located north of 40 th Ave based on stakeholder input. Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Draft EIS and the Supplemental Final EIS describes the process to identify the Preferred Alternative which includes improved bicycle/pedestrian crossings of CR 81 but does not include a pedestrian bridge. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Todd | Shoemaker | Shingle Creek and West Mississippi Watershed Management Commissions | Some locations along the corridor will be adjacent to regional stormwater systems. Modifications to regional stormwater BMPs should be explored if onsite practices are not achievable. | Comment will be considered during design development. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Richard | Adair | Bryn Mawr Active Transportation Committee | Crossing of the Blue Line by the Grand Rounds trail between Victory Memorial Drive and Wirth Park should be kept at grade with the following additions: 1. Slow down bikers by putting a fence across the trail marked "RR Crossing" that requires them to make a 90 degree turn.2. Put the crossing near the Penn Ave station so trains are traveling slowly and using bells and horns to alert bikers and pedestrians.3. Reject the option of flyover bridge because many bikers would bypass it to save time and energy and instead seek an informal and less safe place to cross the tracks. | Comment will be considered during design development. Flyover bridges are not proposed at the Wirth/Victory Memorial Pkwy Regional Trail for the Build Alternative in the City of Minneapolis. See Chapter 3, Section 3.3 for Bicycle Conditions and refer to the Conceptual Engineering Drawings shown in Appendix A-E of the Supplemental Final EIS for proposed trails. Ongoing stakeholder coordination will be advanced through final design. |



Design

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Individuals | Jen | Salyers | | Consider using an elevated track and station at 40th Av N. to curb noise, additional traffic congestion and safety issues. | The Downtown Robbinsdale Station will be located north of 40 th Ave at-grade based on stakeholder input. Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Draft EIS and the Supplemental Final EIS describes the process to identify the Preferred Alternative. See Chapter 5, Sections 5.6 for additional details about noise impacts and Chapter 4, Section 4.7 for additional details about safety in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Jen | Salyers | | Instead of a station at 40th Ave N, put the station at 36th Ave N/Co.Rd. 81 to help people with mobility issues get to the HyVee Grocery. | Thank you for your comment. Refer to the Conceptual Engineering Drawings shown in Appendix A-E of the Supplemental Draft EIS for pedestrian crossings and sidewalk connections at 36th Ave N/CR 81. The station location north of 40th Ave in Downtown Robbinsdale was identified during the Municipal Consent Process. |
| Individuals | Jen | Salyers | | It would make more sense to move the station near 40th Ave N to 41st Ave N. This would give better access to downtown Robbinsdale and be a little less disruptive to the people living near the 40th Ave N./Co. Rd 81 intersection. | Thank you for your comment on station placement. The Downtown Robbinsdale Station will be located north of 40 th Ave based on stakeholder input. Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Draft EIS and the Supplemental Final EIS describes the process to identify the Preferred Alternative. |
| Individuals | Brad | Sutton | | The soils along 81 are built on wetlands; we had a sinkhole appear in Robbinsdale on 42nd and 81 a little while back. How will these "soft" areas be mitigated to accommodate the weight of the trains? | Geotechnical considerations based on soil borings will be factored in during design advancement to plan construction techniques for soft soils. |
| Individuals | Brad | Sutton | | How will you accommodate emergency traffic to North Memorial Hospital? Not the ambulances, but the people arriving by car who will not take priority to cross the street vs. the continuation of the train on its route or boarding at the (terribly placed) Lowry Station? | A traffic signal will be installed at Lowry Ave/Theodore Wirth Pkwy to facilitate traffic movements near the at-grade LRT crossing. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Kristel | Porter | West Broadway Business Association | Provide options for elevating the light rail throughout the entirety of North Minneapolis or at high density points between I94 and 26th Avenues along with an increase in stops within the SDEIS | Station placements are determined by ridership models, reasonable spacing to ensure effective travel time, and based on coordination with municipalities. LRT structure was evaluated in North Minneapolis between Lowry Ave and Washington Ave. City stakeholder feedback identified this as visual and physical barrier to a community divided by the I-94 interstate. Chapter 2 Appendix Chapter 2 in the Supplemental Draft EIS describes the process to identify the Preferred Alternative. Chapter 4 Appendix A-4 Visual Quality Technical Report Appendix B includes visualizations at Key View Points analyzing this impact from a visual quality perspective and is available on the Project website at https://metro council.org/Transportation/Projects/Light-Rail-Projects/METRO-Blue-Line-Extension/Publications-And-Resources/Environmental/SDEIS/BLE_SDEIS_Appendix-A-4-Visual-Quality-Technical-Re.aspx . |
| Individuals | Steve | Wessman | | As proposed the Lowrey station is dangerous to bikers, people with strollers, skateboards and anything with wheels to get caught or tripped up in tracks. Rails should be placed on a bridge above parkway, not at ground level. | Thank you for your comment on station placement. Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Draft EIS and the Supplemental Final EIS describes the process to identify the Preferred Alternative. |



Design

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|-------------------------|---|---|
| Individuals | Jonathon | Wescott | | I would like to see a change made in Minneapolis to follow the alternative alignment as this seems like the more reliable and safer routing of the train through the Northern Minneapolis area, but I'd like to see it run along the on-ramp to 94 underneath Plymouth Avenue, have a station located under Plymouth Avenue with vertical circulation access to both sides of Plymouth Avenue. | Thank you for your comment. Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Draft EIS and the Supplemental Final EIS describes the process to identify the Preferred Alternative. The Project Alignment was advanced by the Corridor Management Committee in September 2023 and the City of Minneapolis during the Municipal Consent Process which concluded in October 2024. |
| Individuals | Jonathon | Wescott | | I'd then like to see the train continue along the on-ramp underneath the Washington Avenue exit and then switch to an elevated line which would require about a 2.8 percent grade by my estimations from underneath the Washington Avenue to have a level crossing with Broadway Avenue. | Thank you for your comment. Chapter 2 of the Supplemental Draft EIS and the Supplemental Final EIS describes the process to identify the Preferred Alternative. The Project Alignment was advanced by the Corridor Management Committee in September 2023 and the City of Minneapolis during the Municipal Consent Process which concluded in October 2024. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | North Memorial Hospital | Locating the station between the extended bridges, below the Bottineau Boulevard roadway is of concern to North Memorial Hospital. The elevations we have been shown have been insufficient to determine access and egress from all directions. Our tantamount concern is for the safety of our Team Members and visitors who might choose to ride LRT. Lighting and security for riders and pedestrians must be guaranteed. The open station design that has proven troublesome at other Metro Transit stations is shown in plans to-date. North would like to review and understand how restricting access, as is being planned at other stations, might serve our neighborhood better. | The project will continue to coordinate directly with North Memorial Hospital to address safety and security concerns through design and construction. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | North Memorial Hospital | Robbinsdale Hospital is a 24-hour operation. Hence, team members arrive and leave work at all hours. And while only approximately 5% of team members currently use transit, the LRT line may be more popular. To increase ridership to/from Robbinsdale Hospital, lighting, camera surveillance, platform safety and regular Metro Transit Police visits should be included in the design and operating plan. | The Project will continue to coordinate directly with North Memorial Hospital to address safety and security concerns through design and construction. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | North Memorial Hospital | North must be convinced that the proximity of the LRT operating system will not affect helicopter navigating systems or any other component of the operations of AirCare operations, specifically it's helipad which will be eliminated under current plans. North's position remains that there must be mitigation for the emergency landing changes and insulation from any other impediment to Air Care operations. We believe that relocating the helipad across the street atop the Emergency Department, at project expense, is the best solution to maintaining safe, secure and perhaps improved operations. This would also involve working with the City of Robbinsdale to revise flight path and emergency landing agreements. | The Project will continue to coordinate directly with North Memorial Hospital to address safety and security concerns through design and construction. |



Design

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|---|--|
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>Energy efficient design and material selection could reduce construction and operations costs and promote a high-quality work environment, while also better protecting the environment. Recycling construction debris also preserves valuable landfill space and makes use of materials that have high embodied energy.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>a) Achieving Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) certification at the platinum level (or designing for net-zero energy usage) for new stations associated with the Project. Best practices for energy efficiency and sustainable building design can include the use of energy-efficient building materials, such as south-facing skylights and windows, motion-censored lighting, solar or wind power, and Energy Star certified windows and doors. In addition to reducing the overall environmental footprint, green building certification programs promote health by encouraging practices that protect indoor air quality. At a minimum, EPA encourages FTA to commit to analyzing the strengths and feasibility of these strategies.</p> <p>b) Constructing proposed park-and-ride facilities, sidewalks, pedestrian bridges, or other surfaces slated for driving or walking using permeable pavement or porous pavers to reduce runoff.</p> <p>c) Identifying and implementing opportunities for additional green stormwater management practices. Opportunities include, but are not limited to, green roofs, bioswales, and rain gardens.</p> <p>d) Discussing to what extent FTA will require energy efficiency measures, greenhouse gas reductions, and other sustainability measures, per Executive Order 13693.</p> <p>e) Incorporating electric vehicle charging stations in park-and-ride areas and designating priority parking spots for carpools and low emission vehicles.</p> <p>f) Committing to recycle a high percentage of construction and demolition debris.</p> <p>g) Replacing raw materials with recycled materials for infrastructure components. Options include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Using recycled materials to replace carbon-intensive Portland Cement in concrete as “supplementary cementitious material;” and - Using tire-derived aggregate in lightweight embankment fill and retaining wall backfill. <p>h) Using recycled materials in pavement applications, such as crushed recycled concrete, recycled asphalt pavement, and rubberized asphalt concrete. Also, in some circumstances, demolished onsite asphalt can be re-used (e.g., cold in-place recycling or full depth reclamation).</p> | <p>Thank you for your comments. We will explore sustainability initiatives such as the State of Minnesota Buildings, Benchmarks & Beyond (B3) and the Metro Transit sustainability management plan to guide the project.</p> |



Design

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>Chapter 3, Transportation, indicates FTA’s Simplified Trips-on-Project software (STOPS) was used to develop travel ridership forecasts for the proposed Project. Two STOPS models were developed: one calibrated to pre-COVID-19-pandemic (2019) transit demand and a second calibrated to post-COVID-19-pandemic (2022) transit demand. Socioeconomic data is used to model increases from existing transit ridership derived from an on-board survey to forecast year levels. In the pre-COVID-19-pandemic model, socioeconomic data from 2018 was considered representative of a base year of 2019, and 2040 data were used to determine horizon year (2040) demand. Similarly, 2020 data was used in the post-COVID-19-pandemic model to represent the base year (2022), and 2050 data was considered representative of a 2045 horizon year. It is unclear why 2020 socioeconomic data was used to represent base year 2022.</p> <p>Recommendation: Explain the basis for using 2020 data, at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, to represent post-COVID-19 transit demand and the implications for travel ridership forecasts.</p> | <p>In the Supplemental Draft EIS ridership forecasts, population and employment (socioeconomic) data from 2020 were used because 2020 was the closest year available to the year of analysis (2022). The data was provided by the Metropolitan Council as part of their regionally adopted population and employment forecasts. The population and employment data are not a primary driver of ridership demand in the STOPS model (transit onboard survey data from 2022 is the primary source of ridership demand). Population and employment data are used primarily to understand how the region will grow into the horizon year and are therefore more relevant to horizon year demand.</p> |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | <p>The engineering concept layouts included in the SDEIS do not align with designs reviewed by City staff as part of the draft 30% plans and do not reflect more recent revisions discussed with the project team. Notable changes not reflected in the SDEIS layout includes but is not limited to: Lowry Ave Station design; location and number of ped and bike crossings including the proposed signal control; Queen Avenue bike connection; On-street parking at Penn Avenue; James Avenue station design; Reconstruction of W Broadway from Irving Avenue North to east of Lyndale Ave; Reconstruction of Irving Avenue North, Girard Avenue North, Fremont Avenue North, Emerson Avenue North, Bryant Avenue North, Aldrich Avenue North, and Lyndale Avenue North between 21st Avenue North and West Broadway; Pedestrian realm, greening, bikeway design and vehicular lanes on 21st Avenue North between 4th Street North and North 2nd Street and Washington Avenue between 21st Avenue North and 10th Avenue North; and Corridor design including track configuration along 10th Avenue North, 7th Street North, and 6th Avenue North.</p> | <p>Supplemental Final EIS Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings present the design analyzed for the Supplemental Final EIS. Ongoing coordination with the City of Minneapolis will continue through advanced design during Design Resolution Team meetings, and design milestone plans will be publicly available on the Project website at: https://metro council.org/Transportation/Projects/Light-Rail-Projects/METRO-Blue-Line-Extension/Design-Engineering.aspx.</p> |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | <p>Project design must align with the city’s Complete Street Policy and Street Design Guide.</p> | <p>Design will be advanced with relevant design criteria, including Minneapolis’ Complete Street Policy and Street Design Guide.</p> |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | <p>Pedestrian Level Street Lighting should be evaluated and included as part of the project as appropriate in accordance with the City of Minneapolis Street Lighting Policy and Transportation Action Plan.</p> | <p>Design will be advanced with relevant design criteria, including the City of Minneapolis Street Lighting Policy and Transportation Action Plan.</p> |



Design

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Safety and security at station locations and routes to/from stations is critical. It is recommended that measures such as (but not limited to) security cameras and street lighting (per the City of Minneapolis street lighting policy) be installed and that station design allows for visibility at stations. | Comment will be considered during design development. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Traction power substations and signal bungalows must be appropriately placed, and the visual impact mitigated. Traction Power Substations should be appropriate for the community context, should be landscaped, should be fenced for safety, and should be designed with architectural fencing instead of chain link fence. | Comment will be considered during design development. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The project must minimize tree loss; salvage trees where possible and replace trees per the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board urban tree policy. Boulevard design should be consistent with the Minneapolis Street Design Guide. | Project will work to minimize tree loss and replacement trees will be coordinated with the r Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. Boulevard design options will be considered during design development. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Embedded track should be constructed along the entire length of the project within Minneapolis and must be designed to allow for emergency vehicle access needs. | Track design will be considered during design development. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The preferred alignment has the potential to impact access and structural condition of the Bassett Creek Tunnel, which is a major storm sewer facility serving a large area. Development along this corridor has created additional access challenges to the tunnel. The Project Office should evaluate how access to this tunnel is to be provided, potential structural impacts and mitigate negative impacts as necessary to ensure continued operation of the tunnel in this location is sustainable, including the existing agreement and replacement plan with Metro Transit. | Comment will be considered during design development to plan for access to the Bassett Creek Tunnel. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 19 -- Table 4-1 includes reference noise levels for LRT on embedded track. How do these reference levels change with turning tracks, aged tracks, etc.? | Table 4-1 also included the reference noise level for ballast and tie track. The text below Table 4-1 includes adjustments for track on elevated structures, at crossovers or turnouts (turning tracks), and additional references for bells and horns at grade crossings and stations. The assumption in the noise assessments is that track and wheels will be maintained in good condition. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 73 -- 2741 Upton Ave is located on a hill and a retaining wall adjacent to West Broadway. How is this representative of properties that are located directly on West Broadway? | 2741 Upton Ave N is represented in Appendix A-E Conceptual Engineering Drawings in the Supplemental Final EIS. This property is represented in aerial photography on the south side of West Broadway outside of the Project Limits of Disturbance. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | A station at Washington Avenue North and West Broadway must be constructed with the project to adequately serve the corridor travel shed, provide improved connectivity and access for communities that were impacted by the construction of I-94, support project and city economic development goals, and advance local and regional equity by providing greater access to employment areas. This is in addition to stations at Lowry Avenue, Penn Avenue, James Avenue, Lyndale Avenue, and Plymouth Avenue. | A new West Broadway Station has been added to the Project and is evaluated in the Supplemental Final document. |



Design

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 10-2 -- When does the project officially reach 30% plans? The city requests that the project include a scenario for O&M cost generation that includes the Washington and W Broadway station | An LRT station at W Broadway Ave is included in the Project and O&M costs are presented in Chapter 10 of the Supplemental Draft EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis City Council | Concern about how proposed plans would impact the newly constructed Lowry Avenue bridge(s) - affecting a significant taxpayer investment and posing potential environmental impacts. | Comment noted. The Project design would impact these bridges to integrate with the current design. Conceptual Engineering Drawings are presented in Appendix A-E of the Supplemental Final EIS for additional details. Ongoing coordination with the City of Minneapolis will continue through Design Resolution Team meetings with City staff and the CMC with elected officials. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis City Council | Concern by some that the Project Office has not provided the desired level of information regarding the design of the Lowry stop including sufficient design details and renderings. | The Project office and Engineering Design Team will continue to coordinate with stakeholders as design advances to refine station area plans and details. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis City Council | Concerns by some that the 21st Avenue route has not been studied with the same level of detail as the potential Broadway and Lowry routes. | N 21st Ave and W Broadway Ave were analyzed with options for track and vehicular travel combinations for east/west movements simultaneous with the Lowry Ave route as a part of the Route Modification Report available online at https://metro council.org/Transportation/Projects/Light-Rail-Projects/METRO-Blue-Line-Extension/Publications-And-Resources/Design/Route-Modification-Report-April-2022.aspx . This study preceded the development of the Supplemental Draft EIS. |
| Government Organizations | Tim | Sandvik | City of Robbinsdale | The project office has shared information that a parking structure could be justified at a level of 500-600 vehicles. Again, it was recognized that a multi-story structure with excessive size, would not fit with the nature of the neighborhood. Preference: Based on discussions and review of available information, the City Council feels that a right-sized parking structure is preferred. Finally, further design and detail will require community and Council review to minimize adverse impacts caused by additional traffic trips and the placement of bus stops (to better understand bus traffic concerns, including planning that limits congestion as Council will not support extended layovers or long-term queueing of buses). | Based on updated ridership model and coordination with the City of Robbinsdale, the latest park and ride concepts at this location accommodate approximately 300 vehicles. This creates a one-story structure on the West Broadway frontage. |
| Government Organizations | Tim | Sandvik | City of Robbinsdale | Grade Separation A grade separation will mitigate takings required for a grade running line, and will also mitigate traffic and pedestrian (to include bicyclists) movements across those intersections. Based on Council discussion, Council preference is a grade separation of the Light Rail Line over 41st Ave and 42nd Ave. Finally, grade separation will mitigate some public safety concerns as it will reduce the response times of public safety vehicles. | The Project office has evaluated these concerns and provided additional details in a memo to City of Robbinsdale from Fall 2024. |
| Government Organizations | Tim | Sandvik | City of Robbinsdale | The City Council gained consensus that the alignment of the line should be center running. | The Project design reflects center running alignment. |
| Government Organizations | Tim | Sandvik | City of Robbinsdale | North Memorial/South Station – The most recent round of conversations with the project office included station area planning for the downtown area, but not the proposed “North Memorial” stop. Council has heard concerns about the bridge design that is required to elevate a stop at North Memorial. Further, Council requests the project office continue conversations with North Memorial and neighbors of the south area of Robbinsdale. | The Project office will continue conversations with North Memorial and Robbinsdale. |



Design

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------|--|---|
| Government Organizations | Tim | Sandvik | City of Robbinsdale | The City Council considered two vicinities for a station location in the downtown area – near 41st Avenue and near 40th Avenue. After considerable discussion about the benefits and concerns of each, the City Council supports a station nearer 40th Ave (with a preference south of 40th Ave). Understanding a station closer to 41st Ave would benefit the downtown area more, Council supports an option that better serves Robbinsdale residents, including an abundance of naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAH), including transit dependent population(s). Finally, South 40th Ave includes more than 450 units of NOAH, many of which would be included in the project office’s projected ridership. | Station is planned to be located south of 40th Ave based on coordination with the City of Robbinsdale. |
| Government Organizations | Hollies | Winston | Brooklyn Park | <p>City staff have been working closely with the project office on design details emanating from the 2022 route modification. Following are design-related comments in the context of the SDEIS:</p> <p>63rd Avenue Station - The SDEIS is based on conceptual engineering drawings from September 2023. Since that time, the project office has refined the design at the 63rd Avenue Station to improve pedestrian safety at the intersection. Those improvements are reflected on the updated plans released in March 2024. The Final Supplemental EIS should include those improvements as well, including documentation of the additional benefit to pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Oak Grove Station Area - Earlier in the design process, MNDOT and the project office committed to including accommodations for an east-west street in the northwest quadrant of West Broadway and Highway 610 to serve new development, known as the "fourth leg." This connection is critical to realizing the vision of the station area plan for high quality mixed-use development, and it must be included in the final project design and Final Supplemental EIS. City staff are also working with the project office on rethinking the siting of the park and ride to better facilitate transit oriented development. This likely does not impact the environmental documentation, but final plans should reflect this change.</p> <p>Sidewalk Connections - The City of Brooklyn Park intends to implement sidewalk connections along critical roadway segments to and from our station sites. We have applied for Federal funding via the regional solicitation process and are optimistic that the request will be funded. The City requests that the portions of these segments that are within the METRO Blue Line Extension project construction limits be constructed as part of the project.</p> | <p>63rd Avenue Station - The Supplemental Final EIS will include updates from Municipal Consent plans, which incorporate the intersection design refinements referenced.</p> <p>Oak Grove Station Area - Design will be updated to accommodate the future "fourth leg" and the project will continue to coordinate with the City of Brooklyn Park to understand their progress with MnDOT for final approval for inclusion.</p> <p>Sidewalk Connections - The project office will continue coordination with the City of Brooklyn Park for adjacent local work. The inclusion for additional sidewalk within the project limits will be discussed on a case-by-case basis.</p> |



Construction

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Individuals | Randy | Voelker | | Extensive disruptions will occur during and after construction. | While detailed construction means, methods, and sequencing would be developed by contractors in later stages of the Project, the Council anticipates that the transitway and roadway improvements would be largely progressed and phased in concert with the construction of bridges, with lane closures and construction detour routes affecting different locations for different time periods within the four-year period. Adverse effects on communities are unavoidable during construction of major infrastructure projects. The Council has committed to mitigation measures and Best Management Practices during construction to minimize the effects of construction to the extent practical. The Amended ROD identifies the anticipated construction period effects (see Table 1, Project Impacts by Environmental and Transportation Category) and the mitigation measures that would be implemented (see Attachment A, Project Mitigation Measures and Responsible Parties by Environmental and Transportation Category). |
| Individuals | Hank | Not provided | | The disruptions that will arise from construction is unfair to Robbinsdale residents, who have already had to deal with massive construction in recent memory. | The Project would be constructed over a four construction seasons and detailed construction means, methods, and sequencing would be developed by contractors in later stages of the Project. However, the Council anticipates that the transitway and roadway improvements would be largely progressed and phased in concert with the construction of bridges, with lane closures and construction detour routes affecting different areas over the four-year period. Adverse effects on communities are unavoidable during construction of major infrastructure projects. The Council has committed to mitigation measures and Best Management Practices during construction to minimize the effects of construction to the extent practical. The Amended ROD identifies the anticipated construction period effects (see Table 1, Project Impacts by Environmental and Transportation Category) and the mitigation measures that would be implemented (see Attachment A, Project Mitigation Measures and Responsible Parties by Environmental and Transportation Category). |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 4-40 MPRB recommends inclusion of "construction sequencing and scheduling" as a potential mitigation option. | Mitigation is presented in Chapter 8 of the Supplemental Final EIS and the Draft 4(f) and 6(f) document published with the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>The SDEIS indicates mitigation options such as locating staging areas in places where visibility effects would be minimal, minimizing the need to remove vegetation to accommodate construction, shielding light sources used in nighttime construction, and restoring areas disturbed during construction could be included in project commitments.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commit to including all mitigation options found in the SDEIS. 2. Compile all mitigation in a single 'green sheet' in the SFEIS with telephone numbers stakeholders can use if mitigation is not followed. 3. Describe the potential extent of nighttime construction in residential areas as well as noise and visual mitigation that will be employed to reduce overnight effects to the greatest extent practicable. 4. Describe the planned communication strategy for notifying residents and businesses about noise and disruption from the proposed action. | The Council will apply EPA's recommendations in the development of the Construction Mitigation Plan, Construction Communication Plan, and construction staging. Development of these plans will occur at advanced design and prior to construction through ongoing coordination with city stakeholders and engagement. |



Construction

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|---|
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | <p>Chapter 4, Community and Social Analysis, indicates mitigation measures for short-term effects to community amenities would be identified in the Construction Mitigation Plan and Construction Communication Plan, which would be developed as the Project advances to construction. The SDEIS does not explain why mitigation plans and detailed economic impact analyses would be developed after the NEPA process, when the public cannot review and provide input.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop the Construction Mitigation Plan and Construction Communication Plan for the SFEIS. At a minimum, provide typical mitigation measures associated with transit projects to inform reviewers of possible mitigation and effects that will not be mitigated. 2. Provide updated socioeconomic data regarding the “sub-geographic areas” referred to above, as well as updated estimates of potential economic effects. Discuss what these effects mean for the well-being of the “sub-geographic areas.” | <p>A Construction Mitigation Plan, Construction Communication Plan, and construction staging will occur at advanced design and prior to construction through ongoing coordination with city stakeholders through Design Resolution Team meetings and engagement.</p> <p>An updated economics analysis for the Project is presented in Chapter 4, Section 4.6 in the Supplemental Final EIS.</p> |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | <p>Detour routes must be provided for all short-term and long-term closures of pedestrian, bicycle, transit and vehicular facilities during construction, and align with city, state and federal policies, standards and guidelines including the city’s Complete Streets Policy.</p> | <p>Detours will be developed and communicated through signage and the Project website and communications. A Construction Mitigation Plan, Construction Communication Plan, and construction staging requirements will be developed prior to construction through ongoing coordination with city staff and engagement.</p> |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | <p>Project construction shall be coordinated with other major construction projects in the area occurring at the same time with a plan to minimize disruption of multiple projects.</p> | <p>Contractors and Construction staff will coordinate through construction with the City of Minneapolis.</p> |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | <p>Best practices for mitigating and communicating construction impacts for local businesses and residents before construction, during construction and after construction should be implemented.</p> | <p>The Council has committed to implementing Best Management Practices to minimize construction effects, see the Amended ROD.</p> |



General Support

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|---|---|
| Individuals | Brandon | Nerburn | | Support for this project is fundamentally the correct position in terms of our efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and addressing a socio-economic barrier that BIPOC communities face here in terms of accessing efficient and affordable public transportation extending outside of Minneapolis city limits. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Brandon | Nerburn | | This project is supported by the working-class people who it will benefit. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Dakota | Franko | | This project is important for our future. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Dakota | Franko | | I will be more likely to visit North Minneapolis because of this rail. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | K | F | | Please move forward with completing the construction of this extension. I currently rely on the 721, 22, and C and D line bus routes. I am very interested in seeing this blue line light rail extension completed to improve connections to Mpls, MSP, etc. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Andrew | Kadlec | | I am 100% for this. It would really connect our city and make it a lot more feasible to not own a car in many more places. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Robert | McCauley | | I have always wanted more light rail lines in the cities so I'm happy that we're getting more even if it doesn't benefit me directly. Trains are the core of good public transit. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Eli | Harvey | | It looks to me like the pros far outweigh the cons in terms of building the new rail line as planned. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Brian | Anderson | | be a Minnesotan and the great efforts we have taken as leaders in our region, but now I feel like we can still go above and beyond to. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Robert | Aronson | | show everyone at all levels (local -> national) what we can and are willing to do to support our communities and change the narrative. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Justen | Pohl | Enticing Entertainment | We are eager to collaborate with the city to find a solution that supports both the development of the Blue Line light rail and the continued success of our business. Our goal is to continue contributing to the community while adapting to the city's growth and development plans. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Elizabeth | Pike | | Fully support the expansion! I love that the Twin Cities are thinking ahead. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | John | Bowman | | We all need this project seen to completion. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Dominique | Wilson | | I think this is a transformative project for the area. It will help connect me to downtown and the airport as someone that struggles with reliable transportation. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Jeffrey | Klein | | We would use this train line often to travel into downtown from our neighborhood for events and food. Minneapolis and the surrounding suburbs need more public transportation like this to ensure we stay green and can keep up with other large cities. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Kate | Nelson | | Yes! Extend north, please. This asset should be accessible to all. Getting into town and connecting to the other lines is so valuable. Cut car emissions to work, the Mall, the airport, the depot, and to the University! | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Allison | Beyer | | WE WANT MORE PUBLIC TRANSPORT in mpls metro. I am proud to see we are working towards an environmentally friendly solution. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Maxwell | Holperin | | I agree that the 'build' alternative should be undertaken as soon as possible to mitigate future traffic impacts and improve access for North Side residents. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |



General Support

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---|--|---|
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | I support the light rail extension it is a good idea. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Matthew | Adamson | | MPLS needs to continue to grow their public transit! I travel for a living and prefer it and rely on it. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Daniel | Waddell | | This is such an exciting project! This will be an absolute boon to the community of the northwest metro. As a commuter, I'm particularly excited for the Plymouth station. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Richard | Adair | Bryn Mawr Active Transportation Committee | The Lowry Blue Line station will give people from all parts of the metro area access to our beautiful north side parks, including those who are transit-dependent. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Erin | Kayser | | Not only is this such an exciting project, but the SDEIS shows a strong commitment to minimizing the harmful impacts of this project and projects like it, particularly EJ and Justice40. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Ronald | Williams | | Not only will this route add significant public transportation for everyone in the Twin Cities region, but it will especially aid those in zero auto homes and bring business and affordable housing development, especially in north Minneapolis and Brooklyn Park where disinvestment has long ruled. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Drew | Neubauer | | Very exciting project, these suburbs were designed for street cars and it is nice to see them being used for what they were designed for. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Cecilia | Blackwood | | As a resident of the near north neighborhood, and as a carless individual who relies heavily on public transit, I wholeheartedly support the blue line extension in its grand outline. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Cecilia | Blackwood | | The ease of use of LRT and its reliability is a large factor in choosing it over bus routes going the same directions. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Henry | Stafford | | I am in total support of it. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Joel | Binder | | Benefits are immense. Please start building ASAP so I can start riding it soon. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | River | Flom | | Projects like this will reduce carbon emissions and increase transit accessibility for all in a city where it's hard to get around without a vehicle. There's no environmental impact statements on the status quo of cars in Minnesota yet we are required to do so for projects that would make this country better. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Geoffrey | Kozen | | Keep doing the good work and get the Blue Line Extension built! | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | George | Lee | | Push the project through! This is very much needed to develop Minneapolis into a world class city. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Soren | Stevenson | Our Streets | This is a great project that needs to move forward as fast as possible for the sake of our economic, climate, and street safety futures. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Michael | P | | I am in favor of the Blue Line extension as someone who has relied on transit in the Twin Cities for most of my time here due to not owning a motor vehicle. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Alec | Rutten | | I'm in favor of this extension. More transit options is better for more people and the environment. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Miranda | Rosa | | It would seriously cut down on my driving on 81 to downtown and the arts district to get to my studio. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |



General Support

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|--|---|---|
| Individuals | Kate | Sahnow | | The vast majority of NE MPLS residents are in your corner. I'm waiting and trusting that more direct and reliable public transportation will continue to be a priority for our beautiful metro area. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Ariel | Warne | | I'm looking forward to the blue line extension. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | santino | Rodriguez | | I don't think it will impact anything it will create more transit and jobs and school. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Dean | Ellingson | | I will definitely be a regular rider on the Blue Line from Brooklyn Park (85th Ave. Station) to downtown Minneapolis and MSP International Airport. Let's build it! | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Robert | Coleman | | I have family who lives near Folwell Park and I am a member of UFCW 663 and would use the Blue Line to visit their offices, which is currently very difficult. I strongly, strongly, support the Build alternative. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Tor | Viren | | All public transport is good and light rail is the fastest in the cities. I don't own a car so this line extension would be nice and useful and would help let me stay car free. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Keith | Scott | | It won't be long before I won't be able to drive. It will help me maintain some semblance of independence. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Olivia | Martin | | I am very excited for the extension to be built as I believe it will better connect so many communities. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Colin | Smith | | I am writing to express my support for the Blue Line Extension. Having previously experienced the construction of the original Blue Line as well as the Green Line, the impacts listed in the SDEIS are very much in keeping with those identified for previous transit projects. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Dylan | Deveza | | This extension is a great idea, as we need to reduce or dependability on cars. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Josh | Cramer | | This project is absolutely needed and will be a vital part of the sustainable future of our neighborhood. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Rodrigo | Lozada | | As a resident of color that lives near the proposed extension, I wholeheartedly welcome this transit project. It will bring better connectivity to my community especially the Northside which has the most transit dependent people in the entire state of MN. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Thomas | Simon | | This extension must be made no matter the costs thank you. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Natasha | Villanueva | | I am enthusiastic about the Blue Line Extension as an avid user of public transportation and Northside resident. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Brandon | Detvongsa | | I see the pros and cons of what this might signify what Minnesota will look like in the future whether for better or worse. I am excited for the opportunity to explore new ways of transportation that is better for our communities and cleaner and safer for our environment and its people. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Ben | Werner | | Thank you so much for all your hard work! This is really exciting. I can't wait for more light rail lines across the rest of the city. Rail is the future. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Joshua | Houdek | Sierra Club Minnesota North Star Chapter | The Sierra Club Minnesota Chapter is a strong supporter of the Blue Line Extension for the benefits that it's going to bring to current residents and future generations. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Ron | Williams | | The Blue line extension would benefit Robbinsdale, North Minneapolis and Brooklyn Center. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |



General Support

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|--------------|--|--|---|
| Individuals | Richie | Song | | I take the bus, and sometimes the busses are unreliable. A light rail will better service people. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Ricardo | Perez | The Alliance | We celebrate the anti-displacement work that is being done on this project. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Brandon | Detvongsa | | Our (Brooklyn Park) community see's that this will benefit people without vehicles. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Ron | Williams | | It is good to see anti-displacement measures being taken seriously. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Ron | Williams | | We should trust engineers about traffic flow problems. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Claudia | Fuglie | | People with disabilities have a hard time on the city bus, and an easier time using a train. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Claudia | Fuglie | | This will also help people who cannot afford a car. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | No additional comments: this topic will be covered by the 106 process. (In reference to Appendix A-4 Archaeological and Architectural History Reports) | Thank you for your comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | No additional comments; please apply Chapter 4 comments to the appendix. (In reference to Appendix A-4 Community and Social Analysis) | Thank you for your comment. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | No additional comments. (In reference to Appendix A-4 Cultural Resources Document) | Thank you for your comment. |
| Individuals | Leo | Brosius | | This transportation is a lifesaver for people. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |
| Individuals | Tom | Not provided | | Would be happy if more people ditched their cars. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 1. |



General Opposition

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|---|---|
| Individuals | Brenda | Remus | | Why does 81 not have facilities for busses? Will the new line have high enough ridership? There will be a lack of public safety on the light rail. Lack of law enforcement on the light rail. This project will disrupt life in Robbinsdale. | Thank you for your comment. Please see responses to FRC 2 and 6. |
| Individuals | Eric | Hillman | | 90% of Robbinsdale is against light rail. We would prefer bus rapid transit. Our light rail is worst in crime category. | Thank you for your comment. Please see responses to FRC 2, 5, and 6. |
| Individuals | Dan | Neubert | | I am a Robbinsdale resident who is opposed to this project for a variety of reasons, including traffic, noise, ridership. | Thank you for your comment. To view information on noise and traffic see Chapter 4, as well as their associated technical reports. Ridership can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.1. Please also see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | Robbinsdale and Crystal police are not in favor of BLRT. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | Not utilizing existing BNSF rail tracks; is too destructive. The process should be paused. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Constance | Romo | | The existing trains are not usable, and the new one will be no different. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Randy | Voelker | | No Net Transportation Value for On-Street Blue Line Extension. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Brenda | Remus | | The BLRT should stop and bus rapid transit should be implemented. | Thank you for your comment. Please see responses to FRC 2 and 5. |
| Individuals | Steven | Johnson | | The BLRT should stop and bus rapid transit should be implemented. | Thank you for your comment. Please see responses to FRC 2 and 5. |
| Individuals | Aaron | Lebuhr | | This project serves area's where people do not work and will fail. | Thank you for your comment. The Project will serve job centers and areas with increasing job growth. For more information and the factors supporting the Project's need, please see Section 1.4 and response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Michael | Meehan | | I strongly oppose this project. It is unnecessary and unwanted. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Steve | Palmberg | | End expensive boondoggle now. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 4. |
| Individuals | Ryan | Hammes | | I believe this agency needs to be disbanded because it failed on the green line project. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Julia | Le | | No, I don't approve of this. Huge burden on taxpayers. | Thank you for your comment. Please see responses to FRC 2 and 4. |
| Individuals | William | Anderl | | I oppose the entire project. Bus transportation is available in all the service areas impacted by this proposal. Costs of the project far exceed the benefits. Environmental damage from all aspects of construction can be eliminated in total if project is cancelled | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Mary | Pattock | | It would not provide the fine grain service networks that Bus Rapid Transit would provide. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2 and 5. |
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | Busses would be better. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2 and 5. |
| Individuals | Kari | Anderson | | Please do not extend the rail here. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Tom | Heinrich | | The blue line is a waste of taxpayer money | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 4. |
| Individuals | Joe | Wiatros | | Focus on safety of existing rails instead of building new ones. | Thank you for your comment. For more information on developing and ongoing public safety and security measures on Metro Transit, please see response to FRC 6. |
| Individuals | Joe | Wiatros | | Bus service is more comprehensive and flexible. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Noah | Barton | | There is no good reason not to use busses instead of a BLRT expansion. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | John | Caye | | This will be a boondoggle/over budget. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 4. |
| Individuals | Ken | Bollinger | | Green line was a disaster, and we'd like to see no more light rail. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | NANCEE | HARTNELL | | Not needed or wanted. Big waste of money for something that will get minimal use. | Thank you for your comment. Please see responses to FRC 2 and 4. |
| Individuals | randy | swanson | | End this expensive boondoggle. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 4. |



General Opposition

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---|--|
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | Do not spend tax dollars on this project. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Christopher | Thanghe | | I am against the BLRT. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Nancy | Johnson | | This project is poorly thought out because of its impact on traffic, community cohesion, and budgeting, and should not continue. | Thank you for your comment. Please see Chapter 4 for more information on traffic and community cohesion, and responses to FRC 2 and 4. |
| Individuals | Paul | Gustafson | | I oppose this project because it is over budget and slow. | Thank you for your comment. The Project budget is currently in development and is not overbudget. Please see responses to FRC 2 and 4. |
| Individuals | Drew | Scott | | Blue line would be better if it ran through denser neighborhoods. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Ramona | Elwood | | Stop this project. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Melonie | Fuhrman | | Not a good idea. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Nykia | Hardy | | This project will destroy the feel of Robbinsdale. | Thank you for your comment. For more information on impacts to community character, please see Chapter 4. The Council, Hennepin County, and partners are committed to reducing the impacts of the Project. For more information on mitigation against community character impacts, please see information about cultural placekeeping design groups in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Chapter 9 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Individuals | Randall | Voelker | | The BLRT should stop and bus rapid transit should be implemented. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Kristi | Miller | | The BLRT should stop and bus rapid transit should be implemented. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Wendi | Girard | | The BLRT should stop and bus rapid transit should be implemented. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Amy | Hodgson | | This train will destroy our small town. | Thank you for your comment. The Council, Hennepin County, and partners are committed to reducing impacts to community character and cohesion. For more information, please see Chapter 4, Section 4.2, and response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Mona | Grellson | | Needs are not accurately assessed in the EIS. Buses are more flexible to serve changing needs of neighborhoods and the community. | Thank you for your comment. Modal alternatives, including BRT and enhanced bus, were evaluated during the Alternatives Analysis phase of the Project and eliminated from further consideration. The EIS reviews the Project history and evaluates the Build Alternative that advanced through the public planning process, in accordance with federal environmental review requirements. Also, please see the response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Mona | Grellson | | Robbinsdale specifically doesn't want to change character, so the light rail doesn't fulfill its development goals. | Thank you for your comment. The Council, Hennepin County, and partners are committed to reducing impacts to community character and cohesion. For more information, please see Chapter 4, Section 4.2, and response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Holly | Knox | | The BLRT should stop and bus rapid transit should be implemented. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Kathy | Neitzke | | LTR will harm environment, cause air pollution because of car back ups, is unsafe for people using other modes of transit, unsafe, and expensive. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2, 4, and 6. |
| Individuals | Lois | Siljander | | The BLRT should stop and bus rapid transit should be implemented. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Terri | Larson | | No one wants the BLRT. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Karen | Shull | | The BLRT should stop and bus rapid transit should be implemented. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Rosemarie | Clark | | The BLRT should stop and bus rapid transit should be implemented. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | I vote no to the Green Line Extension. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | I do not support the light rail extension. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | Cancel the Blue Line. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |



General Opposition

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---|---|
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | I do not like rail lines. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 2. |
| Individuals | Pat | Healy | | The BLRT should stop and bus rapid transit should be implemented. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |
| Individuals | Not provided | Not provided | | The BLRT should stop and bus rapid transit should be implemented. | Thank you for your comment. Please see response to FRC 5. |



General Comments on Executive Summary

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page ES-6 Include MPRB in the list of CMC members. | Revised as suggested in the Supplemental Final EIS Executive Summary. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page ES-10 Reference Wirth/Victory Memorial Parkway in description of CR82/Lowry intersection. | Revised as suggested in the Supplemental Final EIS Executive Summary. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page ES-11 Why is there a label referencing "elevated LRT"? | Revised to remove "elevated" label in the Supplemental Final EIS Executive Summary. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page ES-21 Recommend including 4(f) mitigation as a general topic under the bulleted list. | Revised as suggested in the Supplemental Final EIS Executive Summary. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Please update the Executive Summary to reflect comments on the individual chapters provided by this letter. | The Executive Summary has been updated to reflect comments received on the individual chapters in the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Mitigation

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| Individuals | Aaron | McMenamy | | What sort of assurances can Met council offer if mitigation measures fail? Particularly about crime, property value, insurance, and noise levels. | Thank you for your comment. The Supplemental Final EIS identifies the measures that would be implemented to mitigate the Project's adverse effects and the party responsible for their implementation. The Council is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the mitigation measures and reporting to FTA on progress. |
| Individuals | Molly | Schlieff | | I know that you are going to provide re-imbusement to businesses that are being forced to close down, but will you also provide incentives to re-open those businesses? | Thank you for your comment. For property acquired by the Council, property owners would be fairly compensated for the value of their property, inclusive of fixtures and reasonable moving costs, in accordance with the Uniform Act requirements. Relocation assistance would be provided to support businesses re-opening, including re-establishment costs. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Warren | McLean | Northside Economic Opportunity Network | I recommend a \$75 million parking garage much like the parking structure in 1256 (Thor) building on the corner of Penn and Plymouth in North Minneapolis. | Thank you for your comment. The Council has committed to providing surface parking at W Broadway Ave and Penn Ave to support the businesses in the commercial corridor. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Warren | McLean | Northside Economic Opportunity Network | I recommend instituting a \$250 million grant fund for business disruptions | Thank you for your comment. The Council has committed to mitigation measures to reduce the burden on small business and low-income residents that would be affected by Project construction and operation. The mitigation measures are described in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Also, please see response to FRC 8. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Dr Tara | Watson | | The rapid increase in development may lead to gentrification based displacement. Subsidies should be made available for people with less optimal rental histories. | Thank you for your comment. The Council has committed to mitigation measures to reduce the burden on small business and low-income residents that would be affected by Project construction and operation. The mitigation measures are described in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Also, please see response to FRC 8. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Dr Tara | Watson | | Our legislature was able to secure a \$10 million "matching" appropriation for anti-displacement efforts that can be used after we figure out how to match the funds and currently Met Council is talking of plans to match it with raising a tax on citizens to cover it. The match should be secured with no expense to the parties displaced. The funding should be able to be leveraged with other funding so that businesses and individuals eligible can combine multiple options | Thank you for your comment. The matching funds for the anti-displacement funds from the legislature have not yet been determined, and an increased tax levy from Met Council has not been explored. The Council intends to leverage funding appropriated by the State legislature and has committed to a number of mitigation measures to reduce the burden on small business and low-income residents that would be affected by Project construction and operation. The mitigation measures are described in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Also, please see response to FRC 8. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Kristel | Porter | West Broadway Business Association | A solid plan on how Hennepin County and Met Council plan to implement and enforce the anti-displacement plan, which organizations and/or public entities (and their departments) will be implementing and enforcing the anti-displacement plan, and a budget showing where the financial resources will be coming from and when. | Thank you for your comment. The Council has committed to mitigation measures to reduce the burden on small business and low-income residents that would be affected by Project construction and operation. The mitigation measures are described in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Also, please see response to FRC 8. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Kristel | Porter | West Broadway Business Association | Require that Hennepin County work with Northside businesses and property owners to adopt a parking plan which includes off-street parking that will adequately serve our community's current and future needs (essential for retail development financing) | Thank you for your comment. The Council has committed to mitigation measures for a parking facility to support the businesses in the commercial corridor. |



Mitigation

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|--------------|-----------|--|--|---|
| Organizations and Businesses | Joshua | Houdek | Sierra Club Minnesota North Star Chapter | We urge that every agency, every level of government, from the federal government to the state of Minnesota, to the Hennepin County, and to the Metropolitan Council and all the cities along the corridor dig in, fund, and work diligently to implement the anti-displacement plan | Thank you for your comment. The Council has committed to mitigation measures to reduce the burden on small business and low-income residents that would be affected by Project construction and operation. The mitigation measures are described in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Also, please see response to FRC 8. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Not provided | Yang | Asian Media Access | There should be some type of financial support for the next three years for us to do research and analysis based on impact evaluation on the businesses and the community within that area. | Thank you for your comment. The Council has committed to mitigation measures to reduce the burden on small business and low-income residents that would be affected by Project construction and operation. The mitigation measures are described in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Also, please see response to FRC 8. |
| Organizations and Businesses | Ricardo | Perez | The Alliance | We would like to see a concerted effort of corridor cities to contribute to anti-displacement work, ensuring long term residents area able to stay in their homes. | Thank you for your comment. Chapter 4, Section 4.2.4 of the Supplemental Final EIS outlines community support mitigation measures including measures to support current residents. Some of these measures build out from the anti-displacement recommendations and will be funded by the Project. Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Also, please see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | Brandon | Detvongsa | | We (Brooklyn Park) would like to see anti-displacement related investments. | Thank you for your comment. Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS outlines community support mitigation measures including measures to support current residents which include commitments to lessen displacement due to the project. Some of these measures build off the anti-displacement recommendations and will be funded by the Project. Additionally, please see response to FRC 8. |
| Individuals | Amanada | Xiong | | More money should go towards anti-displacement measures so that we do not repeat what happened with the Green Line. | Thank you for your comment. Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS outlines community support mitigation measures including measures to support current residents. which include commitments to lessen displacement due to the project. Some of these measures build off the anti-displacement recommendations and will be funded by the Project. Additionally, please see response to FRC 8. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | Asian Media Access, Asian American Business Resilience Network | Recommend examining Eastern and Western models for transit-oriented development especially in the context of the N 21st Ave alignment decision and request \$500,000 for 3 years to develop Hub that embodies 'Eastern' planning values (defined extensively in the letter). | Thank you for your comment. The Council has committed to mitigation measures to reduce the burden on small business and low-income residents that would be affected by Project construction and operation. The mitigation measures are described in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. Establishment of Cultural Placekeeping Design Groups to incorporate existing cultural identities at stations, public infrastructure, and streetscapes. Concentrate public realm improvements such as lighting, seating, public art, and pedestrian and bicycle amenities in and around communities affected by the Project are described in Chapter 4, Section 4.2.4.1. |



Mitigation

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|---|
| Organizations and Businesses | | | Asian Media Access, Asian American Business Resilience Network | The following mitigation measures for construction impacts should be implemented: requirements for maintaining business access during construction, community outreach coordinators lease between businesses, community, and project team, develop construction communication plan, parking assistance, business assistance programing, subsidies for businesses affected by construction, business consulting services, and coordination with anti-displacement working group. | Thank you for your comment. The Council has committed to mitigation measures to reduce the burden on small business and low-income residents that would be affected by Project construction and operation. The mitigation measures are described in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | Northside Residents Redevelopment Council | Project should include anti-displacement measures in it's relocation policy, including: grants and forgivable loans for businesses, funds for moving costs, deposits, and down-payments for displaced renters, relocation advisory services with the goal of allowing residents to remain in their neighborhood if so desired, eviction prevention funding to mitigate the harm of rising rents, tax relief and relocation assistance for home-owners, as well as no interest loans for home improvements. | Thank you for your comment. The Council has committed to mitigation measures to reduce the burden on small business and low-income residents that would be affected by Project construction and operation. The mitigation measures are described in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | Northside Residents Redevelopment Council | The project should adopt a land disposition policy, stating that current residents and businesses as well as land trusts should be prioritized when land purchased for the project becomes available for sale. | Thank you for your comment. The Council has committed to mitigation measures to reduce the burden on small business and low-income residents that would be affected by Project construction and operation. The mitigation measures are described in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | Northside Residents Redevelopment Council | The project must monitor the displacement which is occurring as well as the effectiveness of their avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures. The project should halt all steps towards construction until all anti-displacement measures as well as adequate funding for those measures is in place. | Thank you for your comment. The Council has committed to mitigation measures to reduce the burden on small business and low-income residents that would be affected by Project construction and operation. The mitigation measures are described in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | African Career & Educational Resources | Pursuing the Tenant Opportunity to Purchase model explores the potential for shared ownership among business tenants, where multiple small businesses acquire and collectively operate a property that was formerly vacant or underutilized. This model can give business owners better leverage, financial stability, and serve as a wealth building opportunity. A relevant precedent is the Shingle Creek Center. | Thank you for your comment. The Council supports business owners to be able to purchase property; these policies would need to be implemented at the City policy level. |
| Organizations and Businesses | | | Blue Line Coalition | Recommend incorporating specific, actionable displacement prevention plans as detailed by the CURA anti-Displacement Report, including affordable housing preservation, rent control, and support programs for affected residents and businesses. Enhanced financial and relocation support, particularly for small and minority-owned businesses to help them remain in the area. Additionally, a robust, long-term monitoring system should be established to track displacement effects and adapt strategies based on ongoing community feedback, and ensure that mitigation efforts are effective and responsive to community needs. | Thank you for your comment. The Council has committed to mitigation measures to reduce the burden on small business and low-income residents that would be affected by Project construction and operation. The mitigation measures are described in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |



Mitigation

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| Organizations and Businesses | | | Blue Line Coalition | To address historical injustices faced by BIPOC communities, targeted reparative actions and investments in community development should be implemented. Strategies must ensure that benefits are equitably distributed to the most affected and disadvantaged communities, supported by specific programs with measurable outcomes and strong accountability mechanisms. | Thank you for your comment. The Council has committed to mitigation measures to reduce the burden on small business and low-income residents that would be affected by Project construction and operation. The mitigation measures are described in Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 6-22 MPRB agrees wholeheartedly with this statement. However, MPRB should be mentioned here, or at the very least the phrasing should be "...funding for acquisitions, Minneapolis and other communities...." | Chapter 6, Section 6.2 is revised per comment in the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | page 6-27 MPRB mostly agrees with this statement, but mitigation for parkland acreage impacts may be necessary under certain project design factors, such as a severing of connections to parks. In addition, assistance with acquisition of additional parkland would be an appropriate mitigation for past harms from the transportation system, especially in north Minneapolis and around the Lowry Station area, where land rights were taken for transportation purposes. The Project should strongly consider revising existing transportation easements as part of the project, and ensuring that the Parkway road itself can exist on MPRB owned land. | See Chapter 8 of the Supplemental Final EIS for Section 4(f) mitigation strategies including increases to existing parkland. |
| Government Organizations | Kathy | Kowal | EPA | Explain the method for documenting and monitoring mitigation measures. | Mitigation commitments are presented in the Supplemental Final EIS and will be tracked and monitored through construction by the Project. The Council is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the mitigation measures and reporting to FTA on progress. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The Project Team needs to identify and mitigate harms experienced in communities along the previous alignment including communities along Olson Memorial Highway. | Thank you for your feedback. The Council, Hennepin County, and its partners are committed to mitigating the impacts of the Project. See Chapter 4, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 of the Supplemental Final EIS. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Pg 43 -- What additional investigations will be performed to identify potential risks (and mitigation necessary) due to karsts? | Language updated in the Supplemental Final EIS to indicate that geotechnical borings focusing on station locations and other areas of infrastructure were completed for the Project. These borings will be used to help identify the presence of subsurface karst features in the project area. If present, appropriate mitigation will be applied to address potential impacts to the design and from construction. |
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | Given the scale of impacts and sequencing of the SDEIS, Municipal Consent and SUPPLEMENTAL FINAL EIS, the City of Minneapolis requests the Project Office develop a mitigation workplan in advance of the Municipal Consent process, which should describe anticipated mitigations for major impacts in Minneapolis and/or the process to determine mitigations for impacts identified in the SDEIS. Developing this workplan should include coordination with the public. | The Project has coordinated with the City of Minneapolis regarding mitigation measures and has conducted stakeholder outreach to develop mitigation in partnership with community. |



Mitigation

| Stakeholder Type | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|---|
| Government Organizations | | | Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development and Public Works | The SDEIS describes how the environmental impacts are measured. The FSEIS will describe how the impacts identified in the SDEIS are being mitigated. To be successful, these mitigations must include: Preventing displacement and supporting strategies that promote equitable transit-oriented development along the corridor for residents and businesses; Mitigating construction impacts of the project; supporting small businesses and residents to maintain access to customers and services; including a corridor-wide parking strategy that supports businesses through the construction phase and into transit oriented development; identifying pedestrian, bicycle, and other connections, to the stations along and across the corridor; improving underlying and connecting street design; an additional station at West Broadway and Washington Avenue; Pursuing strategies to increase walkshed size and resident access to stations in North Minneapolis through removing barriers and increasing safe walking, rolling and biking routes to the stations; streetscape, urban design, art, and greening in the corridor prioritizing routes to and from stations; continued participation in transit and planning efforts along Olson Memorial Highway to deliver high quality transit in the corridor and improve the safety and accessibility of the corridor for all users consistent with needs already identified; and advance arterial Bus Rapid Transit on Lowry Avenue, to further connect north Minneapolis to the regional transit system. | Mitigation commitments will be documented in the Amended ROD. The Amended ROD states FTA's decision and the alternatives considered in reaching its decision. The Amended ROD identifies the recommended Locally Preferred Alternative, which is the Build Alternative that was evaluated in the Supplemental Draft and Supplemental Final EIS. |