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Notice of Intent
(January 2012)
the PBA comport in all respects with Federal law.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)


Issued on: January 4, 2012.

Jonathan D. McDade,
Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, Albany, New York.

[FR Doc. 2012–296 Filed 1–9–12; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Federal Highway Administration

Notice of Final Federal Agency Actions on Proposed Highway in Utah

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Limitation on Claims for Judicial Review of Actions by FHWA and other Federal agencies.

SUMMARY: This notice announces actions taken by the FHWA and other Federal agencies that are final within the meaning of 23 U.S.C. 139(l)(1). The actions relate to a proposed transportation corridor project (Provo Westside Connector) in Provo, Utah County in the State of Utah. These actions grant licenses, permits, and approvals for the project.

DATES: By this notice, the FHWA is advising the public of final agency actions subject to 23 U.S.C. 139(l)(1). A claim seeking judicial review of the FHWA actions on the highway project will be barred unless the claim is filed on or before July 8, 2012. If the Federal law that authorizes judicial review of a claim provides a time period of less than 180 days for filing such claim, then that shorter time period still applies.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For FHWA: Mr. Edward Woolford, Environmental Program Manager, Federal Highway Administration, 2520 West 4700 South, Suite 9A, Salt Lake City, Utah 84129; telephone (801) 955–3524; email: Edward.Woolford@dot.gov.

The FHWA Utah Division’s regular business hours are Monday through Friday, 7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. MST.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is hereby given that the FHWA and other Federal agencies have taken final agency actions by issuing licenses, permits, and approvals for the following highway project in the State of Utah: the Provo Westside Connector in Provo, Utah County, Utah. project number FHWA–UT–EIS–10–01–F. Federal Lead Agency: Federal Highway Administration.

Project description: The Selected Alternative (1860 South Alternative) implements a transportation project consisting of: (1) A new arterial roadway from the Interstate 15 interchange located at 1860 South/University Avenue (the Interchange) to 3110 West Street near the entrance to the Provo Airport (Mike Jense Parkway) in Provo; (2) three-way intersections located at 500 West, 1100 West, and Mike Jense Parkway; (3) the typical cross-section for the roadway consists of a total of five travel lanes: two travel lanes in each direction, and a center turn lane median, a 2-foot paved shoulder on each side, curb and gutter on the north side of the roadway, and a 10-foot paved trail on the south side of the roadway separated from the paved roadway by a 9-foot vegetated drainage swale (without curb and gutter); (4) three (3) parking pull-out locations are planned for trail access. One of these, at 500 West, replaces and improves an existing recreational access maintained by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources; and an unpaved roadway accesses would be provided for private and public land parcels south of the roadway.

The actions by the FHWA and other Federal agencies, and the laws under which such actions were taken, are described in the FEIS for the project, approved on October 12, 2011, in the FHWA Record of Decision (ROD) issued on January 3, 2012, and in other documents in the FHWA administrative record. The FEIS, ROD, and other documents in the FHWA administrative record are available by contacting the FHWA at the address provided above. The FHWA FEIS and ROD can be viewed and downloaded from the project Web site at http://www.prorovwestsidconnector.com or viewed at public libraries in the project area.

This notice applies to all Federal agency decisions as of the issuance date of this notice and all laws under which such actions were taken, including but not limited to:

2. Air: Clean Air Act [42 U.S.C. 7401–7671(q)];
3. Land: Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 [49 U.S.C. 303];
5. Historic and Cultural Resources: Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended [16 U.S.C. 1470(f) et seq.];


Issued on: January 4, 2012.

James C. Christian,
Division Administrator, Salt Lake City.

[FR Doc. 2012–292 Filed 1–9–12; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–RY–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Federal Transit Administration

Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement on the Bottineau Transitway Project From Minneapolis to Maple Grove in Hennepin County, MN

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS).

SUMMARY: The FTA, as the lead federal agency, the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority (HCRRA), and the Metropolitan Council intend to prepare an EIS for the proposed Bottineau Transitway project located along the Bottineau Transitway Corridor in Hennepin County, Minnesota. The proposed transitway, approximately 13 miles long, would connect downtown Minneapolis with North Minneapolis...
and the northwest suburbs of the Twin Cities. The transitway would originate in Minneapolis near the existing Target Field Station, where several existing transit lines converge, and would extend to the following subways: Robbinsdale, Golden Valley, Crystal, New Hope, Brooklyn Park, Maple Grove, and Osseo. The EIS will be prepared in accordance with Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality’s regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] parts 1500–08), as well as provisions of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA–LU). The purpose of this notice is to alert interested parties of the intent to prepare the EIS; provide information on the proposed transit project; invite public participation in the EIS process, including comments on the scope of the EIS proposed in this notice; and serve as an announcement of public and agency scoping meetings.

**DATES:** Written comments on the scope of the EIS should be sent to Brent Rusco, Bottineau Transitway Project Manager, on or before February 17, 2012. See ADDRESSES below for the locations to which written comments may be submitted. Public scoping meetings will be held on the following dates, in order to solicit input on the scope of the EIS:

- **January 23, 2012,** from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m., at the Theodore Wirth Chalet, 1301 Theodore Wirth Parkway, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- **January 24, 2012,** from 6 to 8 p.m., at Brooklyn Park City Hall, 5200 85th Avenue North, Brooklyn Park, Minnesota.
- **January 25, 2012,** from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m., at the Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center (UROC), 2001 Plymouth Avenue North, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- **January 31, 2012,** from 6 to 8 p.m., at the Robbinsdale City Hall, 4100 Lakeview Avenue North, Robbinsdale, Minnesota.

An interagency scoping meeting for agencies with interest in the project will be held on the following date:

- **January 19, 2012,** from 9 to 11 a.m., at the Kimley-Horn and Associates office, 2550 University Avenue West, Suite 238N, St. Paul, Minnesota.

All the scoping meetings will be accessible to persons with disabilities. If special translation or signing services or other special accommodations are needed, please contact Brent Rusco (see ADDRESSES below) at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. Project information outlining the project purpose and need, as well as alternatives proposed for analysis, will be available in the form of a scoping information packet, at the meetings and on the project Web site: http://bottineautransitway.org. Paper copies of the information may also be obtained from Brent Rusco [see ADDRESSES below].

**ADDRESSES:** Comments on the scope of the EIS will be accepted at the scoping meetings, or written comments should be sent to Brent Rusco, Bottineau Transitway Project Manager, Hennepin County, 701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400, Minneapolis, MN 55415, Phone: (612) 543–0579, Email: Brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us, Fax: (612) 348–9710.


**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Scoping**

The FTA, HCRRA, and the Metropolitan Council invite all interested individuals and organizations, public agencies, and Native American Tribes to comment on the scope of the EIS for the proposed Bottineau Transitway, including the project’s purpose and need, the alternatives to be studied, the environmental impacts to be evaluated, and the evaluation methods to be used. Comments should address: (1) Feasible alternatives that may better achieve the project’s purpose and need with fewer adverse impacts, and (2) any significant impacts relating to the alternatives.

“Scoping,” as described in the regulations implementing NEPA (Title 40 of CFR 1501.7) has specific and fairly limited objectives, one of which is to identify the significant issues associated with alternatives that will be examined in detail in the document, while simultaneously limiting consideration and development of issues that are not truly significant. It is during the NEPA scoping process that potentially significant environmental impacts—those that give rise to the need to prepare an EIS—should be identified. Impacts that are deemed not to be significant need not be developed extensively in the context of the EIS, thereby keeping the EIS focused on impacts of consequence consistent with the ultimate objectives of the NEPA implementing regulations: “to make the environmental impact statement process more useful to decision makers and the public; and to reduce paperwork and the accumulation of extraneous background data, in order to emphasize the need to focus on real environmental issues and alternatives * * * [by requiring] impact statements to be concise, clear, and to the point, and supported by evidence that agencies have made the necessary environmental analyses.” (Executive Order 11991 of May 24, 1977.)

Once the scope of the EIS is defined, and significant environmental issues to be addressed have been identified, an annotated outline of the EIS will be prepared that: (1) Documents the results of the scoping process, (2) contributes to the transparency of the process, and (3) provides a clear roadmap for concise development of the EIS.

**Purpose and Need for the Project**

The purpose of the Bottineau Transitway is to provide transit service which will satisfy the long-term regional mobility and local accessibility needs for businesses and the traveling public. Residents and businesses in the Bottineau Transitway project area need access to the region’s activity centers to fully participate in the region’s economy. Access to jobs in Minneapolis, St. Paul, the University of Minnesota, and the growing Minneapolis suburbs is crucial. Traffic congestion is expected to intensify in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area through 2030 and beyond, and it cannot be addressed by highway construction alone. Current transit service in the Bottineau Transitway offers a limited number of viable alternatives to personal vehicles. Without major transit investments, it will be difficult to effectively meet the transportation needs of people and businesses in the corridor, manage highway traffic congestion in the project area, and achieve the region’s 2030 Transportation Policy Plan (TPP) goal of doubling transit ridership by 2030.

Five factors contribute to the need for the Bottineau Transitway project:

- Growing travel demand resulting from continuing growth in population and employment.
- Increasing traffic congestion and limited funding.
- Growing numbers of people who depend on transit.
- Limited transit service to suburban jobs (reverse commute opportunities) and travel-time competitive transit options.
- Regional objectives for growth.

**Project Location of Environmental Setting**

The project is located in Hennepin County, Minnesota, and includes...
downtown Minneapolis, Minnesota, and its northwest suburbs, including Robbinsdale, Golden Valley, Crystal, New Hope, Brooklyn Park, Maple Grove, and Osseo.

Possible Alternatives

The Bottineau Transitway Alternatives Analysis (AA) Study was completed by HCRRA in March 2010. The AA Study evaluated a no-build alternative and a broad range of build alternatives, including an enhanced bus/transportation system management alternative, as well as commuter rail, light rail transit (LRT), and bus rapid transit (BRT) alternatives. The study progressively narrowed down the build alternatives to a set of 21 alternatives which underwent detailed evaluation. The AA Study is posted on the project Web site.

The following alternatives are currently under consideration for further study in the EIS:

No-Build Alternative. The No-Build alternative serves as the baseline against which environmental effects of the Bottineau Transitway build alternatives are measured. It is defined as the existing transportation system in the Bottineau Transitway Corridor, plus any committed transportation improvements in the region, i.e., those roadway, transit facility, and service improvements that are planned, programmed, and included in the TPP, and that are to be implemented by the year 2030. The No-Build Alternative does not include the Bottineau Transitway project. It does include major regional transit projects such as the Green Line (Central Corridor LRT and Southwest Transitway LRT), Red Line (Cedar Avenue BRT), and the Orange Line (I–35W BRT), as well as minor transit service expansions and/or adjustments in order to continue existing Metropolitan Council service policies.

Enhanced Bus/Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative. The TSM alternative is defined as enhancements and upgrades to the existing transportation system in the Bottineau Transitway Corridor, such that the project’s purpose and need would be met as much as possible without a major capital investment. The TSM alternative could include bus route restructuring, scheduling improvements, new express and limited-stop services, intersection improvements, and other focused infrastructure improvements that would heighten the functioning of the current transit system. The specific combination of improvements to be incorporated into this alternative will be developed during EIS process.

Light Rail Transit (LRT) Alternatives. All LRT alternatives would include several station stops between downtown Minneapolis and the Maple Grove/Brooklyn Park area. These alternatives, which would follow West Broadway, the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) rail corridor, and Olson Memorial Highway and/or Penn Avenue, would include tracks, stations and support facilities, as well as transit service for LRT and connecting bus routes.

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Alternative. The BRT alternative would include a busway in its own dedicated space (guideway) with several stations between downtown Minneapolis and the Brooklyn Park area. This alternative, which would follow West Broadway, the BNSF rail corridor, and Olson Memorial Highway, would include all facilities associated with the construction and operation of BRT, including right-of-way, travel lanes, stations, and support facilities, as well as transit service for BRT and connecting bus routes.

Possible Effects

The purpose of the EIS process is to study, in a public setting, the potentially significant effects of the proposed project on the quality of the human environment. Primary areas of investigation for this project include, but are not limited to: Land use and economic development; land acquisition, displacements, and relocation; neighborhood cohesion and environmental justice; historic resources; parklands; visual and aesthetic qualities; air quality; water quality, wetlands, and floodplains; wildlife/endangered species and ecosystems; noise; vibration; hazardous materials affected by demolition and construction activities; traffic circulation and transportation linkages; parking; pedestrian and bicycle connections; energy use; and safety and security. Effects will be evaluated in the context of both short-term construction and long-term operation of the proposed project. Direct, indirect, and cumulative effects as well as indirect and cumulative effects on the environment will be addressed. The environmental analysis may reveal that the proposed project will not affect, or affect substantially, many of the primary areas of investigation. However, if any adverse impacts are identified, measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate those adverse effects will be proposed.

Procedures for Public and Agency Involvement

The regulations implementing NEPA, as well as provisions of SAFETEA–LU, call for public involvement in the EIS process. Section 6002 of SAFETEA–LU (23 U.S.C. 139) requires that FTA, HCRRA, and the Metropolitan Council do the following: (1) Extend an invitation to other federal and non-federal agencies and Native American tribes that may have an interest in the proposed project to become “participating agencies;” (2) provide an opportunity for involvement by participating agencies and the public to help define the purpose and need for proposed project, as well as the range of alternatives for consideration in the EIS; and (3) establish a plan for coordinating public and agency participation in, and comment on, the environmental review process. An invitation to become a participating or cooperating agency, with scoping materials appended, will be extended to other federal and non-federal agencies and Native American tribes that may have an interest in the proposed project. It is possible that FTA, HCRRA, and the Metropolitan Council will not be able to identify all federal and non-federal agencies and Native American tribes that may have such an interest. Any federal or non-federal agency or Native American tribes interested in the proposed project that does not receive an invitation to become a participating agency should notify at the earliest opportunity the Project Manager identified above under ADDRESSES.

A comprehensive public involvement program for public and agency involvement will be developed for the project and posted on the project Web site. The public involvement program includes a full range of activities including maintaining the project Web site, and outreach to local officials, community and civic groups, and the general public.

Paperwork Reduction

The Paperwork Reduction Act seeks, in part, to minimize the cost to the taxpayer of the creation, collection, maintenance, use, dissemination, and disposition of information. Consistent with this goal and with principles of economy and efficiency in government, it is FTA policy to limit insofar as possible distribution of complete printed sets of environmental documents. Accordingly, unless a specific request for a complete printed set of environmental documents is received before the document is printed, at the latest, FTA and its grantees will distribute only the executive summary of environmental documents in printed form together with a compact disc (CD) that contains the complete environmental document. A complete
printed set of the environmental documents will be available for review at the grantee’s offices and elsewhere; an electronic copy of the complete environmental document will also be available on the grantee’s Web site.

**Other**

The EIS will be prepared in accordance with NEPA and its implementing regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), and with the FTA/Federal Highway Administration regulations “Environmental Impact and Related Procedures” (23 CFR part 771).

Issued on: January 5, 2012.

**Marisol Simon,**

*Regional Administrator, FTA, Region V.*

[FR Doc. 2012–264 Filed 1–9–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**
Notice of Availability in EQB Monitor
(December 26, 2011)
NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY - BOTTINEAU TRANSITWAY SCOPING BOOKLET

Project Title: Bottineau Transitway Project

Local Project Proposer: Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority

Responsible Governmental Unit (RGU): Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority

Description: The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority (HCRRA) and the Metropolitan Council have initiated the environmental review process for the Bottineau Transitway Project. Federal funding will be pursued for this project from FTA. As a result, FTA-designated as the lead federal agency for this project—is undertaking environmental review in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). As the local public agency sponsoring the project, HCRRA is complying with the requirements of the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA). The FTA, HCRRA and Metropolitan Council have determined that the Bottineau Transitway Project may have significant environmental impacts. To satisfy both federal and state requirements, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is being prepared for the Bottineau Transitway Project. A Scoping Booklet has been prepared to serve as the Scoping Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the Bottineau Transitway Project, in compliance with the state environmental review requirements.

The Bottineau Transitway is a proposed project that will provide for transit improvements in the highly traveled northwest area of the Twin Cities. The Bottineau Transitway is located in Hennepin County, Minnesota, extending approximately 13 miles from downtown Minneapolis to the northwest through North Minneapolis and the suburbs of Golden Valley, Robbinsdale, Crystal, New Hope, Brooklyn Park, Maple Grove, and Osseo. Two types of high-frequency transit service are being studied for the Bottineau Transitway: bus rapid transit (BRT) and light rail transit (LRT).
Copies of the Scoping Booklet which documents the project’s history, purpose and need of the project, proposed alternatives under consideration for study in the EIS, overall decision-making process/schedule, issues to be covered in the EIS, project schedule, and the public outreach/comment process are available for public review beginning December 23, 2011, at the following locations:

- **Project website** – [www.bottineautransitway.org](http://www.bottineautransitway.org)
- **Maple Grove Library** - 8001 Main St., Maple Grove
- **Osseo Library** - 415 Ave., Osseo
- **Brooklyn Park Library** - 8600 Zane Ave. N., Brooklyn Park
- **Brookdale Library** - 6125 Shingle Creek Pkwy., Brooklyn Center
- **Rockford Road Library** - 6401 42nd Ave. N., Crystal
- **Golden Valley Library** - 830 Winnetka Ave. N., Golden Valley
- **North Regional Library** - 1315 Lowry Ave. N., Minneapolis
- **Sumner Library** - 611 Van White Memorial Blvd., Minneapolis
- **Hennepin County Public Library** – 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis

To afford an opportunity for all interested persons, agencies and groups to be informed about the details of the Bottineau Transitway project, four formal public Scoping Meetings are scheduled for the following dates and locations:

**Scoping Open House #1**
Monday, January 23rd, 2012
4:30 – 6:30 pm
Theodore Wirth Chalet
1301 Theodore Wirth Parkway, Minneapolis

**Scoping Open House #2**
Tuesday, January 24th, 2012
6:00 – 8:00 pm
Brooklyn Park City Hall
5200 85th Avenue North, Brooklyn Park

**Scoping Open House #3**
Wednesday, January 25th, 2012
5:30 – 7:30 pm
Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center (UROC)
2001 Plymouth Avenue North, Minneapolis

**Scoping Open House #4**
Tuesday, January 31, 2012
6:00 -8:00 pm
Robbinsdale City Hall
4100 Lakeview Avenue, Robbinsdale

*All of the scoping meeting locations are accessible for persons with disabilities.*
Government agencies will be invited to a separate Interagency Scoping meeting to be held as follows:

Thursday, January 19, 2012
9:00 – 11:00 am
2550 University Avenue West, Suite 238N, St. Paul

Auxiliary aides, services and communication materials in accessible formats and languages other than English can be provided by contacting Brent Rusco at the contact information provided below.

Copies of the Scoping Booklet are being distributed to agencies on the current Minnesota EQB list. Comments will be accepted through **February 17, 2012**. Comments can be submitted in writing, by U.S. mail, by e-mail, or by fax to:

**Contact Person:** Brent Rusco
Bottineau Transitway Project Manager
Hennepin County
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415
Phone: 612-543-0579
E-mail: brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us
Fax: 612-348-9710

Comments may also be submitted directly via the Bottineau Transitway website, [www.bottineautransitway.org](http://www.bottineautransitway.org).

Written materials, project updates, and materials presented at the public Scoping meetings will be available on the Bottineau Transitway project website noted above.

**AUAR UPDATE**

**Project Title:** Shenandoah Business Park and Minnesota Valley West, Shakopee, MN
**WSB Project No. 1756-06**

**Description:** The original AUAR was adopted by the City in 2001. Pursuant to Minnesota Rules 4410.3610, Subp. 7, and AUAR must be updated every five years to remain valid. The purpose of this submittal is to update the AUAR so it remains valid for another five years.

Pursuant to Minnesota Rules 4410.3610, Subp. 7, this AUAR Update is being submitted for the required ten-day review. The comment period will end on December 28, 2011. Any comments can be forwarded to:

**RGU:** City of Shakopee

**Contact Person:** Mr. Michael Leek
City of Shakopee
129 South Holmes Street
Shakopee, MN 55379
mleek@ci.shakopee.mn.us
Scoping Booklet Distribution Memos
December 22, 2011

Re: Bottineau Transitway Project Scoping Booklet

Bottineau Corridor Librarians and City Hall Administrators:

Enclosed please find the Scoping Booklet for the Bottineau Transitway project located in Hennepin County, Minnesota. The attached document(s) are being submitted to your organization in compliance with the Minnesota environmental review program. We respectfully request that you keep the enclosed document available for public review. During the week of December 27, 2011 a representative from the project will be providing you with additional copies, for public review.

If you have questions regarding the Bottineau Transitway Project and/or the contents of this submittal, please contact me via phone at 612-543-0579 or via email at brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us. You can also find information on the project website at www.bottineautransitway.org

Regards,

Brent Rusco
Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority
Bottineau Transitway project manager
December 22, 2011

Re: Bottineau Transitway Project Scoping Booklet

Bottineau Corridor Stakeholder Agency:

Enclosed please find the Scoping Booklet for the Bottineau Transitway project located in Hennepin County, Minnesota. The attached document(s) are being submitted to your organization in compliance with the Minnesota environmental review program.

If you have questions regarding the Bottineau Transitway Project and/or the contents of this submittal, please contact me via phone at 612-543-0579 or via email at brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us. You can also find information on the project website at www.bottineautransitway.org

Regards,

[Signature]
Brent Rusco
Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority
Bottineau Transitway project manager
Press Release
Bottineau Transitway open houses in January 2012

The public is invited to attend a series of open houses in January 2012, involving the Bottineau Transitway. The project is in what is called the “scoping phase” and is soliciting public comment through Feb. 17, 2012, on its scoping booklet, which includes:

- The history, purpose and need of the project
- Information about proposed alternatives under consideration for study and other issues that will be covered in the Environmental Impact Statement
- A general timeline for the project, including key decision-making milestones

The Bottineau Transitway is a proposed project that will provide for transit improvements in the highly traveled northwest suburbs of the Twin Cities. The Bottineau Corridor generally follows Bottineau Boulevard (County State Aid Highway 81), extending approximately 13 miles from downtown Minneapolis through North Minneapolis to the northwest suburbs of Brooklyn Park, Crystal, Golden Valley, Maple Grove, Osseo and Robbinsdale.

The public meetings are hosted by the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority, and are taking place the following dates in January 2012:

- Monday, Jan. 23, 4:30 – 6:30 p.m., Theodore Wirth Chalet, 1301 Theodore Wirth Parkway, Minneapolis
- Tuesday, Jan. 24, 6 – 8 p.m., Brooklyn Park City Hall, 5200 85th Ave. N., Brooklyn Park
- Wednesday, Jan. 25, 5:30 – 7:30 p.m., Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center (UROC), 2001 Plymouth Ave. N., Minneapolis
- Tuesday, Jan. 31, 6 – 8 p.m., Robbinsdale City Hall, 4100 Lakeview Ave. N., Robbinsdale
Bottineau/2

All meeting locations are accessible for persons with disabilities. Materials from the meetings will also be made available on the project website.

The scoping booklet is available for online review at the project website. Copies of the scoping booklet are also available for public reviewing beginning today, Dec. 23, at the following Hennepin County Library locations:

- Maple Grove, 8001 Main St.
- Osseo, 415 Central Ave.
- Brooklyn Park, 8600 Zane Ave. N.
- Brookdale, 6125 Shingle Creek Pkwy., Brooklyn Center
- Rockford Road, 6401 42nd Ave. N., Crystal
- Golden Valley, 830 Winnetka Ave. N.
- North Regional, 1315 Lowry Ave. N., Minneapolis
- Sumner, 611 Van White Memorial Blvd., Minneapolis
- Minneapolis Central, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis

Auxiliary aides, services and communication materials in accessible formats and languages other than English can be provided by contacting Brent Rusco at 612-543-0579 or via email.

Comments can also be submitted online at the project website, by emailing Brent Rusco, by faxing 612-348-9710, or by U.S. Mail using the address:

Brent Rusco
Bottineau Transitway Project Manager
701 Fourth Ave. S., Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415

Look for more news on the Hennepin County website – www.hennepin.us.
Public Meeting Poster
If you are interested in the Bottineau Transitway project, we encourage you to take part in the Scoping process. Project planners are especially interested in your input on:

- Purpose and need for the project
- The alternatives proposed for study
- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

There are several ways for you to participate and for your voice to be heard.

You can attend a meeting to learn more about the Scoping process and to share your thoughts about the project.

Formal public Scoping meetings are scheduled for the following dates and locations:

**Scoping Open House #1:**
Monday, January 23rd
4:30 to 6:30 PM
Theodore Wirth Chalet
1301 Theodore Wirth Parkway, Minneapolis

**Scoping Open House #2:**
Tuesday, January 24th
6:00 to 8:00 PM
Brooklyn Park City Hall
5200 85th Avenue N, Brooklyn Park

**Scoping Open House #3:**
Wednesday, January 25th
5:30 to 7:30 PM
Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center (UROC)
2001 Plymouth Avenue N, Minneapolis

**Scoping Open House #4:**
Tuesday, January 31st
6:00 to 8:00 PM
Robbinsdale City Hall
4100 Lakeview Avenue N, Robbinsdale

You can submit comments in writing, by U.S. mail, e-mail, or fax, to:

Brent Rusco
Bottineau Transitway Project Manager
Hennepin County
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415
Phone: 612.543.0579
Email: brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us
Fax: 612.348.9710

Comments may also be submitted directly via the Bottineau Transitway website, www.bottineautransitway.org.

The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date.
Public Meeting Handouts
(January 23, 24, 25, & 31, 2012)
What is the purpose of this booklet?
The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority (HCRRA), and the Metropolitan Council have initiated the environmental review process for the Bottineau Transitway project. Federal funding will be pursued for this project from the FTA. As a result, the FTA—designated as the lead federal agency for this project—is required to undertake environmental review in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). As the local public agency sponsoring the project, HCRRA and Metropolitan Council must also comply with the requirements of the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA). The FTA, HCRRA, and Metropolitan Council have determined that the Bottineau Transitway project may have significant environmental impacts. To satisfy both federal and state requirements, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) is being prepared for the Bottineau Transitway project. This Scoping Booklet is the first step in the Draft EIS process.

This Scoping Booklet provides information about the formal “Scoping” process required under both federal and state environmental review. Within this booklet you will find a description of the Scoping process, information on the contents of the Draft EIS, and information on how you can get involved in the Scoping process. You will have the opportunity to review the Scoping information and offer your comments in person at one of four meetings or in writing during the public comment period (please submit written comments using the form included with this booklet, email, or through the project website. Contact information is provided on page 13).

Formal public Scoping meetings are scheduled for the following dates and locations:

**Scoping Open House #1:**
Monday, January 23rd
4:30 to 6:30 PM
Theodore Wirth Chalet
1301 Theodore Wirth Parkway, Minneapolis

**Scoping Open House #2:**
Tuesday, January 24th
6:00 to 8:00 PM
Brooklyn Park City Hall
5200 85th Avenue N, Brooklyn Park

**Scoping Open House #3:**
Wednesday, January 25th
5:30 to 7:30 PM
Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center (UROC)
2001 Plymouth Avenue N, Minneapolis

**Scoping Open House #4:**
Tuesday, January 31st
6:00 to 8:00 PM
Robbinsdale City Hall
4100 Lakeview Avenue N, Robbinsdale
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What is the Bottineau Transitway?
The Bottineau Transitway is a proposed project that will provide for transit improvements in the highly traveled northwest area of the Twin Cities. The Bottineau Transitway is located in Hennepin County, Minnesota, extending approximately 13 miles from downtown Minneapolis to the northwest through north Minneapolis and the suburbs of Golden Valley, Robbinsdale, Crystal, New Hope, Brooklyn Park, Maple Grove, and Osseo. The transitway is anticipated to serve a broader area to the northwest, including the communities of Dayton, Rogers, and Hassan Township.

The Bottineau Transitway line would connect North Minneapolis and the region’s northwest suburbs with the region’s system of transitways that consist of existing light rail transit on the Blue Line (Hiawatha) and Green Line (Central Corridor and the planned Southwest light rail line), bus rapid transit on the Red Line (Cedar Avenue) and Orange Line (I-35W South), the Northstar commuter rail line, and express bus routes. The transitway investments under study for the Bottineau Transitway would also maintain or enhance local bus service in north Minneapolis and the northwest suburbs.

What would be built as part of the Bottineau Transitway Project?
Two types of high-frequency transit service are being studied for the Bottineau Transitway: bus rapid transit (BRT) and light rail transit (LRT). Both of these types of transit service would provide fast, frequent and reliable transit service. Trains or buses would run every 7.5 minutes during peak periods, 10-15 minutes during the daytime and evening, and every 30 minutes during late night and early morning. To support these services, a “dedicated guideway” (road or track serving buses or trains only) would be constructed. Bus or train stations would include shelters, passenger boarding platforms, and ticket vending machines.

Why is an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) necessary? How long will the process take?
Due to anticipated federal funding for the Bottineau Transitway, and the fact that the project may have significant environmental impacts, the FTA is required to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The HCRRA and the Metropolitan Council will also conduct this review in compliance with the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) and Minnesota Rules Chapter 4410.

The EIS process occurs in three stages – Scoping, Draft EIS and Final EIS – and culminates in a federal Record of Decision under NEPA and a state Determination of Adequacy under MEPA. Each of the three stages includes publication of a document for public comment and narrows the number of alternatives, with the Final EIS identifying a single Preferred Alternative for the project.

This process typically requires a minimum of 18 months, more commonly requiring 24-36 months to complete. See Figure 7 for the anticipated timelines of the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS.

What is Scoping?
Scoping is the process of determining the content of the Draft EIS. As the first step in the Scoping process, interested members of the public, including individuals and groups, as well as representatives of affected Native American tribes and local, state, and federal governmental agencies, are invited to participate in the evaluation of the Bottineau Transitway’s environmental impacts. The purpose of Scoping is to confirm the purpose and need for the project, identify appropriate alternatives that could address project needs, focus on potentially significant issues that should be studied in the Draft EIS, and eliminate issues that are not significant and/or have been addressed by prior studies.

Why Build the Bottineau Transitway? What benefits will it provide? (Project Purpose and Need)
The purpose of the Bottineau Transitway is to provide transit service which will satisfy the long-term regional mobility and accessibility needs for businesses and the traveling public.

Residents and businesses in the Bottineau Transitway project area need access to the region’s activity centers to fully participate in the region’s economy. Access to jobs in Minneapolis, St. Paul, the University of Minnesota, and growing suburbs is crucial. Traffic congestion is expected to intensify in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area through 2030 and beyond. Current transit service in the Bottineau Transitway project area offers a limited number of travel-time competitive alternatives to personal vehicles. Without major transit investments, it will be difficult to effectively meet the transportation needs of people and businesses in the corridor, manage highway traffic congestion in the project area, and achieve the region’s goal of doubling transit ridership by 2030.
Growing Travel Demand

Over the past two decades, the population has grown significantly in the seven-county Twin Cities Metropolitan Area and growth is expected to continue in the future. Between 2010 and 2030, the Metropolitan Council projects a 31% increase in the region’s population and a 32% increase in the number of jobs—meaning that approximately 900,000 new people and 650,000 new jobs would be added to the seven-county area that consists of Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott, and Washington counties.

Between 1990 and 2010, Bottineau Transitway communities such as Brooklyn Park and Maple Grove experienced population increases of 34% and 59%, respectively; while communities also potentially served by Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott, and Washington counties by the transitway such as Dayton, Hassan Township, respectively; while communities also potentially served by Bottineau Transitway have consistently been included in regional transportation system plans. Many different alignments (routes) and transportation modes, including BRT, LRT, and commuter rail, have been considered and evaluated in plans and studies in the past. These studies provide a valuable base of information for this Draft EIS process.

Limited Transit Service to Suburban Destinations (reverse commute opportunities) and Time-Efficient Transit Options

The dominant travel pattern during morning commutes in the Bottineau Transitway project area today is toward downtown Minneapolis. A “reverse commute” pattern also exists toward Brooklyn Park, Maple Grove, and beyond into Rogers and surrounding communities to the north. Workers and students commute to major activity centers in the project area, such as North Memorial Medical Center in Robbinsdale, the Target North Campus, North Hennepin Community College, Hennepin Technical College in Brooklyn Park, and the Arbor Lakes retail complex in Maple Grove.

Although communities in the project area are served by a network of local and express bus routes, fast and convenient transit options to access schools and jobs in Maple Grove and Brooklyn Park are limited. Direct bus service from Minneapolis to suburban communities in the Bottineau corridor is provided on two limited-stop and express routes. Accessing this bus service may require a transfer in downtown, and only a few trips are available each day. However, residents of Minneapolis and the inner northwest suburbs have other transit options for accessing activity centers in the outer suburbs of Maple Grove and Brooklyn Park. Three transit centers located within the project area provide a valuable transfer point from express and urban local routes to suburban local routes. Unfortunately, these suburban local routes stop frequently, often require transfers, and travel at lower speeds on arterial streets, resulting in long overall travel times.

Regional Objectives for Growth

The policies guiding the development of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area are articulated in the 2030 Regional Development Framework. Most recently updated in December 2006, the 2030 Regional Development Framework established four policies for guiding growth in the region:

- Accommodate growth in a flexible, connected and efficient manner
- Plan and invest in multi-modal transportation choices to slow the growth of traffic congestion and serve the region’s economic needs
- Encourage expanded choices in housing locations and types of improved access to jobs and opportunities
- Conserve, protect and enhance the region’s vital natural resources

What previous studies apply to Scoping?

Transportation and land use studies along the Bottineau Corridor began in 1988 with the Hennepin County Comprehensive LRT System Plan. The Bottineau Transitway has consistently been included in regional transportation system plans. Many different alignments (routes) and transportation modes, including BRT, LRT, and commuter rail, have been considered and evaluated in plans and studies in the past. These studies provide a valuable base of information for this Draft EIS process.

Transit travel demand in the Bottineau Transitway has been consistently identified in regional transportation system plans, including the Regional Transit Board LRT Plan (1990), the transit 2020 Master Plan (2000), the 2025 Transportation Policy Plan (adopted January 2001, amended January 2002), and the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan (adopted December 2004).

The region’s current long-range transportation plan, the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan (adopted November 2010) identifies the Bottineau Transitway as one of the transit corridors to be developed by 2030. The recommendation for the Bottineau Transitway is based on findings from the Metropolitan Council’s 2030 Transit Master Study (2008).
Stage 2: Universe of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and Light Rail Transit (LRT) Alternatives

The Bottineau Transitway recently completed an Alternatives Analysis (AA) study in Crystal, New Hope & Brooklyn Park.

### Northern Variations (Alignments):
- **Alignment A** originates in Maple Grove at Hemlock Lane/Arbor Lakes Parkway, and follows the future Arbor Lakes Parkway and Elm Creek Boulevard to the BNSF railroad corridor located on the west side of Bottineau Boulevard.
- **Alignment B** begins at the Target North Campus (located just north of Highway 610), follows West Broadway Avenue, and crosses Bottineau Boulevard at 73rd Avenue to enter the BNSF railroad corridor.

### Southern Variations (Alignments):
- **Alignment C1** goes Olson Memorial Highway to downtown Minneapolis.
- **Alignment C2** continues along the BNSF railroad corridor to Olson Memorial Highway, and then follows Olson Memorial Highway to downtown.
- **Alignment D2** exits the railroad corridor near 34th Avenue, joins West Broadway Avenue, and travels on Penn Avenue to Olson Memorial Highway and into downtown.

### Light Rail Transit (LRT) Alternatives
LRT alternatives proposed for study include several stations between downtown Minneapolis and the Maple Grove/Brooklyn Park area. Each LRT alternative would include tracks, stations, and support facilities, as well as transit service for LRT and connecting bus routes. The four LRT alternatives under consideration for more detailed study in the Draft EIS consist of the north (Alignments A and B) and south alignment alternatives (Alignments D1 and D2) connected by the central alignment C.
- **A-D1**
- **A-C-D2**
- **B-C-D1**
- **B-C-D2**

### Enhanced Bus/Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative
The TSM alternative is defined as enhancements and upgrades to the existing transportation system in the project corridor, attempting to meet the project’s purpose and need as much as possible by investing in a limited capital investment. The TSM alternative could include bus route restructuring, scheduling improvements, new express and limited-stop services, intersection improvements, and/or other focused infrastructure improvements that would improve the function of the transit system. The specific combination of improvements will be incorporated into the TSM alternative will be developed during the Draft EIS process.

In addition to the No-Build and TSM alternatives, the following Build alternatives are proposed for inclusion in the Draft EIS:
- **A-C-D2**
- **B-C-D1**
- **B-C-D2**

### What alternatives are being considered?
The Draft EIS will evaluate a No-Build alternative, an Enhanced Bus/Transportation Systems Management (TSM) alternative, and several Build alternatives. The Build alternatives being considered for further study in the Draft EIS (four LRT and one BRT) are the most promising alternatives identified during the AA study.

### No-Build Alternative
The No-Build alternative serves as the baseline against which environmental effects of the Bottineau Transitway alternatives are measured.

The No-Build alternative is defined as the existing transportation system, plus any committed transportation improvements in the region. Committed transportation improvements include roadway and transit facility and service improvements (not including the Bottineau Transitway) planned, programmed, and included in the TPP to be implemented by the year 2030. Major regional transit projects (shown in Figure 1) are included in the No-Build alternative.

### What alternatives are being considered?
The Draft EIS will evaluate a No-Build alternative, an Enhanced Bus/Transportation Systems Management (TSM) alternative, and several Build alternatives. The Build alternatives being considered for further study in the Draft EIS (four LRT and one BRT) are the most promising alternatives identified during the AA study.

### No-Build Alternative
The No-Build alternative serves as the baseline against which environmental effects of the Bottineau Transitway alternatives are measured.

The No-Build alternative is defined as the existing transportation system, plus any committed transportation improvements in the region. Committed transportation improvements include roadway and transit facility and service improvements (not including the Bottineau Transitway) planned, programmed, and included in the TPP to be implemented by the year 2030. Major regional transit projects (shown in Figure 1) are included in the No-Build alternative.

### Enhanced Bus/Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative
The TSM alternative is defined as enhancements and upgrades to the existing transportation system in the project corridor, attempting to meet the project’s purpose and need as much as possible by investing in a limited capital investment. The TSM alternative could include bus route restructuring, scheduling improvements, new express and limited-stop services, intersection improvements, and/or other focused infrastructure improvements that would improve the function of the transit system. The specific combination of improvements will be incorporated into the TSM alternative will be developed during the Draft EIS process.

In addition to the No-Build and TSM alternatives, the following Build alternatives are proposed for inclusion in the Draft EIS:
- **A-C-D2**
- **B-C-D1**
- **B-C-D2**

### Northern variations (alignments): At the north end of the corridor, there are two alignment options:
- **Alignment A** originates in Maple Grove at Hemlock Lane/Arbor Lakes Parkway, and follows the future Arbor Lakes Parkway and Elm Creek Boulevard to the BNSF railroad corridor located on the west side of Bottineau Boulevard.
- **Alignment B** begins at the Target North Campus (located just north of Highway 610), follows West Broadway Avenue, and crosses Bottineau Boulevard at 73rd Avenue to enter the BNSF railroad corridor.

### Center segment:
Both the A and B alignments would transition to the C alignment in the BNSF railroad corridor on the west side of Bottineau Boulevard through southern Brooklyn Park, Crystal, and Robbinsdale.

### Southern variations (alignments):
There are two alignments under consideration for the transitway south of 36th Avenue in Robbinsdale and into downtown Minneapolis:
- **Alignment D1** continues along the BNSF railroad corridor to Olson Memorial Highway, and then follows Olson Memorial Highway to downtown.
- **Alignment D2** exits the railroad corridor near 34th Avenue, joins West Broadway Avenue, and travels on Penn Avenue to Olson Memorial Highway and into downtown.

### Light Rail Transit (LRT) Alternatives
LRT alternatives proposed for study include several stations between downtown Minneapolis and the Maple Grove/Brooklyn Park area. Each LRT alternative would include tracks, stations, and support facilities, as well as transit service for LRT and connecting bus routes. The four LRT alternatives under consideration for more detailed study in the Draft EIS consist of the north (Alignments A and B) and south alignment alternatives (Alignments D1 and D2) connected by the central alignment C.
- **A-C-D1**
- **A-C-D2**
- **B-C-D1**
- **B-C-D2**

### What alternatives are being considered?
The Draft EIS will evaluate a No-Build alternative, an Enhanced Bus/Transportation Systems Management (TSM) alternative, and several Build alternatives. The Build alternatives being considered for further study in the Draft EIS (four LRT and one BRT) are the most promising alternatives identified during the AA study.

### No-Build Alternative
The No-Build alternative serves as the baseline against which environmental effects of the Bottineau Transitway alternatives are measured.

The No-Build alternative is defined as the existing transportation system, plus any committed transportation improvements in the region. Committed transportation improvements include roadway and transit facility and service improvements (not including the Bottineau Transitway) planned, programmed, and included in the TPP to be implemented by the year 2030. Major regional transit projects (shown in Figure 1) are included in the No-Build alternative.

### Enhanced Bus/Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative
The TSM alternative is defined as enhancements and upgrades to the existing transportation system in the project corridor, attempting to meet the project’s purpose and need as much as possible by investing in a limited capital investment. The TSM alternative could include bus route restructuring, scheduling improvements, new express and limited-stop services, intersection improvements, and/or other focused infrastructure improvements that would improve the function of the transit system. The specific combination of improvements will be incorporated into the TSM alternative will be developed during the Draft EIS process.

In addition to the No-Build and TSM alternatives, the following Build alternatives are proposed for inclusion in the Draft EIS:
- **A-C-D2**
- **B-C-D1**
- **B-C-D2**

### Northern variations (alignments): At the north end of the corridor, there are two alignment options:
- **Alignment A** originates in Maple Grove at Hemlock Lane/Arbor Lakes Parkway, and follows the future Arbor Lakes Parkway and Elm Creek Boulevard to the BNSF railroad corridor located on the west side of Bottineau Boulevard.
- **Alignment B** begins at the Target North Campus (located just north of Highway 610), follows West Broadway Avenue, and crosses Bottineau Boulevard at 73rd Avenue to enter the BNSF railroad corridor.

### Center segment:
Both the A and B alignments would transition to the C alignment in the BNSF railroad corridor on the west side of Bottineau Boulevard through southern Brooklyn Park, Crystal, and Robbinsdale.

### Southern variations (alignments):
There are two alignments under consideration for the transitway south of 36th Avenue in Robbinsdale and into downtown Minneapolis:
- **Alignment D1** continues along the BNSF railroad corridor to Olson Memorial Highway, and then follows Olson Memorial Highway to downtown.
- **Alignment D2** exits the railroad corridor near 34th Avenue, joins West Broadway Avenue, and travels on Penn Avenue to Olson Memorial Highway and into downtown.

### Light Rail Transit (LRT) Alternatives
LRT alternatives proposed for study include several stations between downtown Minneapolis and the Maple Grove/Brooklyn Park area. Each LRT alternative would include tracks, stations, and support facilities, as well as transit service for LRT and connecting bus routes. The four LRT alternatives under consideration for more detailed study in the Draft EIS consist of the north (Alignments A and B) and south alignment alternatives (Alignments D1 and D2) connected by the central alignment C.
- **A-C-D1**
- **A-C-D2**
- **B-C-D1**
- **B-C-D2**

### What alternatives are being considered?
The Draft EIS will evaluate a No-Build alternative, an Enhanced Bus/Transportation Systems Management (TSM) alternative, and several Build alternatives. The Build alternatives being considered for further study in the Draft EIS (four LRT and one BRT) are the most promising alternatives identified during the AA study.

### No-Build Alternative
The No-Build alternative serves as the baseline against which environmental effects of the Bottineau Transitway alternatives are measured.

The No-Build alternative is defined as the existing transportation system, plus any committed transportation improvements in the region. Committed transportation improvements include roadway and transit facility and service improvements (not including the Bottineau Transitway) planned, programmed, and included in the TPP to be implemented by the year 2030. Major regional transit projects (shown in Figure 1) are included in the No-Build alternative.

### Enhanced Bus/Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative
The TSM alternative is defined as enhancements and upgrades to the existing transportation system in the project corridor, attempting to meet the project’s purpose and need as much as possible by investing in a limited capital investment. The TSM alternative could include bus route restructuring, scheduling improvements, new express and limited-stop services, intersection improvements, and/or other focused infrastructure improvements that would improve the function of the transit system. The specific combination of improvements will be incorporated into the TSM alternative will be developed during the Draft EIS process.

In addition to the No-Build and TSM alternatives, the following Build alternatives are proposed for inclusion in the Draft EIS:
- **A-C-D2**
- **B-C-D1**
- **B-C-D2**

### Northern variations (alignments): At the north end of the corridor, there are two alignment options:
- **Alignment A** originates in Maple Grove at Hemlock Lane/Arbor Lakes Parkway, and follows the future Arbor Lakes Parkway and Elm Creek Boulevard to the BNSF railroad corridor located on the west side of Bottineau Boulevard.
- **Alignment B** begins at the Target North Campus (located just north of Highway 610), follows West Broadway Avenue, and crosses Bottineau Boulevard at 73rd Avenue to enter the BNSF railroad corridor.

### Center segment:
Both the A and B alignments would transition to the C alignment in the BNSF railroad corridor on the west side of Bottineau Boulevard through southern Brooklyn Park, Crystal, and Robbinsdale.

### Southern variations (alignments):
There are two alignments under consideration for the transitway south of 36th Avenue in Robbinsdale and into downtown Minneapolis:
- **Alignment D1** continues along the BNSF railroad corridor to Olson Memorial Highway, and then follows Olson Memorial Highway to downtown.
- **Alignment D2** exits the railroad corridor near 34th Avenue, joins West Broadway Avenue, and travels on Penn Avenue to Olson Memorial Highway and into downtown.
Alignment and station alternatives

- A (Maple Grove)
- B (Brooklyn Park)
- C (common segment)
- D1 (BNSF Railway-Olson Highway)
- D2 (West Broadway-Penn Avenue)
- D1-D2 (common segment)

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Alternative

The BRT alternative would include a busway in its own dedicated space (guideway) with several stations between downtown Minneapolis and the Brooklyn Park area on an alignment following Olson Memorial Highway and the Burlington-Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad corridor (alignment B-C-D1, as shown in Figure 3). This alternative would include all facilities associated with the construction and operation of BRT, including right-of-way, travel lanes, stations, and support facilities, as well as transit service for BRT and connecting bus routes. For the Bottineau Transitway, the BRT alternative is the highest quality investment and includes a dedicated guideway for BRT use only, high-amenity stations and speed, reliability, and frequency similar to LRT.

Alignment Refinements

Several refinements to alignments have been and/or will continue to be considered during Scoping:

- **Alignment B**: Since completing the AA study, the HCRRA has been working with the City of Brooklyn Park and Target planners regarding alignments that integrate with master planning activities occurring on the Target North Campus. Coordination will continue on refinements to the northern end of Alignment B near the Target North Campus. A final decision on this refinement is expected during the Scoping process.

- **D2 Penn Avenue options**: Several options (A, B, and C) for the D2 alignment were considered for the segment between West Broadway Avenue and Olson Memorial Highway that included Penn and/or Oliver Avenues (see Figure 4). The Bottineau Transitway Policy Advisory Committee decided on November 14, 2011 to continue study of Option C (all vehicle and LRT traffic on Penn Avenue)

**Figure 4: Segment D2 alignment options**

- **D2 Option A** places LRT and southbound traffic on Penn Avenue, moving northbound traffic to Oliver Avenue.
- **D2 Option B** places LRT on Oliver Avenue removing all traffic from that street, leaving both north and southbound traffic on Penn Avenue.
- **D2 Option C** widens Penn Avenue to allow LRT as well as north and southbound traffic to operate on Penn Avenue.
Refine goals and objectives

**D1 station locations:** The Theodore Wirth Park Master Planning effort has suggested consideration of moving the Golden Valley Station from Golden Valley Road to Plymouth Avenue, potentially providing better access to surrounding residential areas and park facilities. This option is currently under study (see Figure 5).

**D2 Robbinsdale options:** Additionally, coordination has taken place with the City of Robbinsdale regarding the D2 alignment near the Terrace Mall and North Memorial Medical Center at 34th Avenue. At this time, the City of Robbinsdale has recommended the 34th Avenue option for further study because it minimizes disruption to North Memorial Medical Center, minimizes impacts to streets and traffic, and provides the highest potential for transit-oriented development.

**FIGURE 5: POTENTIAL SEGMENT D1 STATION LOCATIONS**

---

**Figure 5:** Potential D2 Robbinsdale op

Scoping will be eliminated from further study based on agency and public input. As illustrated in Figure 6, as the alternatives are refined and advanced through the NEPA/MEPA process, the definition of the project and the analysis completed becomes more refined and defined.

---

**WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE ALTERNATIVES IDENTIFIED AT THE END OF THE SCOPING PROCESS FOR FURTHER STUDY IN THE DRAFT EIS AND THE LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE?**

The locally preferred alternative (LPA) will be one of the alternatives identified and studied in the Draft EIS. The identification of an LPA is a critical step to pursue federal funding. Based on input and technical analysis completed during the Scoping process, the HCRRA and the corridor cities will make an LPA recommendation to the Metropolitan Council. The Metropolitan Council will then consider amending the region’s long-range transportation plan, called the Transportation Policy Plan (TPP), to identify the Bottineau Transitway LPA.

The LPA selection process does not replace or override the requirement to fully examine alternatives and determine the adverse impacts that must be avoided or mitigated under the federal and state environmental review process. While there is a provision in the federal environmental review process to identify an LPA in the Draft EIS, the LPA identification and inclusion in the region’s long-range transportation plan does not dictate that the LPA be the only “Build Alternative” studied in the Draft EIS.

---

**FIGURE 6: ALTERNATIVES SELECTION PROCESS**

**Decisions**

**Alternatives Analysis Study**

- Alternatives Analysis (Alternatives Analysis)
- Refined purpose and need
- Refined goals and objectives

**Scoping**

- Locally Preferred Alternative
- End Study*

**EIS**

- End Study*
- Final concepts
- Comprehensive evaluation

*End Study refers specifically to Alternative(s).

---

**Goal 1:** Enhance regional access to activity centers throughout the Twin Cities via connections to the emerging transitway system and the greater regional transit system.

**Goal 2:** Enhance the effectiveness of transit service within the Bottineau Transitway project area by connecting key activity centers and providing access to jobs, schools, housing, health care, parks, shopping, and entertainment.

**Goal 3:** Develop the Bottineau Transitway as an integral component of a cost-effective and financially feasible transit system.

**Secondary Goals Addressing Community Sustainability**

**Goal 4:** Promote sustainable development patterns for the long-term viability of Bottineau Transitway communities and the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.

**Goal 5:** Support healthy communities and sound environmental practices along the Bottineau Corridor.

---

**HOW WILL THE ALTERNATIVES BE EVALUATED?**

Building off the goals and objectives developed during the AA study, the following goals and objectives have been developed to serve as a framework to first develop and then evaluate the alternatives under consideration for the Bottineau Transitway. For an alternative to be advanced for further study, the basic purpose and need of the Bottineau Transitway must be met. This means that any alternative advanced for further study must meet Goals 1 through 3 (outlined below). Goals 4 and 5 reflect sustainability goals of corridor communities, and will be considered in the evaluation of alternatives that meet the basic purpose and need of the project.

**Goals Directly Addressing the Primary Project Needs**

**Goal 1:** Enhance regional access to activity centers throughout the Twin Cities via connections to the emerging transitway system and the greater regional transit system.

**Goal 2:** Enhance the effectiveness of transit service within the Bottineau Transitway project area by connecting key activity centers and providing access to jobs, schools, housing, health care, parks, shopping, and entertainment.

**Goal 3:** Develop the Bottineau Transitway as an integral component of a cost-effective and financially feasible transit system.

---

**HOW MANY ALTERNATIVES WILL BE ANALYZED IN THE DRAFT EIS?**

The Draft EIS will review a range of alternatives that best meet the project purpose and need, are most technically and financially feasible, and avoid significant environmental impacts that cannot be easily mitigated. Typically, between two and five alternatives are analyzed in addition to the No-Build alternative. It is expected that some of the alternatives entering the definition of the project and the analysis completed becomes more refined and defined.

---

**FIGURE 5: POTENTIAL SEGMENT D1 STATION LOCATIONS**
Why does an LPA need to be identified before the EIS analysis has been completed?

The identification of an LPA is a critical step to pursue federal funding. The selection of an LPA for the Bottineau Transitway marks the end of the Alternatives Analysis phase. Concluding the AA process allows the project to pursue federal funding. The public input received during Scoping along with the analysis conducted during the Scoping process will inform the LPA decision-making.

What types of issues will be covered in the Draft EIS?

The Draft EIS provides an opportunity for the public and agencies to disclose and explore anticipated project impacts. The Draft EIS will evaluate existing conditions and the significant potential impacts of the No-Build, TSM and Build alternatives on the environment. Environmental effects to be analyzed in the Draft EIS will include:

- **Neighborhood and community resources:** Effects on neighborhoods, social groups, community facilities, and community cohesion in the project area.
- **Environmental justice:** Effects of the proposed alternatives on minority and low-income populations and communities.
- **Noise and vibration:** Effects on noise and vibration on sensitive properties.
- **Historic and cultural resources (Section 106 process):** Effects on historic and cultural resources that include historic districts, buildings, structures, and other objects included in, or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.
- **Parks and public land (Section 4(f) and 6(f)):** Effects on publicly owned parks and recreation lands within the project area.
- **Water resources, wetlands, and habitat:** Effects on water resources, including surface water resources, water quality, wetlands, floodplains, critical areas, and groundwater. It also considers effects on ecosystems and protected plant and animal species.
- **Air quality and climate change:** Effects on climate change and regional air quality.

Other potential impacts to be addressed in the Draft EIS include:

- Land use and zoning
- Consistency with local plans
- Right-of-way impacts
- Economic development and redevelopment
- Visual and aesthetics
- Transportation (including transit, roads and highways, railroads and pedestrian/bicycle facilities)
- Safety and security
- Hazardous material/contamination
- Soils and geologic resources
- Utilities
- Energy
- Secondary and cumulative effects

During the EIS process, refined capital cost estimates will also be prepared, along with operating and maintenance cost estimates, and ridership forecasts.

The schedule for the Draft EIS is shown in Figure 7.

![Figure 7: EIS Schedule and Milestones](image-url)
HOW CAN I VOICE MY OPINION IN THE PROCESS?

Anyone interested in the Bottineau Transitway project is encouraged to take part in the Scoping process. Project planners are especially interested in your input on:

- Purpose and need for the project
- The alternatives proposed for study
- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

There are several ways for you to participate and for your voice to be heard.

You can attend a meeting to learn more about the Scoping process and to share your thoughts about the project.

Formal public Scoping meetings are scheduled for the following dates and locations:

**Scoping Open House #1:**
Monday, January 23rd
4:30 to 6:30 PM
Theodore Wirth Chalet
1301 Theodore Wirth Parkway, Minneapolis

**Scoping Open House #2:**
Tuesday, January 24th
6:00 to 8:00 PM
Brooklyn Park City Hall
5200 85th Avenue N, Brooklyn Park

**Scoping Open House #3:**
Wednesday, January 25th
5:30 to 7:30 PM
Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center (UROC)
2001 Plymouth Avenue N, Minneapolis

**Scoping Open House #4:**
Tuesday, January 31st
6:00 to 8:00 PM
Robbinsdale City Hall
4100 Lakeview Avenue N, Robbinsdale

You can submit comments in writing, by U.S. mail, e-mail, or fax, to:

Brent Rusco
Bottineau Transitway Project Manager
Hennepin County
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415
Phone: 612.543.0579
Email: brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us
Fax: 612.348.9710

For your convenience, a public comment sheet is included with this booklet. Comments may also be submitted directly via the Bottineau Transitway website, www.bottineautransitway.org.

The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date.

Government agencies will be invited to a separate interagency Scoping meeting to be held as follows:

**Interagency Meeting:**
Date: Thursday, January 19
Time: 9:00 to 11:00 AM

Auxiliary aides, services and communication materials in accessible formats and languages other than English can be provided if notice is given at least 14 calendar days before the meeting by contacting Brent Rusco at the address, telephone number, or e-mail address above.

Written materials, project updates, and materials used at the public Scoping meetings will be available on the Bottineau Transitway project website: www.bottineautransitway.org.

How will my comments be used? Will they make a difference?

Your comments can make a difference. Comments received during the Scoping period will be used to finalize the Bottineau Transitway purpose and need, refine the proposed alternatives, and identify environmental topic areas to be analyzed in the Draft EIS and their method of analysis. You can find out how all comments were addressed by reviewing the Scoping Decision Document, which is a summary of the Scoping process, comments received, and response to comments that is published after the Scoping public comment period ends. This report will be made available to the public and interested agencies.

What does the Scoping Decision Document tell us?

The Scoping Decision Document is a summary of the Scoping process, comments received, and responses to comments, published after the Scoping public comment period ends. It tells how comments were addressed during the Scoping process were addressed and presents the final Bottineau Transitway purpose and need, the alternatives to be studied, and the environmental topic areas and the methods of analysis in the Draft EIS.

What happens after Scoping? Can I still be involved?

The Scoping process is just the beginning of the environmental review process. Although the formal Scoping period ends on February 17, 2012, opportunities for involvement in the Draft EIS will continue. Additional community meetings will be scheduled during the preparation of the Draft EIS and materials will be posted to the project website for community review and comments.

Following publication of the Draft EIS another series of formal public hearings will be conducted to receive your comments on the findings of the Draft EIS and the recommendation for the preferred alternative.

Who is involved locally in the process?

A number of other local groups are included in the Scoping and Draft EIS process (see Figure 8). A complete list of the federal, state, and local agencies involved in the Draft EIS process is available in the Bottineau Transitway Coordination Plan. Some of the most active local agency partners participate on the Bottineau Transitway Policy Advisory Committee (PAC), Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Advise, Review, and Coordinate Committee (ARCC):

- Policy Advisory Committee (PAC): PAC members are elected officials, key policy leaders for participating agencies, business leaders, and institutional leaders, convened to review project development progress and advise progress toward identifying a Locally Preferred Alternative.
- Community Advisory Committee (CAC): Members represent communities, businesses, and institutions in the Bottineau Transitway study area. CAC members provide a conduit for integrating the values and perspectives of citizens, communities, businesses and institutions into the study process.
- Advise, Review, and Coordinate Committee (ARCC): ARCC members are technical staff from agencies convened to advise project development. The ARCC provides advice regarding local governmental perspectives, issues of concern, technical methodologies, and study process details. The ARCC is comprised of staff from Hennepin County; the cities of Brooklyn Park, Crystal, Golden Valley, New Hope, Maple Grove, Minneapolis, Osseo, and Robbinsdale; Maple Grove Transit; the Metropolitan Council, MnDOT; and project consultants.

**FIGURE 8: DRAFT EIS PARTNERS**
**List of Acronyms:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Alternatives Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCC</td>
<td>Advise, Review, and Coordinate Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNSF</td>
<td>Burlington-Northern Santa Fe (railroad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Bus Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC</td>
<td>Citizen Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCRRA</td>
<td>Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPA</td>
<td>Locally Preferred Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Light Rail Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEPA</td>
<td>Minnesota Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnDOT</td>
<td>Minnesota Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Policy Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPP</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSM</td>
<td>Transportation System Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regional Color-Coded Transit Lines:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Line</td>
<td>Hiawatha LRT (In Operation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Line</td>
<td>Central Corridor (In Construction) and Southwest LRT (Preliminary Engineering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Line</td>
<td>I-35W South BRT (Preliminary Engineering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Line</td>
<td>Cedar Ave BRT (In Construction)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
- The alternatives proposed for study
- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
- Other comments

Name: __________________________________________________________
Address: _______________________________________________________
email: __________________________________________________________

Please check all of the following that apply:
- Area resident
- Area business owner
- Community-based organization member
- Other interested party
Guide to Bottineau Transitway Scoping Meetings

Thank you for participating in tonight’s Scoping Meeting. Tonight we want to share with you the evaluations completed to date regarding possible transit modes (bus rapid transit and light rail), route alternatives and the potential transportation benefits of a Bottineau Transitway. We also request your input on the alternatives to be studied in the upcoming Environmental Impact Statement.

Specifically, we are interested in your input on:

- Purpose and Need for the project
- The alternatives proposed for study
- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

We ask that you participate in the following activities tonight:

- Watch the video presentation to get an overview of the project and summary of the Scoping Booklet.
- Review the Scoping Booklet and information displays
- Talk to project staff about any questions or concerns you might have
- Provide your input!

You can provide your input in several ways:

- Speak to the comment recorder available at tonight’s meeting. The reporter will transcribe your comments word for word for the project record.
- Write your comments on the comment form provided and leave in the comment box tonight or mail before February 17. The form is set up with the mailing address on the back – just fold, secure with tape and add a stamp.
- Submit your comments from home or the local library through the project website: www.bottineautransitway.org.

Please remember all comments must be received by February 17, 2012.

Also, feel free to share this information with your neighbors, co-workers or friends who are unable to attend these meetings. All information available at tonight’s meeting (including the video presentation) is available on the project website.

Auxiliary aides, services and communication materials in accessible formats and languages other than English can be provided if notice is given at least 14 days in advance by contacting Brent Rusco, Bottineau Transitway Project Manager at 612-543-0570 or brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us.

Your comments can make a difference!
Build Alternatives Proposed for Study in the Draft EIS

What are Your Thoughts?

Alignment and station alternatives:
- A (Maple Grove) (LRT only)
- B (Brooklyn Park) (LRT and BRT)
- C (common segment) (LRT and BRT)
- D1 (BNSF Railway-Olson Highway) (LRT and BRT)
- D2 (West Broadway-Penn Avenue) (LRT only)
- D1-D2 (common segment) (LRT and BRT)
Figure 1: Optimized BRT Scenario Overview

- **BRT trunk line** extends full length of Segment B to 97th Avenue Station in Brooklyn Park.
- **Route 732** provides limited stop, street-running branch service between MGTS and Brooklyn Blvd; operates on guideway from Brooklyn Blvd to downtown. Operates in both directions during peak period only.
- **Route 732A** shuttle retained between MGTS and Brooklyn Blvd during off-peak periods.
- **BRT** and **Route 732** provide service to all stations on guideway south of Brooklyn Blvd (BRT all day, 732 peak only).

Key Points:
- Interchange stop for BRT/732 relocated to Border Avenue (full guideway station).
- Outbound: BRT/732 stops on Hennepin nearside 4th Street.
- Inbound: BRT/732 stops on 4th Street nearside Hennepin.
- BRT/732 use existing enhanced stops on Marquette/2nd (midblock stop groups A/G assumed).
- BRT/732 use Leamington Ramp layover.
Summary of Public Comments During Scoping Process
Summary of Public Comments during the Bottineau Transitway Scoping Process

May 21, 2012

Overview

This document provides a summary of public comments received during the Scoping period (December 26, 2011 through February 17, 2012) for the Bottineau Transitway Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS). Comments received during the Scoping period will be used to finalize the Bottineau Transitway purpose and need, refine proposed alternatives, and identify environmental topic areas to be analyzed in the Draft EIS and their method of analysis. Comments will be addressed in the Scoping Decision Document, which is a summary of the Scoping process, comments received, and response to comments that is published after the Scoping public comment period ends. This report will be made available to the public and interested agencies.

One interagency Scoping meeting and four public Scoping Open Houses were held during the Scoping period to gain stakeholder input. At the interagency meeting on January 19, 21 participants representing municipalities and local, state, and federal government agencies reviewed and discussed concerns relative to the proposed project. The dates, locations, and number of people attending each of the open house meetings are provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Open House Meeting Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Open House</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Attendees*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Wirth Chalet</td>
<td>January 23, 2012</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Park City Hall</td>
<td>January 24, 2012</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center</td>
<td>January 25, 2012</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbinsdale City Hall</td>
<td>January 31, 2012</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of people who signed the sign-in sheet
Public and Agency Outreach

An extensive outreach effort was used to solicit public and agency comments for the Bottineau Transitway project during the formal Scoping period, which extended from December 26, 2011 to February 17, 2012. The Scoping Booklet, which contained a list of Scoping Open House locations, was provided to members of the Bottineau Transitway Advise, Review, and Communicate Committee (ARCC), Community Advisory Committee (CAC), and Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) and other interested stakeholders on the project mailing list. An extensive e-mail list of more than 600 individuals, neighborhood groups, special interest groups, agencies, businesses, churches, elected officials, and media outlets was used to distribute the Scoping Booklet. The Scoping Booklet was also posted on the project website and hard copies were provided to libraries and community centers in the project area. Notice of the Scoping Open Houses was sent via e-mail to Maple Grove Transit riders and posters were put up at the transit station. Notices of the meetings were also sent to more than 500 property owners within approximately 350 feet of the Bottineau Transitway alignments in Robbinsdale.

Comments Received during the Scoping Process

Open house attendees were encouraged to provide input on the purpose and need for the project, the alternatives proposed for the study, and the project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated or any other areas of interest or concern. Comments represent public comments plus those from organizations, groups, municipalities, and agencies. Nearly 300 comments were received via the various formats described below. Comments were forwarded to one central location where they were tabulated, analyzed, coded, and summarized.

Written Comments: As part of the Scoping process, Scoping comment forms were prepared and included with the Scoping Booklet (see attached comment form), available on the project website and at each of the public meetings. Interested individuals were invited to submit written comments, either in letter format, on the Bottineau Transitway Scoping comment form, or electronically, to the project manager or the project email address. Comments were also received by city officials and forwarded for inclusion in the scoping input.

Verbal Comments: A court reporter was available at each open house to record verbatim statements.

Table 2: Summary of Comment Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Comment</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment forms submitted at open houses</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal statements received at open houses</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written comments (mail and electronic) and additional comment forms</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>295</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 2, 295 comments were received through February 17, 2012. Of these, 84 written comments and 45 verbal comments were received at the Scoping open houses. The balance was received by mail or e-mail prior to the end of the comment period and one person commented by phone. A few individuals provided comments using more than one format (e.g., email and comment form), or submitted comments to more than one recipient (e.g., project website and the city council). In addition to comments from the general public, written statements were also received from the following municipalities, agencies, and organizations: City of Crystal, City of Brooklyn Park, City of Robbinsdale, City of Golden Valley, City of Maple Grove, City of Minneapolis, Minneapolis Park &
Recreation Board, Metropolitan Council’s Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe, Shingle Creek Watershed Management Commission, Bassett Creek Watershed Commission, West Broadway Business and Area Coalition, Transit for Livable Communities, Alliance for Metropolitan Stability, North Loop Neighborhood Association, Harrison Neighborhood Association, ISAIAH, BNSF Railway, and the Bottineau Transitway CAC.

Comments by Topic

Purpose and Need for the Project

The Scoping comment form asked people to respond to the purpose and need for the project. General responses to this question indicated a need for better public transportation in the northwest portion the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area that would serve future growth in the northwest suburbs, support economic development, provide access to employment and school, and reduce traffic congestion and pollution. Responses to the purpose and need question, as well as other questions, provided information reflecting support or opposition to the transitway and preferences for LRT or BRT. The following tables summarize input received at the open houses (verbally and in comment forms) as well as in additional comments received during the Scoping process.

Comments that offered support for or opposition to the transitway are shown in Table 3. The majority of comments indicated general support for the transitway.

Table 3: Public Comments – Support or Opposition to Transitway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Wirth Chalet Open House</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Park City Hall Open House</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UROC* Open House</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbinsdale City Hall Open House</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional comments</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center

**Support for Transitway Project:** Specific comments indicating support for the transitway included: economic growth, environmental sustainability, reduction in traffic congestion, and providing access to non-car owners and non-drivers (e.g., young, elderly, and disabled persons).

**Opposition to the Transitway Project:** Specific comments indicating opposition to the transitway included: social and environmental impacts, tax increases (including subsidies to maintain the transitway), much of the current plan is redundant to the existing transit system, the existing public transportation is underutilized, and the plan assumes people will actually use the transitway.

Comments pertaining to preferences for BRT or LRT are summarized below and in Table 4.
Mode Preferences

Table 4: Public Comments – LRT or BRT Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>LRT</th>
<th>BRT</th>
<th>Combination of LRT &amp; Bus</th>
<th>Improve the Existing System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Wirth Chalet Open House</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Park City Hall Open House</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UROC* Open House</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbinsdale City Hall Open House</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center

Preference for LRT: Many (36) people who provided comments indicated a preference for LRT over BRT. Specific reasons for supporting LRT included: cleaner and more efficient than buses, more environmentally responsible, faster travel time, require less maintenance than buses, more visually appealing, has more “personality” leading to higher ridership, transports a higher volume of riders, leads to higher surrounding land values, not as susceptible to weather, better long-term transportation solution than buses, and adds to the existing Metro LRT system. One person noted that with LRT, two Van White stations would not be needed (i.e., the Southwest Transitway and the Bottineau Transitway are close together). Several individuals noted that they preferred LRT or nothing and that they would not use a BRT system.

Preference for BRT: Several (6) people expressed a preference for BRT. Specific reasons for supporting BRT included: more flexibility in routing and vehicle sizes compared to buses, easier to board and exit, lower initial costs and lower operating costs than LRT, and represents a better use of tax dollars.

Preference for LRT and BRT: Transit for Livable Communities indicated that both LRT and BRT should be given full consideration. Several other comments also supported both LRT and BRT.

Preference for a combination of LRT and bus: Comments were received that favored the use of LRT with “feeder buses” to transport users to the LRT route.

Preference for improving the existing system: Several comments supported finding ways to improve the existing system and questioned the need for a dedicated transitway. One comment noted that using the existing system could avoid tax increases and avoid environmental impacts.

BNSF Railway input: HCRRA’s proposal to operate a BRT system immediately adjacent to BNSF trackage on the Monticello Subdivision has been reviewed by the BNSF Operations and Engineering Departments. After reviewing the proposal, BNSF will not support the BRT option.

Alignment Preferences

The Scoping comment form asked people to respond to the alternatives proposed for study. Responses to this question expressed preferences for or opposition to specific alignments. Comments offering suggestions for alternative alignments are provided at the end of this summary.
Statements of preference for the proposed alignments are summarized in Table 5. Those who indicated support or a preference for a specific alignment are included under “support” column. Comments that expressed overall opposition to the transitway project are not represented in Table 5. For the northern portion of the transitway, comments generally indicated a preference for the A (Maple Grove) or B (Brooklyn Park) alignment. For the southern portion of the transitway, comments generally indicated a preference for D1 (BNSF Railway – Olson Highway) or D2 (West Broadway – Penn Avenue) alignment.

Table 5: Public Comments – Alignment Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Alignment A</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Alignment B</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Alignment D1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Alignment D2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Wirth Chalet Open House</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Park City Hall Open House</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UROC* Open House</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbinsdale City Hall Open House</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional comments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center

Alignment A (Maple Grove)

**Support:** In addition to general support for Alignment A, comments indicated that this alignment would better serve access to employment and education opportunities. One individual indicated that a line terminating in Maple Grove would bring more job opportunities to the residents of Minneapolis and the inner-ring suburbs than a Brooklyn Park terminus. Another individual comment indicated that Alignment A facilitates the need for reverse commutes.

**Oppose:** One individual indicated that the route serves a minority of people and retail shoppers who would probably opt to drive. The comment also noted that Brooklyn Park alignment (B) has more industry along their corridor for commuting.

**Concerns:** The City of Maple Grove Resolution 12-016 supports further review of alternatives A-C-D1, A-C-D2, B-C-D1, and B-C-D2. However, the resolution outlines concerns regarding impacts related to Alignment A, including impacts to the Gravel Mining Area, the existing Maple Grove Transit operation, and the right-of-way of a future extension of Arbor Lakes Parkway. Details associated with these specific concerns are detailed in the City of Maple Grove’s Resolution No. 12-016.
Alignment B  (Brooklyn Park)

Support: The City of Brooklyn Park supports Alignment B, indicating that this alignment will reach more of its residents and businesses than Alignment A. In addition to general public comments indicating support for Alignment B, comments providing specific reasons for preferring this Alignment included: would help Highway 610 business development and development in Brooklyn Park, would have a stop at the new Brooklyn Park library, provides better access to schools (i.e., North Hennepin Community College) and jobs (e.g., Target North Campus), and provides more opportunity for more riders to take public transportation on a regular basis.

Alignments A and B

Support: Several individuals suggested providing transit service along both the A and B alignments, indicating that both alignments provide opportunities for jobs, school, shopping, and commuting. The City of Crystal and Transit for Livable Communities support further study of both alignments. Transit for Livable Communities also supports the possibility of constructing both northern alignments for BRT.

Alignment C

The City of Crystal Resolution 2012-14 and the City of Robbinsdale Resolution No. 7143 support Alignment C. Comments providing specific reasons for supporting this alignment included: minimizes crossings at roadways and signalized intersections, offers reasonable opportunities for station siting, requires no additional right-of-way, provides a station within Crystal’s most significant concentration of existing shopping and employment, and is adjacent to residential neighborhoods.

Alignment D1   (BNSF Railway-Olson Highway)

Support: The City of Brooklyn Park and the City of Robbinsdale Resolution No. 7143 support Alignment D1. In addition to general public comments stating support for Alignment D1, comments providing specific reasons for preferring this alignment included: using the existing rail line is much less disruptive to the residential neighborhood, more people would use due to faster travel time (e.g., fewer stops and signalized intersections), allows people living farther out to get downtown quickly, will serve more people in the long-term, and is more compatible with general motor vehicle, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic as compared to Alignment D2. One comment stated that Broadway should be reserved for future streetcar reintroduction.

Oppose: The Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board (MPRB) opposes the Alignment D1 due to potential impacts to natural resources, parkland, and the recreational opportunities it is entrusted to protect. MPRB correspondence details concerns regarding the historic nature of the Grand Rounds, park and trail impacts, bus transportation restrictions on MPRB parkways, pedestrian and wildlife barriers associated with the transitway, floodway and floodplain impacts, and the potential removal of disease resistant elms. If the Alignment D1 is selected, the MPRB requests the environmental review of both the Golden Valley Road and Plymouth Avenue stations.

The majority of public comments opposing this alignment are related to environmental (e.g., wetlands, floodplains, wildlife, and ecosystems) and recreational impacts (e.g., safety and increased noise) to Theodore Wirth Park. Many comments expressed opposition to D1 indicating that it would disregard people in north Minneapolis who most need the service. Other reasons for opposition included: does not serve a high ridership, provides no service destinations (e.g., restaurants, shops,
hospital), impacts quality of life for nearby residents, bypasses North Memorial Medical Center, does
not provide an opportunity for economic development, efficient transit is already available to
downtown, influx of crime and/or “undesirable people,” decrease in property values, increase in
taxes, noise and vibration impacts, increased traffic, the residents do not need it/will not use it, would
eourage sprawl, oppose as a way for suburban commuters to avoid racial diversity, and there is no
parking available on the D1 alignment (e.g., people would park on local streets).

Concerns: Correspondence from the City of Golden Valley sets forth specific concerns associated
with Alignment D1. Golden Valley asks that, if study of the D1 Alignment continues, the following
items be addressed: natural resources (e.g., recreational and environmental impacts), station
location (Golden Valley Road and Plymouth Avenue), property impacts (e.g., property values, noise
and vibration impacts, lighting impacts), and community resources (e.g., public services, utilities).
Details are provided in correspondence from the City of Golden Valley dated February 21, 2012.

Scoping comments received from the City of Minneapolis Scoping also address specific concerns
regarding Alignment D1. The City specifies that Alignment D1 largely bypasses transit-dependent
communities in north Minneapolis and does not extend the transportation and economic
development benefits provided by the transitway directly to these communities. Details related to this
concern, along with the need for future arterial/regional transitway improvements, are provided in the
City of Minneapolis Bottineau DEIS Scoping Comments approved by City Council on February 15,
2012.

Alignment D2 (West Broadway-Penn Avenue)

Support: The MPRB supports Alignment D2 because it believes that this alignment presents the
greatest opportunities for urban revival, economic development, strong ridership, and transportation
equity in north Minneapolis. Many public comments addressed the need for the transitway to be close
to where people live. Comments providing specific reasons for preferring Alignment D2 included:
serves more people (greater ridership) than D1, has more stations and better station access
(including by foot) than D1, supports economic growth in the area, would better serve low-income
community, better serves non-car owners, provides equity in infrastructure and access to
employment/education/healthcare, and provides a better long-term transit strategy. One individual
stated that “a growing and accessible north Minneapolis community where people want to live is
essential for stabilizing surrounding communities.”

Oppose: The City of Crystal opposes the D2 alignment because it sacrifices travel times and higher
overall ridership offered by the D1 alignment, requires two additional station stops and seven
additional signalized intersections as compared to Alignment D1, has significant technical challenges
associated with operating a transitway in a largely residential neighborhood and on arterial streets
with relatively narrow existing right-of-way, duplicates existing bus service, and has substantial
property, right-of-way, and community impacts. In addition, residents of north Minneapolis signed a
“petition against the D2 LRT plan down the streets of Oliver and Penn.” The petition, signed by 118
residents, was submitted to the Bottineau Transitway PAC prior to the scoping process.

Additional reasons for opposition to Alignment D2 included: will destroy the neighborhood, negatively
impact property values, remove too many houses (cost of right-of-way and relocation), damage the
character of the neighborhood, exacerbate congestion, present potential safety concerns, and
remove parking on city streets. One individual indicated that outsiders are bringing in the idea that
the transitway is going to be really good for economic development. Another individual stated that
Penn needs to be protected as a north/south thoroughfare.

Concerns: Comments received from the City of Minneapolis presented specific concerns regarding
Alignment D2. The City specifies that the D2 Alignment has significant community impacts related to
removal of single-family homes on the west side of the street, the reduction of traffic lanes on West
Broadway Avenue, and the removal of existing off-peak on-street parking. Details related to these
concerns, along with the need for future arterial/ regional transitway improvements, are provided in
the City of Minneapolis Bottineau Draft EIS Scoping Comments.

Alignments D1 and D2:

Support: Several comments suggested providing transit service along both the D1 and D2
alignments, indicating that both alignments have benefits. Transit for Livable Communities also
supports further study of the D1 and D2 alignments. One individual suggested that D1 could be BRT,
facilitating transport to D2. Several comments expressed a desire for transit along the D2 alignment
if it were possible without the loss of so many homes.

Alignment Options D2A, D2B, and D2C

Multiple comments stated support for D2A and D2B, or other parallel routes, indicating that these
alignments are preferable because they would result in fewer property impacts. One individual stated
that at the last North Side meeting, the option going down Oliver Avenue was the preferred choice of
neighborhood residents because it would be less destructive to homes and businesses. Transit for
Livable Communities indicated that the D2A, D2B, and D2C alignments should be given further
consideration. In November 2011, the Bottineau Transitway Policy Advisory Committee decided to
continue study of Alignment D2 Option C (all vehicle and LRT trafﬁc on Penn Avenue).

Other Alignments

Several people indicated that they preferred the proposed alignment to use the existing BNSF railway
line, but did not specify a preference for Alignment D1. One commenter indicated a preference for
Alternative 1 or 5 and D2C. Another commenter noted a preference for Alternative 7. Alternatives 11,
53, and 73 were among the universe of alternatives considered in the Alternatives Analysis Study.
Finally, other comments suggested various combinations of buses and light rail to provide transit
services. Several comments speciﬁed the use of feeder buses in conjunction with LRT. Specific
suggestions for alternative alignments are provided under Project/ Alternative Suggestions at the end
of this summary.

Potential Project Impacts and Other Topics of Public Concern

The Scoping comment form asked for input regarding project impacts or beneﬁts that should be
evaluated and also asked for other comments. Responses to these questions, as well as to other
comment form questions, identiﬁed topics of public concern and are summarized in Table 6. The
table also includes topics of concern provided in verbal and written comments from the public. Each
topic listed in the table is discussed in the subsequent text. Specific concerns raised by the general
public are provided under the heading from public comments. Specific concerns raised by particular

1 Alternative 1 – BRT/LRT, BNSF right-of-way – Olson Memorial Highway
2 Alternative 5 – BRT, Bottineau Boulevard – West Broadway Avenue – Lyndale Avenue – 7th Street North
3 Alternative 7 – BRT/LRT, Bottineau Boulevard – West Broadway Avenue – Lowry Avenue –
   Emerson/Fremont – 7th Street North
groups are summarized under the heading from organizations, groups, municipalities, and agencies, with additional detail provided in correspondence from the group or within city resolutions.

A list of project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated is provided at the end of this summary.

Table 6: Summary of Potential Project Impacts and Other Topics of Public Concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics of Concern</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social and Economic Impacts and Relocations</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise and Vibration</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic, Congestion, and Accessibility</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Locations</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeder Buses</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Operations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Engagement Process</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impacts</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Assumptions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner’s Drive-In</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Impacts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social and Economic Impacts and Relocation:

From public comments: Many comments (70) indicated concern about decreases in property values and increases in taxes as a result of the proposed transitway. Other comments expressed concern about impacts to homes/businesses and stated the importance of minimizing impacts to properties and providing appropriate compensation. One comment noted that removal of housing along the west side of Penn Avenue would mean the loss of millions of dollars of NRP investment and would affect neighborhood/area stability and result in a dwindling tax base.

Comments expressed concerns regarding environmental impacts (e.g., noise, vibrations, light pollution, safety and security) and losses in property values resulting from the location of the transitway near their properties. Specifically, individuals asked if property owners are compensated and what agency is responsible for providing compensation. One individual requested that compensation be discussed directly with affected residents, as opposed to communication with
community organizations who do not necessarily act in the residents’ best interest. One individual [Noble Avenue] noted that his property is located only a few feet from the existing railroad fence and asked what criteria are used for buying out homes that would be severely impacted. Several people were skeptical that property values would increase. Several comments addressed the importance of working with landlords, rather than just renters, during relocations and noted the need to ensure that renters receive assistance.

Numerous comments (30) related to social impacts expressed concerns about the importance of providing affordable, accessible, and equitable transportation to low-income and minority residents so that they can have access to financial opportunities (jobs), educational opportunities, health services, and healthy food alternatives. Comments emphasized the importance of avoiding disparities in transportation, in some cases indicated that this should be a primary consideration in the Scoping alternatives. Eight comments reflected a general need to run the transitway in corridors where the greatest number of residents and businesses can be served.

A total of 18 comments noted the importance of the transitway in spurring economic development, business investment, and revitalization in north Minneapolis and Brooklyn Park.

One verbal statement expressed concern about impacts to community facilities, specifically Estes Funeral Chapel, noting that the chapel has provided services to the community for 54 years. Several comments addressed impacts to North Point Health and Wellness Center stating that African American people and lower income people go there for health care.

From organizations, groups, municipalities, and agencies: Environmental justice concerns were clearly evident in correspondence from the Alliance for Metropolitan Stability, the Harrison Neighborhood Association, and ISAIAH (a coalition of churches advocating for racial and economic justice). Specific concerns are detailed in correspondence received from these organizations. In addition, the City of Minneapolis recommends further analysis of the distribution of the project’s benefits relative to the transit-dependent, minority, and low-income communities in the D1 Alignment corridor. Further discussion is provided in the City of Minneapolis Bottineau Draft EIS Scoping Comments.

The West Broadway Business & Area Coalition stressed the importance of applying the best management practices learned from Blue Line (Hiawatha), Central, and Southwest Transit Lines to any line that comes through north Minneapolis. The Coalition wants small businesses to survive and thrive through construction, and wants rail stops be designed for the best accessibility to existing businesses.

Noise and Vibration
From public comments: Numerous comments (55) addressed concerns about noise and vibration impacts (during construction and during operation) and the need to mitigate them. Comments expressed concerns about noise generated by the train whistle and the arm of the crossing guard, vibration damage to foundations, health impacts, impacts to children and pets, and noise affecting quality of life (e.g., loss of peacefulness, inability to sleep). In addition, specific inquiries about sound walls along alleys or Queen and Russell (D2) or for Highway 55 to Plymouth Avenue (D1) were made. One individual noted that “there is very little information on the specifics about what else might be going in (sound barriers or other sound or motion issues).” Questions related to noise and vibration included: Will soundproofing be provided for homes? Will the project include sound barriers/earth berms? What kind of vibration impacts will there be? How do BRT and LRT compare in terms of noise and disruption? What is the impact?

One comment questioned the noise and vibration assessment, specifically the noise impact for D1 (Moderately High) and D2 (Moderate). The comment indicated that it was extremely difficult to believe that LRT along a relatively straight, long-established, and in use railroad track would have a greater
noise impact than LRT down city streets where no rail transit currently exists and that would require at least two sharp turns and many crossing signals. The commenter asked how overall noise/vibration impact scores were calculated. The commenter requested an explanation of how the seemingly arbitrary vibration impacts for D2 LRT and D3 LRT were determined.

**Natural Resources**

From public comments: A total of 40 comments expressed concerns about natural resources, many of which were associated with Alignment D1. Comments expressed concerns about negative impacts to resources (e.g., wetlands, floodplains, vegetation, wildlife and habitat, ecosystems, etc.). Many comments specifically noted concerns about resource impacts in Theodore Wirth Park, Mary Hills Nature Area, and Sochacki Park. Several comments mentioned concerns about light pollution and pollution in general. One individual noted the demolition and disposal of homes along Penn Avenue as an environmental impact. Another individual asked if any necessary landscaping could be done with native plants. One individual cautioned that the proposed D1 Alignment poses a fire risk because of all the fallen trees in the area between the tracks and private properties between Plymouth Avenue and Highway 55. Another person asked if the “availability of LRT lessened air and soil pollution in Twin Cities neighborhoods where it has been put into service.”

From organizations, groups, municipalities, and agencies: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) identified the potential for wetland impacts along Theodore Wirth Park (D1) and noted that moving the Golden Valley Station from Golden Valley Road to Plymouth Avenue also has the potential for wetland impacts. The USFWS also indicated that although there are no known eagle nests within the action area, existing data may not be current. The USFWS advises that if Alignment D1 advances for further study in the Draft EIS, eagle nest surveys should be incorporated in the EIS for any forested areas planned for development. The surveys should be performed a few years prior to construction. If eagle nests are identified, construction timetables should be designed to do much of the work outside the eagle nesting season or outside a 660 foot buffer from the nest.

Shingle Creek Watershed Management Commission (Commission) is currently undergoing rule revisions. Changes that may affect the Bottineau Transitway project are outlined in correspondence from the Commission.

The Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission (BCWMC) noted that portions of two of the proposed alignments are located in the jurisdiction of the BCWMC; nearly all of Alignment D1 and a portion of Alignment D2 near the Robbinsdale/Crystal border. Correspondence from the BCWMC provided detailed comments regarding floodplain issues, runoff and rate control, water quality, maintenance, erosion control, and wetland management.

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) offered several comments regarding regulatory requirements. Specific concerns related to permitting, impaired waters, and contamination are addressed in correspondence from the MPCA.

**Parks**

From public comments: A total of 38 comments addressed concerns related to recreational (e.g., safety and disruption of peacefulness/tranquility) and environmental (e.g., wildlife, wetlands, vegetation, etc.) impacts to parkland. Theodore Wirth Park, Mary Hills Nature Area, and Sochacki Park were specifically mentioned. In addition to concerns about habitat loss and danger to wildlife, people were concerned that they would no longer be able to observe wildlife near their home and/ or neighborhood. One individual noted that a light rail line would cut off access for residents living on the east side of Sochacki Park and Mary Hills Nature Area. Two people indicated that Alignment D1 would not interfere with their enjoyment of the Theodore Wirth Park. One comment expressed concerns about Triangle Park and Lee Park, given their proximity to the existing railroad tracks and questioned whether or not they would still be usable.
Traffic, Congestion, and Accessibility

From public comments: Many comments (25) identified concerns regarding increases in congestion and traffic and noted that Penn Avenue is too congested already. Another comment expressed concern about the access and the ability to cross Penn Avenue with the transitway running down the center. One commenter indicated that impacts would occur on the busy and speedy Golden Valley Road, which is not in great shape. Another commenter identified disruptions to commuting patterns if Golden Valley Road was closed during construction. Several comments expressed a desire to not bring more buses in the area to bring people in to get on the train.

Safety and Security

From public comments: Numerous comments (22) addressed safety for neighborhood children, trail users, pedestrians crossing the tracks, and commuters using the transitway. Transit for Livable Communities indicated that safe and convenient access to any future stations for pedestrians and bicyclists must be addressed. One comment expressed concern regarding the safety of riders on LRT versus BRT given that a driver is not present in the cars with the passengers. Several comments expressed concerns about the safety issues related to running a transitway through a residential area.

From organizations, groups, municipalities, and agencies: The City of Minneapolis recommends that the Draft EIS evaluate the impacts of the transitway and associated roadway design on pedestrian safety along Highway 55 and identify safe and convenient pedestrian infrastructure improvements. This concern is discussed further in the City of Minneapolis Bottineau DEIS Scoping Comments.

Station Locations

From public comments: A total of 15 comments addressed station locations. Comments addressed dissatisfaction with some station locations and also suggested locations for additional stations/stops. One individual commented that no one is going to walk 15-20 minutes or more to get to a station. Another person indicated that the North Memorial Medical Center station is too far from the hospital and another noted that the Golden Valley stop and the Plymouth stop (D1) are inaccessible for many people. Several comments noted that the stops on D2 are too far apart and too far for an elderly person to walk, especially in the winter. One comment indicated that the inclusion of park-and-ride may not be needed in neighborhoods with high numbers of zero-car households. Another comment noted that it is “stupid to put a big stop right before a neighborhood that terrifies most people from the suburbs.”

Suggested station locations included: a stop between Robbinsdale and Bass Lake Road, between 42nd and Plymouth, at Lowry and Olson Memorial, at 36th, and at the former Robbinsdale Farm and Garden. One comment suggested moving the proposed Golden Valley Road station to Plymouth Avenue. Another individual indicated that if the Maple Grove terminal is chosen, it must serve Arbor Lakes and added that the current stations are too far from the mall. One commenter noted that there is no need for rail stops at Plymouth Avenue and Golden Valley Road and added that buses already exist and are working well. Another comment noted that Golden Valley Road option has more space and visibility and is less disruptive to private residences.

From organizations, groups, municipalities, and agencies: The City of Crystal commented that the lack of parking facilities suggests that the Crystal station will serve walk-up riders only, compromising pedestrian safety and posing traffic/pedestrian conflicts as riders are dropped off and picked up on adjacent roadways. City of Crystal comments also emphasized that the safety of pedestrians and non-motorized traffic near stations must be protected. In addition, the siting of the Crystal station at a location between Bass Lake Road and Wilshire Boulevard is dependent on considerations such as adjacent opportunities for development, visual prominence, traffic delays at nearby crossings, and noise impacts on adjacent residential properties.
The City of Minneapolis recommends that the Draft EIS include an evaluation of the benefits and costs of including stations at both Golden Valley Road and Plymouth Avenue along Alignment D1. The City also recommends that the Draft EIS evaluate alternative Target Field station location options and/or pedestrian access improvements for the BRT alternative that provide more convenient access to Target Field and the Interchange than the proposed Border Avenue station. These concerns are discussed further in the City of Minneapolis Draft EIS Scoping Comments.

Trails
From public comments: A total of 14 comments addressed potential trail impacts, specifically mentioning concerns about safety for trail users in Theodore Wirth Park, Mary Hills Nature Area, and Sochacki Park. One individual noted a possible loss of access to Wirth Lake as a result of the transitway. Another individual noted that, because of the lack of sidewalks in portions of Golden Valley, these trails are “the only place for kids to ride their bikes or for pet-owners to walk their dogs.” Others commented on the need to provide trail connectivity with the transitway.

One individual suggested a walk/bike bridge over Hwy 81 so people from the north side would have a safe path to the station. One individual asked how bike trails and the Luce Line proposed links (including a north-south route through Golden Valley and a route down Golden Valley Road to Theodore Wirth Park) would fit into this plan. Another person asked if there could be a tie in to Greenway-type bike trails along the rail line indicating that a trail would be more likely to be used by residents than BRT or LRT.

Parking
From public comments: A total of 14 comments addressed parking concerns. Comments addressed the need for more parking options near stations, including bicycle parking. One comment noted that there needs to be an adequate park-and-ride near Penn Avenue and Olson Memorial Highway to provide access for northsiders. Comments also expressed concern that the lack of parking at stations would result in transit users parking on residential streets and resulting in the loss of street parking.

Project Cost
From public comments: A dozen comments addressed concerns about the cost of the project, cost to taxpayers, misappropriation of “scarce public funds,” transitway subsidies, and the likelihood that the transitway will not be able to support itself solely with fares. One individual asked that the project be respectful of tax dollars, noting that there is no need to incur the extra initial cost and the additional operating expenses of LRT.

Feeder Buses
From public comments: A dozen comments stressed the importance of maintaining a system of “feeder buses” to provide access to transit stations.

Transit Operations
From public comments: Eight comments and suggestions were made regarding transit operations. Specific comments included: Trains should be three cars long and run every 7-10 minutes, commuters should pay before entering the train platforms, trains should be given green lights at intersections, the ride needs to be more pleasant than on a Metro Transit bus, and service should be available during the evening and on weekends.

Several comments noted a need to study how the Bottineau transitway interconnects with other non-car transportation. One comment noted that the BRT alternative does not appear to provide direct service to neighborhoods in north Minneapolis. Regarding existing transit operations, one individual expressed concern that the 760 bus would be eliminated.
Public Engagement Process

From public comments: Six comments addressed the public engagement process, indicating that not enough has been done to involve the community members. One comment indicated that a notice in the newspaper is not sufficient, especially in a neighborhood that does not have a high literacy rate. The commenter suggested announcements on KMOJ Radio. Another individual indicated that little advanced notice was given and the hours for review quite limited. One individual asked if a public meeting had been considered for the Maple Grove community and why public comments are only being received through February 17. One individual indicated that the neighborhood was not being heard regarding their preference for the Oliver Avenue option. Several individuals noted that many of the elderly do not have computers/internet and do not know much about the proposed alternatives. Other individuals commented that it appears their input does not matter.

Visual impacts

From public comments: Five comments expressed concern with the aesthetic impacts as a result of the transitway. Comments referred to the transitway infrastructure as “ugly” and called it “visual pollution.” Concerns related to visual impacts included loss of aesthetics associated with park properties. Comments also noted light pollution as a visual impact.

Crime

From public comments: Five comments mentioned concerns about increases in crime to their neighborhoods as a result of the transitway. One individual asked if “the availability of LRT lessened theft, homicide, and other crime in Twin Cities neighborhoods where it has been put into service.” Another comment indicated that LRT will make it easier for “thugs” to get to the Mall of America.

Data Assumptions

From public comments: Four comments challenged the accuracy of statistics for population and employment growth that were provided in the Scoping Booklet and presented at the Scoping Open Houses. Comments noted that the economic downturn may have an effect on the accuracy of the data provided. The data accuracy for senior population growth and their use of public transit as a segment of the population who depend on transit was also questioned.

One comment challenged the data used for traffic congestion. The comment noted that the traffic data forecast growth between years 2005 and 2030, which were generated during a period of optimistic economic outlooks. In addition, the comment asked for the source of the forecast, the assumptions on which it was based, and whether these assumptions are still reasonable.

Emergency Services

From public comments: Three comments addressed impacts to emergency services. One comment stated that “all the ambulances go through our street [3300 block of France Avenue North] and with the transit they are going to have to reroute all of them and it will take longer.” Another comment addressed concerns about emergency access to North Memorial Medical Center, noting that due to existing infrastructure, direct routes to the hospital are already limited. The comment indicated that access to emergency services needs to be addressed and suggested that legal advice be sought on the issue of longer emergency transport times and survival rates, adding that the risk and cost of any potential litigation be included in the assessment of Alignment D2 costs in the Draft EIS.

Cultural Resources

From public comments: Three comments mentioned historic or archaeological resources. One comment noted that the Terrace Theater is a historic building and should not be tampered with as part of the plan. One comment indicated that there is an “Indian burial ground” claim pending in the area of the BNSF track (Alignment D1).
Wagner’s Drive In

From public comments: Three individuals who attended the open house in Brooklyn Park noted the importance of avoiding impacts to Wagner’s Drive-In. This family-owned drive-in restaurant is located on West Broadway Avenue.

Health

From public comments: Three comments mentioned general health concerns as related to the transitway.

Construction Impacts

From public comments: One comment specifically noted that construction would disrupt access to Highway 100 from Golden Valley Road for the house north of the Church of St. Margaret Mary. Another comment expressed concern that transitway construction will create traffic problems and generate noise.

ADA Accessibility

From public comments: One individual expressed concern for ADA accessibility, specifically mentioning the need to ensure access to people at the Courage Center.

From organizations, groups, municipalities, and agencies: The Metropolitan Council’s Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee (TAAC) requested that if the BRT alternative advances, to carefully consider whether wheelchairs need to be secured on a BRT vehicle, and if so, how to secure them effectively and efficiently to minimize transit travel time. The TAAC requested that if commuter bus service is assumed in the baseline alternative, providing paratransit service that complements the commuter bus service so this kind of connecting transit service is available to people of all ages and abilities should be considered. If the Bottineau project proceeds into preliminary engineering, the TAAC requests that a TAAC member be named to one of the project advisory committees to provide advice on accessibility for people with disabilities. The TAAC also requests a meeting with Hennepin County Public Works ADA Title II specialist, if one exists and the Bottineau project moves forward into preliminary engineering.

Alternative and Station Location Suggestions

Many individuals provided suggestions regarding alternative routes and station locations. These suggestions are listed below:

From public comments:

- Consider constructing on Bottineau Boulevard (County Road 81)
- Keep in mind expanding west along 610 from Target North Campus to area of Home Depot and new hospital, with possible spur from Maple Grove transit center along Hemlock/Zachary to 610
- Reconsider a 7th Street/ Freemont - Lowry Avenue alternative
- Consider Hubbard station to D1 straight across to Plymouth Avenue then along D1 to Penn or across Golden Valley Road to Broadway/ Penn D2
- Consider incremental approach such a building only to Crystal
- Project should end at 63rd; development drops off north of there
- A good alternative would be West Broadway to Washington Avenue and then into The Interchange
- Suggests that LRT down 81 to 41st or 42nd would be much more beneficial
- Suggests BRT down County Road 81 makes the most financial sense
Suggest alternative with LRT along Bottineau transitway on rail and intersect with Hwy 100, follow to Hwy 55 with transit stations along Hwy 55
Suggest a hub at 41st for bus transit; there is space available for LRT coming in from the north side
D1 should be considered for a greenway with a non-motorized trail, allowing access to other trails/downtown (similar to the Kenilworth Trail, Cedar Lake Trail, and Midtown Greenway)
Integrate a safe and useful non-motorized corridor
Sometime in the future, extend the transitway to Rogers and possibly Albertville
Somehow tie the line in with the Northstar Commuter Rail in Big Lake
Stop at Hubbard Market Place and encourage supportive shuttles to the main stop
Build a park-and-ride ramp at the NE corner of 85th and Broadway to increase ridership

From organizations, groups, municipalities, and agencies:

- Transit for Livable Communities correspondence provides multiple comments regarding alternatives proposed for study.

Project Suggestions

Many individuals provided suggestions regarding various aspects of the transitway project. These suggestions are listed below:

From public comments:

- D2 Option – the bridge that crosses Theodore Wirth Parkway has been repaired for a 20-year commitment; suggest switching the parkway so it goes over 81 instead of under it
- D2 Option – reinitiate the old traffic circle
- Could some of the roads around D2 be redone to avoid forcing people to move?
- D1 and D2 have undesirable sharp bends and speed-limiting wiggles that should be eliminated
- The houses on Penn Avenue that are worth saving can be moved to vacant lots that the city owns – the houses can be rehabbed and sold as affordable homes
- Demolish substandard/vacant housing on Penn Avenue
- Study should propose feeder bus routes for public evaluation
- Put bus on Lake Drive again – a bus will be needed to connect that part of Robbinsdale to the Bottineau transitway
- Buy a fleet of small electric buses and vans to service suburbs on major routes/side streets
- Target should finance services to their facility
- Keep motorcycles in mind during design
- Hire local workers
- Rock ballast = Big mistake in our area!
- Consider double-decker buses to maximize ridership per square foot of road space used

Project Impacts or Benefits that Should be Evaluated

The comment forms asked for input regarding project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated. A list of impacts and benefits to be evaluated is provided below:

From public comments:

- Study all D2 options (D2-A, D2-B, D2-C, D2-D, and D2-W)
- Ridership/number of jobs and residences served
- Environmental justice
- Access to jobs/employment, education, shopping, entertainment
- Transit equity
- Mobility for seniors/poor people/limited mobility
- Impacts to minority business owners
- Project cost/operating costs
- Subsidy per ridership
- Cost savings of BRT/LRT compared to existing roadway transportation
- Comparison of BRT/LRT costs and benefits
- Differences in travel for various options such as D1 vs. D2
- Consider acceptance of buses and LRT based on demographics
- Balance between neighborhood impacts and benefits of transitway
- Cost/benefit and positive economic benefits of the D2 alternative
- Economic development potential in the alternative selection
- Economic impact to surrounding residential and commercial communities
- Mitigation/compensation to residences and businesses
- Property impacts/property values (How can this be evaluated? What has the result been for other neighborhoods?)
- Impacts to emergency services
- Health impact on communities
- Commuter safety at stops, stations, and while on board
- Environmental impacts (CO$_2$, wildlife and habitat, wetlands, ecosystems)
- Historical impacts
- Park impacts
- Traffic congestion
- Repositioning of bike and walking path in Theodore Wirth Park
- Noise and vibration impacts and mitigation
- Interference with sensitive equipment and sensors along the route
- Regional trail access should be included as part of the criteria
- Trail impacts (serenity, quiet, peacefulness)
- Consider regional trail access in conjunction with transitway
- Connectivity to bike, pedestrian, and BRT alternatives
- Design and appearance of area adjacent to the transitway (i.e., plantings, trees, etc.)
- Design and appearance of stations
- Vehicular traffic (intersection crossings, congestion, traffic flows on alternative roads)
- Consider the number of buses that could be cut if the LRT runs down Penn/Broadway
- Construction impacts
- Parking (more options, safety on local streets)
- Increase in crime
- Compare automobile (No Build Alternative) travel to Transitway
- Analysis of bus vs. light rail
- Do a better job at highlighting the economic benefits of LRT for north Minneapolis at future presentations
- Systematic investigation as to where to locate transit station – Golden Valley Road vs. Plymouth – based on transit need – maybe consider both as transit stops
- Can any of these effects be mollified? Possible additions to design that would mitigate effects of pollutants associated with increased traffic and those associated with light rail
- Clarification of additional traffic needs per diversion from freeway system – including 18 wheelers and large trucks
- Impact of EMFs [electromagnetic fields] given the close proximity of the proposed Plymouth station to overhead power lines
- Safety/security risks associated with the Plymouth station, a known “heavy crime” area

From organizations, groups, municipalities, and agencies:

- The City of Robbinsdale Resolution No. 7143 provides a detailed list of items to be studied in detail for the C-D1 and D2 alternatives
- The City of Crystal Resolution 2012-14 provides a detailed list of project impacts or benefits to be evaluated
- The City of Minneapolis Bottineau DEIS Scoping Comments provides a detailed list of recommendations for further study
- Transit for Livable Communities correspondence lists detailed impacts and benefits to be evaluated
- Scoping input from the Bottineau Transitway CAC provides a detailed list of challenges, impacts, and benefits to be evaluated

Specific Questions

In addition to responding to the Scoping Comment Form, people asked the following questions about the transitway:

From public comments:

- Would the proposed track for D1 be on the east side or the west side of the BNSF track?
- Would light rail trains share tracks with BNSF freight trains or run on streets?
- Please describe the fence – how high? Chain link?
- Has anyone done a study of how train will affect rush hour traffic in areas already congested? (Lyndale-Bryant, Emerson, Humboldt, Penn?)
- How disruptive will the 55th LRT segment be to traffic and what will it do to the 55/94 intersection?
- Please show the details of turn at Penn and Olson Highway
- What would “Option A” do to transportation options for the new library [Brooklyn Park]?
- How close does any option come to Brookdale?
- Could the Bottineau Corridor be extended farther northwest if demand warrants?
- Why not run on West Broadway?
- Why not run on France Avenue north of 36th Avenue?
- Why not run along 694/94 to downtown Minneapolis?
- Why has the route closer to the old shopping center on 34th Street not given more consideration?
- Wouldn’t the property in the area of Inglewood Avenue North and Thomas Avenue North, right off of Glenwood Avenue, be a more viable location for a transit or railway stop?
- What does the benefit of the LRT look like in context of a potential Minneapolis streetcar?
- The flyer indicates that there are “property impacts” between Indiana and France. Does that mean that houses are torn down?
- How far off is the construction of this project, if all goes according to plan?
- Has revenue from fares been enough for the upkeep of the Blue Line (Hiawatha) LRT?
- Information presented at the open house stated that the population in the project area is expected to increase significantly in the coming years. What kind of plan is on the table for people to come here?
What about what we were told last year during the discussions of improvements to France Avenue south of Oakdale, the widening and realignment of the intersection? Did all of this have to do with the rail line? And was a choice already made to run down Oakdale Avenue?

Is there going to be a barrier, once they get rid of the houses on Penn, that is going to go all the way or are there going to be breaks in the barrier? How is that going to work?

Have they decided to take one side of the street, which is the west side, and leave the east side? Or are they going to take both sides? [in reference to Penn Avenue]

Have people who currently live along the proposed route been contacted to see if the transitway would be valuable for daily commuting?

Are penalties built into the agreement with contractors if they go over budget? How about incentives for keeping costs down, completing on time, etc.?

Would 40th Avenue at Major be closed?

How many of the 130+ properties impacted by D2C are actually owner occupied and how many are rentals and/or vacant?

What is the decision making process to determine if the project will be approved altogether and which route?

Was this project option already approved by the Park and Recreation Board?

I live on the corner of France and Oakdale (38XX Oakdale Ave.) in the condos on that corner. Do you have any information about how this will affect me and my property?

How is moving a freight rail and laying new rail in a wetland be cheaper than laying rail on a concrete foundation in a developed area? [The comment expressed interest having access to data that indicate that D1 is cheaper to build than D2.]

Since the D1 option has been in consideration since 1985, why has there not been an assessment of the environmental impact to date? (The commenter noted that D1 was tabled during the early days of consideration when it became public that the train running on the existing tracks carried hazardous waste, a danger to those riding the light rail)

Will existing power lines be moved to accommodate space for additional rail? If so, where will these power lines be moved and what impact will there be to nearby residents?
Scoping Comments

A. Written Comments

B. Verbal Comments

• January 23, 2012
• January 24, 2012
• January 25, 2012
• January 31, 2012
Written Comments

I. Brooklyn Park
II. Golden Valley
III. Maple Grove
IV. Minneapolis
V. Robbinsdale
VI. Other Cities
VII. Unknown Locations
VIII. Corridor Cities
IX. Organizations
X. Other Stakeholders
XI. Resource Agencies
I. Brooklyn Park
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

Purpose and need for the project:

High need for better public transit in the area. Metro.

The alternatives proposed for study:

Use BNSF Right of Way.

Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated:

Pew Ave is too congested already.

Residents will lose parking on city streets.

Other comments:

Build LRT only to Brooklyn Park.

Name: MIKE McLAUGHLIN
Address: 5016 OXBOROUGH GDNS, B.F. MN 55443

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [x] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  - More People Want To Jobs
  - Back Home

- **The alternatives proposed for study**
  - Plan B To Target Good Homes

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**
  - Ridership

- **Other comments**
  - Bus commute to Maple Grove
  - Transit station needs to be on the line
  - Downtown Maple Grove

Name: Tom McDonald
Address: 7220 4th Ave N, B Pole
email:

Please check all of the following that apply:
- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

**Purpose and need for the project**

- I think as time goes on there will be an increasing need for people movers of this type.

**The alternatives proposed for study**

- Should run rail up to target campus
- Bus over to Maple Grove or try to do both
- With bus on south end line should go by North Memorial (serve more people & business)

**Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**

- Cost - if you can't get federal money then look at doing everything by bus.

**Other comments**

- In presentations don't use so many acronyms just say bus, train or big train to make it more understandable to us non engineers

Name: MIKE RICHARDS

Address: 740S DOUGLAS DRIVE N. BROOKLYN PARK MN 55443

Email: MIKE.RICHARDS@G.COM

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [X] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

**Purpose and need for the project**

Definitely needed to serve the growth in the NW suburbs.

**The alternatives proposed for study**

- Alignment A over Alignment B
- Alignment D2 seems to connect to a greater population area at a lower price than D1
- Option C (30th Avenue) is better than Options A & B

**Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**

- During the employment of a 9-5 schedule (Alignment B) showed a given appreciation over only occasional use for retail (Alignment A) on a less structured schedule.

**Other comments**


Name: Steven Romanes
Address: 10526 Mississippi Circle North - Brooklyn Park, MN
Email: romanesez@comcast.net

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  - LRT moves more people / more eff / cleaner
  - Use Buses to feed LRT Stations
  - No More Excuses, Build It Already!!!

- **The alternatives proposed for study**
  - North End: Alignment A + B Both
  - Center Sec.: Alignment C
  - South End: DZ
  - Robbinsdale: Option C

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**
  - Inject much needed $ into N Mpls by using Penn Ave
  - Redevelop area should spur further development of N Mpls
  - Keep/Save Wagner's Drive IN!!

- **Other comments**
  - LRT over Buses
  - Trains should be 3 cars in length, run every 7-10 min
  - Pay BEFORE you enter train platforms

Name: Todd Nwaka
Address: 4676 Florida Ave N, Brooklyn Park, MN 55428
Email: trainguy1964@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

* Purpose and need for the project

* The alternatives proposed for study
  I favor BRT over LRT because of flexibility in routing, vehicle sizes, etc.
  I also favor BRT for Maple Grove and use both 'A' and 'B' options. I think both routes warrant service.

* Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  Please publish, as soon as available, differences in travel for various options, such as D1 vs D2.

* Other comments
  Keep in mind expanding west along 610 from Target chores to area of Home Depot and new hospital, with possible spur from LCT Transit Center along Hemlock/Zachary to G10.

Name: Dave Kalinera

Address: 8410 Fairfield Rd N, Brooklyn Park 55444-1522

email: Dave.Kalinera@comcast.net

Please check all of the following that apply:

☑ Area resident    ☐ Area business owner    ☐ Community-based organization member    ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  The need is great. I work with low income persons who cannot afford cars, yet quality for jobs in the suburbs. Transportation is a major stumbling block to steady employment.

- The alternatives proposed for study
  A is preferable to B. I think there are presently more opportunities for employment and education. D2 has the same advantages. It would better serve a low-income community (North Maple) than D1.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  The environmental impact of D1 is of most concern. This area of wetlands, I believe, is in the watershed that includes the Chain of Lakes. Lots of farmland.

- Other comments
  More wetlands, wildlife in Maple and Western suburbs. As nature goes, quality goes, so goes our metropolitan area.

Name: Kathy Chesney
Address: 8172 Zenith Ct., Brooklyn Park 55423
Email: Kathy @ caschney.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  Consider the investment in the future. Can this infrastructure help to increase our options in job location, home location. Can it improve shopping and property values in the region?

- The alternatives proposed for study
  I admit a bias for the 2AME, or Broadway "B" alignment as I live 1/5 mile East of them.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  Jobs, shopping options, entertainment options, mobility for seniors as well as poor people, education options

- Other comments
  Consider environmental, historical, aesthetic, of course but balance them against probable greater impacts on less congested traffic.
  Consider public acceptance of buses (low in middle class) and LRT (high among all demographics). Safety is also perception.

Name: Steve Chesney
Address: 8172 Zephyr Court Brooklyn Park MN 55443-2949
email: LISTS@SCHESNEY.COM

Please check all of the following that apply:
☒ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

a  Purpose and need for the project
  good idea to help relieve congestion going into/out of mall

b  The alternatives proposed for study
  light rail seems to work

c  Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  lots of people in backin park area that would use it
  try to save local business along route, not add box stores

d  Other comments
  save Wagner's drive-in at all costs!

Name:  John Stevens
Address:  6701 68th Ave N  BP, MN  55428
Email:  trustelm@hotmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
☑️ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Thomas and Janice Hanson
6741 83rd Place N
Brooklyn Park, MN 55445
763-425-5092

We think light rail is the only way to go. It should go to North Hennepin Community College and the Target Corporation in Brooklyn Park.

Reasons for this route:
- Light rail is cleaner and more efficient than buses
- It would take generations of people to and from a college
- Light rail would take people to and from the Target campus, the largest employer in the northwest
  - This would make it very usable for executives and others coming to the campus from the airport for business
  - Commuting from the campus to downtown Minneapolis for business purposes
- There is a lot of industry along this corridor; much more opportunity for the masses to take public transportation on a day to day basis

Reasons NOT to have light rail to Maple Grove:
- Retail can be here today, gone tomorrow; we should not give up this opportunity for shopping purposes which touches only a minority of people
- Odds are that retail shoppers wouldn't carry too much on public transportation; they would probably opt to drive
- Brooklyn Park has more industry along their corridor for commuting
Purpose and need for the project:

This type of community input is crucial for getting inclusive feedback from the community.

We need to plan ahead and pool resources to get access to public transportation for areas where access is limited or there is no current service.

Our young, poor, those who rely on public transport need better transportation particularly getting from, to and around Brooklyn Park north and south. There needs to be service to and from noble park and ride to Target north campus on 97th to north hennepin community college. Also service from highway 610 connecting to brookdale drive. There needs to be bus service to and from highway 252 and 85th avenue to Broadway in Brooklyn park. These are currently significant bus service gaps.

Filling these gaps in concert with the bottineau transit project will connect people to major activity centers in and near Brooklyn park and to and from Minneapolis.

Addressing these gaps in cooperation with metro transit will not cost much and should be part of the early implementation phases of an enhanced bus TSM alternative.

Brooklyn Park is growing and the projects efforts to increase transport to businesses and jobs will be good for the economy and contribute to a thriving community with sustainable transportation.

Many who now drive in the area would switch to convenient, environmentally friendly transportation.

I also support alignment "B" for LRT alternatives in the north and alignment "D2" options "A or B" for LRT options in and to the south.

Thanks for the opportunity of feedback.

Sincerely,
Reva Chamblis,
resident of Brooklyn Park
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  - BRT would be the best way to travel. (Gerrard)

- The alternatives proposed for study
  - B is the best because of schools & jobs.
  - B & I more people would use because of speed to Mills, Airport Rd, and back to Brooklyn Park for home or jobs.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  - Benefits likely bring North well to South make to gather

- Other comments
  - LRT is the only way to go. I'd vote LRT!
  - Sound & the project.

Name: T.A. Hanson
Address: 6741 83rd St. N Brooklyn Park Minn. 55443-2290
email: 

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
- Transportation
- Emergency
- Save green space

The alternatives proposed for study

Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
- Help save you
- Go around neighborhoods
- Help people who walk to walk to school

Don’t cut the trees along any roads (not highways, nor small roads), but stop there underground instead.

It’s nice, but if it goes through Minneapolis, don’t that mean some people need to move? If they do, they should be responsible to get those people a place to live. It’s a nice idea, but it seems daunting at the same time.

Name: Pa Nhia Thor
Address: 4913 Penn Ave North, Brooklyn Park
Email: nhia.thor@hotmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☑ Area resident
☐ Area business owner
☐ Community-based organization member
☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

1. Purpose and need for the project
   Purpose is to make transportation easier for the people in Minneapolis. Need is that it will make life easier for all of us. Easier for us to get to places, instead of waiting for rides.

2. The alternatives proposed for study
   __________________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________________

3. Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
   __________________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________________

Other comments
   __________________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________________

Name: Sheng Thor
Address: 4418 Penn Ave NW, Brooklyn Park
Email: Shengthor@ outlook.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
☐ Area resident    ☐ Area business owner    ☐ Community-based organization member    ☐ Other interested party
II. Golden Valley
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

* Purpose and need for the project
  BRT or LRT would be a benefit to me in my commute to work in downtown Mpls. However, I'm disappointed there aren't more parking options at stops (as men are in Golden Valley).

* The alternatives proposed for study

* Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  Offering more parking options could mean more winter traffic.

* Other comments

Name: Dana D. Knopic
Address: 3036 Lee Avenue North, Golden Valley
Email: dknopic@cdrg.org

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident    ☐ Area business owner    ☐ Community-based organization member    ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project:

  THE NEED TO GET OUR ACHES OFF THE HIGHWAY & STREETS WITH LRT

- The alternatives proposed for study

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

- Other comments

  WE WILL REMEMBER THE PEOPLE WHO OPPOSED THE FIRST LRT. ONE MO. SENATOR CALLED IT A TRAIN TO NOWHERE. WE GUESS SOME POLITICAL LEADERS WHO HAD THE FORGE TO SUPPORT THE PROJECT WERE THE RIGHT PEOPLE.

Name: Richardson
Address: 9205 Tylor Ave, N. Golden Valley
Email: richr232@aol.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [X] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party

9205 Golden Valley Dr.
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

1. Purpose and need for the project

2. The alternatives proposed for study
   - This is my primary concern at this time, and particularly the D2/D3 options. It would seem to me that the D2 option overwhelmingly provides access to more residents and more activity centers than D3. Unless D1 was to be substantially less expensive, I don't understand why it would even be considered.

3. Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

4. Other comments

Name: Bed Kedus
Address: 611 Radisson Rd, Golden Valley
email: bkedus@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident ☐ Area business owner ☐ Community-based organization member ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

1. Purpose and need for the project
   Agree LET connecting to other lines is important to sparcy
   transportation area. Disagree with using this route (rail line through
   Forest Park) - don't think the neighborhood locals would justify
   impact to natural resource.

2. The alternatives proposed for study
   Bus line through Broadway is most efficient
   but LET along an existing that traffic road
   not through a beautiful urban park!!

3. Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
   construction disrupting access to 100 from Golden valley
   for house on fro St Margaret Mary
   vibration - we are at truck level and can feel
   a large vibration impact with the current line 2x/day

4. Other comments
   Vibration Mitigation!!

Name: Beth Lindholm
Address: 2511 Byrd Ave N, Golden Valley
Email: ____________________________

Please check all of the following that apply:
☐ Area resident    ☐ Area business owner    ☐ Community-based organization member    ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

1. Purpose and need for the project

   The Northwestern Suburbs have long been in need of fast, efficient rapid transit between these densely populated areas and downtown Minneapolis. Planning and construction should have taken place years ago.

2. The alternatives proposed for study

   LRT and BRT

3. Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

   Electrically powered light rail trains do not pollute and require less maintenance than buses.

4. Other comments

   To me, light rail transit offers far more advantages than buses, one being that it is capable of moving more people in trains than can be accomplished on an articulated bus.

Name: Jim Foster

Address: 2901 Kyle Ave., N., Golden Valley, MN 55422

Email: GUFOSTER@USFAMILY.NET

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project

- The alternatives proposed for study
  - Strong preference for LRT - even considering higher cost. More energy-efficient, less visually appealing, leads to higher surrounding land values, and has more "personality," leading to higher ridership. Also permits Hiawatha interconnection.
  - Strong preference for D2 alignment - serves needed communities, positions line as true urban transit instead of a suburban spur for commuters only. If we do not serve existing density close to urban core, we only encourage development farther out, instead of reinvesting & improving our existing urban fabric.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

- Other comments
  - Transit riders worldwide tend to prefer rail systems to bus systems - respect that, work with, not against human psychology. For optimal ridership.

Thanks for listening!

Name: Andy Pearson
Address: 1428 Angela Dr, Golden Valley, MN
Email: stepthewar24@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

♫ Purpose and need for the project
"I would like to see an improved bus system. Put it through North Minneapolis. It will not be used in our neighborhood by our residents but will bring undesirables in.
♫ The alternatives proposed for study
"Bus System"

♫ Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
"The Nature reserve will be ruined. I walk here with my dog. The Cline from North Minneapolis, Brooklyn Park, & Brooklyn Center will be coming into our neighborhoods"

♫ Other comments
"I am strongly opposed. It will be detrimental to our property values. The noise and vibrations will bother me. I will have to move. I've been in this house 19 years and I'm not happy about it."

Name: Cathy Abroad
Address: 2801 Pike Dr. N, Golden Valley, MN
Email: CathyAbroad@Kwil.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  If you hope to attract the greatest number of people that currently drive motor vehicles near the proposed transitway, the experience of waiting for, boarding, de-boarding, leaving, and riding the bus or LRT train will have to be more pleasant than is the case when one rides or attempts to ride, a Metro Transit bus.

- The alternatives proposed for study
  In terms of making the ride more pleasant than on a Metro Transit bus, both option D1 and option D2 have undesirable sharp bends and speed-limiting wigglies that should be eliminated.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  Has the availability of light-rail transit lessened air and soil pollution in the neighborhoods of the Twin Cities where it has been put into service? Has the availability of light-rail transit lessened theft, homicide, and other aggressive behavior (that is, "crime") in these neighborhoods of the Twin Cities where it has been put into service?

- Other comments
  Advances in power-train technology for motor vehicles will undermine the case for environmental benefits of the transitway being proposed.

Name: Mr. Tim Curme
Address: 14 Western Terrace, Golden Valley, Minnesota 55426
Email: ___________________________

Please check all of the following that apply:
☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

Purpose and need for the project

NW area needs better transit, but close-in areas can be better served by bus. NW area not real.

The alternatives proposed for study

Route should be based on importance of serving north suburbs versus city dwellers. Can't do both. Northeast route may serve outliines better, but Penn route may be a contributor to No. Side neighborhood.

Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

Potential for land values to revitalize W. Broadway. Many minority businesses have left or shut down, so demand is not there currently. Would like to see redevelopment through Riverside and NW highs but this is a lot to overcome given few views of residents. Private development will not follow.

Other comments

Transit is one way to improve communities, but must be supported by other plans to integrate communities economically.

Name: Cathy Wehran
Address: 3220 Football Ave N. Golden Valley 55422
email: caudal@bostream.net

Please check all of the following that apply:

☒ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

**Purpose and need for the project**

High - The Metro Plan had been in the works for decades.

Now we have a real need.

End of debate. Start now expanding CDT.

**The alternatives proposed for study**

**Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**

**Other comments**

Too many people ride free in the transit corridor. Downtown.

Re build all early paid require a purchased ticket to ride.

Name:  
Stephen Elias  
Address:  2460 Ragoa Ave N. - Golden Valley

email:  

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project

- The alternatives proposed for study

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

- Other comments

  I prefer the line to Hendrickson instead of to Target on the north end, and D1 on the southern end. My concern for the Broadway plan is one of safety and cost.

Name: Rose Ryan
Address: 2741 Lee Ave N, Golden Valley
Email: ryangv@msn.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☑ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

1. Purpose and need for the project

2. The alternatives proposed for study

3. Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

   **EXTREMELY CONCERNED ABOUT THE EFFECTS OF LINE D1 TO THE NATURAL AREAS OF THE DOWNE WORTH PKWY AS WELL AS NEGATIVE IMPACT TO PROPERTY VALUES ALONG NEAR THIS SECTION. CONCERNED ABOUT NOISE IMPACT AND INCREASED TRAFFIC.**

4. Other comments

Name: Michael Jeske
Address: 1929 Glenwood Plwy  Golden Valley
email: MAJ246J@MSN.COM

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [x] Area resident  □ Area business owner  □ Community-based organization member  □ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  After reading the scoping documents and watching the video, I am convinced that the LRT (light rail transit) option will better serve the community. It appears to me to offer improved safety, efficiency and a higher return on investment.
  The alternatives proposed for study:
  - Given homes (Golden Valley) and work locations, purpose and (Shinnyer and Maple Grove), I'd prefer to see the light rail option at the north end and the alternatives
  - BRT tram line rather than the Broadway/Charlotte route.

- Projected impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  Projected ridership balanced with current and projected destinations.

- Other comments

Name: Jane Ryker
Address: 2741 Lake Ave, Golden Valley, MN
email: 

Please check all of the following that apply:
- Area resident  - Area business owner  - Community-based organization member  - Other Interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  I question if a dedicated transitway is the best approach for connecting the NW suburbs with the central city – could increased public transit options provide better transit options and also include Plymouth, Brooklyn Center, etc.?

- The alternatives proposed for study
  Would increased bus service over a broad range of the NW suburbs provide better transit options or also include Plymouth, Brooklyn Center, etc.?

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  I believe we need excellent public transit, but I believe there might be better alternatives for the NW suburbs than a dedicated transitway.

- Other comments
  I saw no analysis of bus vs light rail. I had thought that decision was still up in the air.

Name: John Cornelius
Address: 1515 Valders Ave N, Golden Valley
Email: jcorielus@mncelcom

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☑ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date.

Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  
  **Primary purpose is to relieve highway congestion for decades and reduce pollution associated with growth of conventional transportation (namely automobiles).**

  **This assumes people will actually use the system instead of automobiles and key drivers in the future will be congestion, price of gas, economics.**

- **The alternatives proposed for study**
  
  **None of current alternatives will accomplish this because existing public transportation is under-utilized, this proposal will have minimal value to Minneapolis or inner suburbs; current congestion largely comes from outer suburbs and anticipated growth in these northwestern communities, especially traffic from I-94 & northwest.**

  **Evaluate benefit of adding a convenient park & ride to siphon traffic from I-94 at or north of Maple Grove -- an extension (without transfer) to Vikings, Twins & Target Center.**

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**
  
  **If you want to relieve congestion, go to where congestion exists & where it stems from; current plan is redundant to much of existing system. Relieving congestion benefits all along the proposed route, albeit indirectly. Current proposal will have insufficient riders, hence an economic failure as well -- I will oppose it.**

Name: **Warren Rottmann**

Address: **1821 Angelo Drive, Golden Valley MN 55422**

Email: **wlröttmann@msn.com**

Please check all of the following that apply:

☑ Area resident  □ Area business owner  □ Community-based organization member  □ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project:
  Provide trans to those in need. In D corridor there are incomes and we located ourselves to close access to downtown and Don't need or want it in our wetland area.
  DON'T WANT A CORRIDOR!!

- The alternatives proposed for study:
  If light rail Do Not follow D but use C corridor to ease as a medical stop at North Memorial and this business that can benefit. Also C has a population in need of transportation where D does not have the population and the rail can only use it so they can gain speed - not acceptable.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated:
  We moved here for the wetlands, scenic and wildlife not to be impacted with light rail. This is very upsetting. We don't need it around us. When we went to a BRT meeting, people representing C wanted and need the transport they didn't get. Crime and traffic will be increased in a residential area and should go on Broadway in C where the is business traffic. Other comments:
  The thought of putting more rail in our wetlands which brought us here to buy homes is an OUTRAGE. The state has little money. The wetlands have to be replaced but it won't be here were we bought our homes to enjoy wildlife, refuge, and the wooded environment.

Name: Carmen, Err, Courtney and Erin Heim
Address: 3840 Bassett Creek Drive, Golden Valley, MN 55422
Email: MN1Heim@AOL.COM

Please check all of the following that apply:
[ ] Area resident    [ ] Area business owner    [ ] Community-based organization member    [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

01/31/2012

- Purpose and need for the project
  
  This looks like a good idea to me.

- The alternatives proposed for study
  
  1) Alternative #2 appears to be more
     usable for large # of riders, & the one we prefer.
  
     2) Would the proposed track for D1 be on the
        East side or West side of the BNSF track? West
        side of BNSF would put the transit almost in our backyard.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

  No comment

- Other comments

  None at this time

Name: David Zook & Laurel Lareen
Address: 3540 Dranchell Lane
          Golden Valley, MN 55422
email: dzll@comcast.net

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  To provide outlying citizens to needed services

- The alternatives proposed for study
  Yes to D Line to North Memorial Hospital
  W. Broadway
  Penn Ave

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  No 11 to Ds (Red Line) Golden Valley Rd.

Reasons:
1) High density of wildlife, wetlands and mature trees
2) Low ridership usage
3) Provides no distinction for citizens seniors
   - No restaurants
   - No shops
   - No hospital

- Other comments
  4) Homes in area were established in 1959
  5) No parking availability, thereby, residential areas would
     be crowded with cars
  6) Offers nothing for more population to this quiet
     wildlife and residential area

Name: Margaret Webinger
Address: 3850 Bassett Creek Avie Golden Valley, MN 55422
Email: mw-webinger@mtu.org

Please check all of the following that apply:
☒ Area resident ☐ Area business owner ☐ Community-based organization member ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project

- The alternatives proposed for study

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

- Other comments

When federal funding is used to build the Kennebunk County transitway, it does not fund the upkeep of the facility, and does not subsidize any operation losses. Therefore, any revenue received from fares has been enough for the upkeep of the transitway.

Name: Dean Shirley Schneider
Address: 2520 Dresden Lane GV

Please check all of the following that apply:

☒ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  Purpose should be to transport people to their place of work etc. Light Rail should be to assist people who do not have a means of transportation.

- The alternatives proposed for study
  Light Rail would serve the people in North Minneapolis much better than Golden Valley.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  My friends and neighbors in Golden Valley want Light Rail to go to a game and the airport area. We do not intend on giving up our cars or driving.

- Other comments
  The wildlife area would be totally compromised if Light Rail goes through Golden Valley.

Name: Pat Jordan, Dale Runke
Address: 3830 Bassett Ave. G.V.
email: patjovisi.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  
  **The project is an absolute necessity for improved transit options, economic growth and environmental sustainability.**

- **The alternatives proposed for study**
  
  **The option through North Minneapolis and Robbinsdale will serve the most people and provide the greatest benefits.**

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**
  
  **Amount of people served, access/proximity to local businesses**

- **Other comments**
  
  **If Brooklyn Center/Target Campus is chosen by transit to Maple Grove Transit Center is a must.**

Name: **Randy Fordige**

Address: **4747 34th Ave N, Golden Valley MN 55422**

email: **RFORDIGE@GMAIL.COM**

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident  
- [ ] Area business owner  
- [ ] Community-based organization member  
- [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  The way I see this project is that I won't be able to use it because the routes don't go near my house but I will be negatively affected by it through increased traffic and higher taxes.

- **The alternatives proposed for study**
  Buses are best I think. Consider double-decker buses to maximize ridership per sq. ft. of road space. Taken up, unless infrastructure (e.g. skyway) prevents their use.

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**
  Thanks for the railway take up road space 100% of the time. Whatever improvements in congestion from transit riders will be lost because there will be less road space for cars. Also, drop off-peak hours when no one rides, the train will still mean more traffic for cars.

- **Other comments**
  The scoping booklet speaks about requesting federal funding but no mention is made of the cost to people, in particular, those who won't have easy access to the train and won't be able to use it. Also, are penalties built into the agreement with contractors if they go over budget? How about how to keep costs down, completing on time etc.?

Name: Raul Rosado
Address: 6850 Harold Ave, Golden Valley, MN 55427
Email: qauthority@yahoo.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Brent,

I recently received a letter indicating the city is considering routing the proposed Bottineau LRT along the border of Theodore Wirth park (option D1 of the Bottineau Transitway Plan). I live on Xerxes Ave N and experience on a daily basis the nature and animal life that exists in the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad Corridor. Routing a train every 7 minutes through this nature area for the "travel time convenience" of the north suburbs does not seem to justify the permanent damage to the environment and community surrounding this area.

A few specific questions for you:

- What is the decision making process to determine if the project will be approved altogether and which route? I reviewed the website but it did not seem clear.
- Regarding the public meetings in January
  - Will you be present at the meeting on Monday, January 23\textsuperscript{rd} at 4:30pm at Theodore Wirth Chalet? Other meetings?
  - What is the purpose of these meetings?
  - What is the role of the public/community in making this decision?
  - What specifically needs to happen in these meetings to impact a decision? Is there a "vote" per se or are this meetings more informational?
- Was this project option already approved by the Park and Rec board?

Golden Valley's (and Minneapolis's) uniqueness is centered around its dedication/commitment to nature. I would expect you would support and respect the community on this initiative and protect further development of our natural resources.

Thank you in advance for a prompt response.

Emily Alverson
Huron Healthcare
550 W Van Buren St | Chicago, IL 60607
P 612-636-8782 | F 503-884-4203
ealverson@huronconsultinggroup.com
www.huronconsultinggroup.com

DISCLAIMER: The information transmitted in this e-mail message and attachments, if any, may be attorney-client information, including privileged and confidential matter, and is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. Distribution to, or review by, unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited. All personal messages express views solely of the sender, which are not to be attributed to any organization. If you have received this transmission in error,
immediately notify the sender and permanently delete this transmission including attachments.
From: Emily Alverson  
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2012 11:16 AM  
To: ‘planning@goldenvalleymn.gov’  
Subject: Theo Wirth Park / Bottineau Transit  
Importance: High

Joe Hogeboom,

I left you a voicemail and also wanted to send an email.

I recently received your letter indicating the city is considering routing the proposed Bottineau LRT along the border of Theodore Wirth park (option D1 of the Bottineau Transitway Plan). I live on Xerxes Ave N and experience on a daily basis the nature and animal life that exists in the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad Corridor. Routing a train every 7 minutes through this nature area for the "travel time convenience" of the north suburbs does not seem to justify the permanent damage to the environment and community surrounding this area.

A few specific questions for you:

- What is your perspective on this topic?
- Will you be present at the meeting on Monday, January 23rd at 4:30pm at Theodore Wirth Chalet?
- Was this project option already approved by the Park and Rec board?

Golden Valley’s uniqueness is centered around its dedication/commitment to nature. I would expect you would support and respect the community on this initiative and protect further development of our natural resources.

Thank you in advance for a prompt response.

Emily Alverson  
Huron Healthcare  
550 W Van Buren St | Chicago, IL 60607  
P 612-636-6792 | F 503-684-4203  
ealverson@huronconsultinggroup.com  
www.huronconsultinggroup.com
From: ealverson@huronconsultinggroup.com [ealverson@huronconsultinggroup.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 15, 2012 2:48 PM
To: Planning; Harris, Shep
Cc: bottineau@co.hennepin.mn.us; Clausen, Joanie; Freiberg, Mike; Pentel, Paula; Scanlon, DeDe
Subject: RE: Theo Wirth Park / Bottineau Transit
Hi Joe, Shep and GV Council,

Me again. Are you aware of the specific proposal for the BNSF golden valley option? According to the RFP I am reading the current freight rail will need to be moved to the West in order for the new rail to be constructed (in Theo Wirth wetland/weak soil). This is major construction – much less than what is being perceived by the public I think. The notices I have seen to date sure make it sound like the train will run on the current track... which is not the case. I also read that the county and railroad is stating that the D1 Golden Valley option is cheaper and they support it. I would appreciate access to this data as frankly I just do not believe it. In addition to moving the freight rail, the county would be purchasing half of the land that the railway owns. How moving a freight rail and laying new rail in a wetland (impacting our water shed) be cheaper than laying rail on a concrete foundation in a developed area?

In general, the more I read, the more helpless it feels. There seem to be some larger political interests (BNSF, Target, folks afraid of North Minneapolis) in control of this decision. It makes me feel like a “list of concerns” from Golden Valley will even make a difference. Please reassure me that it will....

Thanks again for your time.

Emily Alverson
Huron Healthcare
550 W Van Buren St | Chicago, IL 60607
P 612-636-8792 | F 503-684-4203
ealverson@huronconsultinggroup.com
www.huronconsultinggroup.com
I live on the east side of Golden Valley and commute into downtown Minneapolis. I would love to use the train!
High speed trains roaring by every 7 or 30 minutes would destroy Sochaki Park, Mary Hills Nature Area and portions of Wirth Park. The wetlands and wildlife would be devastated, to say nothing of the simple pleasures of the bicyclists, hikers, dog-walkers, and children at play in all three areas. Property values of homes close to the rail, as mine is in Golden Valley, would be further diminished by the impact of noise, vibration and the destruction of what is now a small urban paradise, linked to all of the rest of the Minneapolis park system. Reclaimed from a construction dump, Sochaki is one of the best achievements of Robbinsdale and it should not be dismantled for lrt when there are so many other alternatives. Moreover, the trails in these parks are themselves part of our greener transit system, not to be sacrificed and unable to be reclaimed if the LRT were to go through this route. Any environmental impact statement has to consider these points, especially as compared to already developed non-park highway routes for buses. Count us as opposed to this part of the transitway plans.

Madge and Brad Thorsen
2811 June Ave N.
Golden Valley MN 55422
mthorsen1@msn.com
612-247-5122
From: Stephen M. Dent  
5929 St. Croix Ave N  
Golden Valley, MN 55422  
763-644-3400

I am contacting you regarding the two alternative sites at the split of the route heading north from Penn Avenue. While I understand the importance of providing reliable public transit to north Minneapolis, many of those areas are already served with frequent and reliable bus service to downtown.

I am concerned that Golden Valley is being left out of the planning of the Bottineau Transitway. Having lived downtown for 26 years, I became accustomed to using the light rail going to the airport on my frequent business trips. Since I have lived in Golden Valley for 1 year, I have to drive my car to the airport or have someone drop me off at the Target Stadium, which does not have a convenient drop-off or pick-up point.

Should the transitway be put in alternative 2 - in Minneapolis' northside, I would be reluctant to park my car and take the train anywhere for safety reasons and I believe public safety statistics would support that statement. It is a less safe route.

I understand the importance of serving the northside population and feel that they are already more than adequately served by public transit. It is time to move beyond the city limits and start to understand that suburbanite desire to use public transit as well, but it must be reliable and safe to get us out of our cars.

Sincerely,

Stephen Dent
I received a flier this morning at my home stating that the Bottineau Light Rail is planned to go through Theodore Wirth, Mary Hills and Walter J. Sochacki Parks. If I am reading the map correctly and you are running the line along the existing railroad track that runs on the edge of Theodore Wirth it seems to me that is the best use of that area. But, if I am not reading this map correctly and you are running through the middle of the park and taking away more wilderness, that I would like more information about this project.

The thought that more wildlife areas would be disrupted needlessly angers me and makes me question why this would be necessary. It seems to me that there are several other ways to run this line that would end in the same vicinity as running through the middle of these 3 areas. Using Penn Ave or County 81 would allow riders to travel to the same areas as running the line through the parks. bring the line within a short distance of any areas the line running through Theodore Wirth would bring a rider.

I am in favor of Light Rail and creating more mass transportation but when there are alternatives to removing wilderness and displacing the little wildlife we have in this area creates more problems that it solves. Please provide me with information on how I can obtain this answer.

Thank you.

Kerstin Wright
2940 Perry Ave N
Golden Valley MN 55422
the-wrights@comcast.net
To: Brent Rusco, Hennepin County  
cc: Golden Valley mayor and city council members

I would like to offer my support for the D1 Alignment (running through Golden Valley) of the proposed Bottineau Transitway. The benefits of running a LRT or BRT along a dedicated right-of-way far outweigh the D2 option of stopping at North Memorial Hospital and then through a residential section of north Minneapolis. The principal benefits of D1 are the following:

- Maintaining fast travel time over the entire route. I would envision travel along Broadway and Penn Avenue to be painfully slow, worse than the Hiawatha line running down 5” St. in downtown Minneapolis.
- Right-of-way purchase costs and construction costs I would think would be significantly less along an established rail line.
- Ongoing operation would be far less disruptive to the residents of north Minneapolis.

I also think it would make sense to consider moving the proposed Golden Valley Road station to Plymouth Avenue as recommended by the Theodore Wirth Park Master Planning effort. Transit projects traditionally focus on where people work and shop, but providing frequent public transit access to one of Minneapolis’ premier parks also has value. I understand there is some opposition among some of my Golden Valley neighbors about running LRT or BRT near or through parkland. Certainly during the construction phase it would be disruptive; however, both LRT and BRT are quiet and vibration free. I do not believe it would negatively impact my enjoyment of Wirth Park. From personal experience of extended visits to a residential home that is one block from an above ground Washington Metro subway line, I can report that electric trains are relatively quiet and they create no noticeable vibrations – very different from freight trains and heavy rail commuter lines.

Thank you for your work on the Bottineau Transitway and the well written draft environmental impact statement.

Sincerely,
Clark Meyer
4947 Culver Rd.
Golden Valley, MN 55422
763-529-2630
I grew up where I currently live (since 1957) in G.V. near Sochacki Park in Robbinsdale which connects to Mary Hills in Golden valley. This is a relatively unspoiled area which has multiple use from recreation seekers. To put a LTR through a quite natural area would be a travesty. There are not many places like this left.

Art Obinger

Art Obinger
QA Inspector II
Atrial Fibrillation Division

St. Jude Medical
14901 DeVeau Place
Minnetonka, MN 55345 USA
Tel: +1 651 730 5106
aobinger@sjm.com
sjm.com

This communication, including any attachments, may contain information that is proprietary, privileged, confidential or legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not a named addressee, you are hereby notified that you are not authorized to read, print, retain a copy of or disseminate any portion of this communication without the consent of the sender and that doing so may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender via return e-mail and delete it from your system.
Good morning.

Frankly I really struggle w/ the placement of the Bottineau Line. I use mass transit and enjoy LRT. At the same time, I was really pleased when NSP donated part of its right of way to Robbinsdale for Sohacki Park. The Mary Hills Park and Sohacki Park are part of my daily biking/walking. There are trains along the rails from time to time but they are infrequent. So, from the point of losing that quietness I object.

Looking at alternative routes, I wonder why the route closer to the old shopping center on 34th street is not considered more. That shopping area could benefit from the type of redevelopment that followed the Hiawatha LRT. Finally, it seems more reasonable too to run along Penn to further redevelopment in that area.

I appreciate the goal but object to impinging on the green space of Wirth, Mary Hills and Sohacki Parks.

Yours truly,

Bill Rowe
4040 Wasatch Lane
Golden Valley, MN 55422
612-709-4032
Dear Mr. Rusco:
I am horrified at the thought of running a light rail through the wilderness and recreation areas. These areas cannot be replaced – once they are gone that is it! There will always be another mode of transportation or the damage will be done and the system will not be used.

What can I do to stop this? On a financial side, what would my home be worth! Please advise what else I can do.

A very concerned citizen!

Joan Jeska
2301 Crestview
Golden Valley, MN 55422

JJ
MSP Resources
763.287.8778 phone
612-889-6442 cell
www.mspres.com
With a population of less than twenty-five thousand, I am having a hard time understanding how the Bottineau Transit Project would benefit Golden Valley. The idea of constructing a rail-line stop that would or may accommodate anticipated demand in a relatively small populated community is confounding. Even more, to place a stop anywhere other than near or alongside Highway 55, which is a major thorough fare for East-west traffic (crossing Highways 100 and 169 for North-South traffic) that is (i) easily accessible to the community and surrounding townships and (ii) could reasonably accommodate a satellite parking facility for such a project, seems to be a recipe for a myriad of environmental and social impact concerns that warrant further discussion, consideration and analysis. If I am not mistaken, the Bottineau line runs along Inglewood Avenue North and Thomas Avenue North, right off of Glenwood Avenue. That parcel of land in that area is for sale so considering its location and proximity to Highway 55, Penn Avenue and Wirth Parkway, wouldn't this property be a more obvious or viable location for a transit or rail-way stop? I support improving public transportation options for Golden Valley residents as well as options that may enhance access for our neighboring community members; however, the idea of developing a railway that is located anywhere than along Highway 55 appears to be an option that the fraught with so many troubling and puzzling obstacles that could potentially negatively impact our community.

Thank you,

Chris Jordan
Golden Valley Resident
Good day! I am a resident of the Noble Grove area of Golden Valley, and I’m extremely excited that the Bottineau Transitway might come close enough to my home for me to use it.

Currently I ride an express bus from May through December of each year, but once the weather gets cold, I drive again. I simply cannot bear standing out in the snow waiting for a bus, and then once I get on, my feet stay frozen for the whole ride in, no matter how good of boots I’m wearing. Also, just the smallest amount of snow can mean my bus will be late (meaning I’m even colder!) Finally, there are only three express buses in the morning and three at night that go down the street nearest me. If I’m running a bit late and miss the last bus, I’m out of luck.

However, the Bottineau Transitway would change all that! It appears I could catch a train near either North Memorial Hospital or the Robbinsdale transit station (provided there will be a Park and Ride option at those locations, since they are both too far for me to walk.) Trains will pass frequently enough so I won’t have to wait long, plus I won’t have to plan my commute around just six buses each day. Best of all, it will be fast so even during the coldest weather, I’ll be to work in no time! I can save money on gas, parking at work, and car wear and tear by being a Metropass rider the whole year long!!

I am all for the project, and I hope it moves forward. I also hope it takes the Theodore Wirth/Golden Valley route so I can take full advantage of its proximity to my home. But please take into consideration that Park and Ride facilities need to be available.

Thank you,

Dana

Dana D. Knopic
3036 Lee Avenue North
Golden Valley MN 55422
Dear Mr. Rusco,

As Golden Valley residents, we are opposed to the D1 line and station currently proposed for Golden Valley.

We live at 3910 Bassett Creek Drive, close to the park that follows the creek. Building more rail lines will not only destroy the tranquil setting of the park, disrupt the wildlife, and impact the residents that daily utilize the park walking paths, but it will certainly increase the volume of car and truck traffic, impact the safety of our neighborhood, add more noise, and cause additional vibration to the soil and creek conditions.

It is unlikely that our neighborhood residents would be using this line. By adding this additional line and a station, we are also very concerned that this will have a negative impact on our area. Our home values and taxes are high in Golden Valley. Dropping a rail line and station in the middle of this neighborhood may not only disrupt and congest our beautiful area, but it could likely reduce the security and value of our neighborhood.

We do not support this plan for the D1 line.

Thank you for listening.

John and Alana Griffith
3910 Bassett Creek Dr.
Golden Valley, MN 55422
Home phone 763-432-5390
From: Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us [mailto:Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us]
Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2012 3:27 PM
To: Jeff and Gillian Rosenquist
Cc: Harris Shep; Beth Bartz; Joseph.Gladke@co.hennepin.mn.us
Subject: Re: Feedback for the Golden Valley - Bottineau Transitway

Dear Mr. Rosenquist,

Thanks very much for your comments and taking the time to provide detail regarding your concerns and opinions. Your comments provide valuable scoping input into the Bottineau Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Regarding your concerns about property values, below are two research links which may be of interest in the near term:

Link to study of development patterns along three new transit lines:

Link to University of Minnesota study on property values for the Hiawatha LRT corridor:

Regards,

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55445-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

From: Jeff and Gillian Rosenquist <grosenquist@comcast.net>
To: Harris Shep <ryshep@gmail.com>, brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us
Date: 01/24/2012 03:40 PM
Subject: Re: Feedback for the Golden Valley - Bottineau Transitway

Dear Mr. Rusco and Mayor Harris:

Thank you for taking our comments and concerns into consideration in making the decision regarding the LRT or BLT line through the Northwest Metro area.

I am an Eastern Golden Valley resident who lives not far off Golden Valley Road from Wirth Parkway. Our concerns about the Golden Valley Route (the Red Route No. 1 on the plan) are as follows:

1. Impact on Mary Hills Nature Area and Sochacki Park: noise; trails; impact on wildlife and habitat; safety for kids and pets who bike, walk and play on the trails. We use this area frequently as do the pet owners and residents with children. With no sidewalks in our part of Golden Valley, these trails are the only safe place for our kids to ride their bikes and for us to walk our dog without intermingling with vehicle traffic. Will this remain a tranquil and safe area with a bus or rail line going through it?

2. Impact on property values--could be positive or negative;
how can this be evaluated? What has the result been for other neighborhoods?

3. Putting transit in an area with high car ownership and low density housing—not the best relief to the infrastructure, i.e. roads. Would the citizens of this area use a GVR station? I know of only a couple neighbors who commute to downtown. The rest commute to other suburban office buildings to the South and West. Also, would citizens in this area use a stop at GVR and Wirth? It is too far for many of our elderly residents to walk. A stop at the Lodge would really only serve Minneapolis residents.

4. Noise that will be generated in what is now a very quiet area. The tornado eliminated much of the natural noise barriers (trees) so it would be far noisier to park neighbors than it would have been a few years ago.

5. Impact that the lack of parking will have on the surrounding areas, i.e. lots of cars parked on neighborhood streets and inflow of non-residents into our area potentially increasing crime and congestion.

6. Positive impacts could be non-car access to downtown and the airport; enhanced access to the Courage Center for the disabled; business development such as a coffee shop.

7. Impact on the already busy and speedy Golden Valley Road (County Rd 66). It’s already difficult to turn at GVR and Legend Drive! Also, Golden Valley Road is already not in great shape—old pavement, crumbling curbs, no turn lanes, no room for increasing the size of the road—and could not deal with increased traffic. I believe the 2007 study that Golden Valley did about traffic and transit identified Golden Valley Road as already above capacity. Hennepin County would need to significantly invest in this road; these additional costs should be part of the equation.

8. How would bike trails and the Luce Line proposed links (including a North-South Route through Golden Valley and a route down Golden Valley Road to Wirth park) fit into this plan? Could we tie in Greenway-type bike trails along the rail line which would be more used by residents than the BRT or LRT would be?

OPINION:
A station at GVR and Wirth is really too far for the people in the Merribee Hills area to walk in Winter and really use. I am skeptical that we would.

This is more a route to get Maple Grove residents downtown and we'd bear the impacts of being in the way (noise, traffic, crime, wildlife disruption, decreased property values) but I fear that we'd not get much benefit. I am of the opinion that if the County and Met Council want transit to serve non-car owners and bring residents who need jobs to areas with jobs, the best route is Penn Ave. through Minneapolis. I honestly think that the direct impact to our area would just be an increase of noise and traffic with little actual use.

Gillian Rosenquist
2321 Kyle Ave N
Golden Valley 55422
Having lived here since about 1965, I strongly oppose the construction of a light rail line through Shadwell, Maryland, and Walter P. Scharski Park.

The wilderness and recreational areas and clear blue neighborhoods which now we take for granted would be enormously disrupted.

The noise could disrupt sleep in all and may affect the local flora, squirrels, birds, deer and other animals in anyway.

Would driving on vehicles be more hazardous?

Bette B. Scharski
2130 Maryland Avenue
Berkeley Valley, MN MN 55422

Thank you for reading about my concerns.
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Laurel Larsen <dlil@comcast.net>
Date: February 16, 2012 11:49:01 AM CST
To: <sharris@goldenvaleymn.gov>,
Cc: <jclausen@goldenvaleymn.gov>, <mfreiberg@goldenvaleymn.gov>,
<pentel@goldenvaleymn.gov>, <jscanlon@goldenvaleymn.gov>,
<jclancy@goldenvaleymn.gov>
Subject: BOTTINEAU TRANSITWAY

Dear Mr. Mayor, City Council Members, and Director of Public Works,

The purpose of this letter is to express our opinion about plans for the Bottineau Transitway. We live at 2540 Dresden Lane next to the Mary Hills and Walter J. Sochacki parks. We believe that the light rail would have a negative impact on these parks as wild life and recreational areas if the Alignment D1 route is chosen. It seems clear to us that the Alignment D2 is preferable for several reasons:

- It serves many more people because it goes through a more heavily populated area.
- It serves more businesses and workplaces – North Memorial Hospital, Broadway/Penn and Plymouth Avenue. Many more workers commute to these areas than to Golden Valley road.
- The three proposed stations on this route are heavily used and have good parking capabilities available.
- No infringement on a local park with it’s walkways, bike paths, and wild life.

In contrast, the D1 route is through a park surrounded by low density residences and no businesses. The one station proposed for this route (the Golden Valley Road station) has no parking adjacent to it except St. Mary’s church a block or so away.

In summary, the choice seems clear. Why build a system that few would use and which reduces the quality of our parks?

Sincerely,

Laurel Larsen  David Zook
Dear Council Members/Mayor,

Thanks for taking input on the various proposals for the extension of light-rail to our area. While the D1 proposal would be geographically more convenient for myself and partner (we routinely take the 14 bus to Downtown to ride the Hiawatha light-rail to the airport), the D2 alignment appears to make better sense for serving a much more dense neighborhood and greater population base, many of whom would be well served by the train. The stations at North Memorial and along Penn Avenue would undoubtedly be much busier than a more isolated station on D1 at Golden Valley Road.

We would like to voice our support for the D2 alignment in your deliberations in representing our neighborhoods of Golden Valley.

Dave Bucher
Bill Cooper
4000 Bassett Creek Drive
Thanks very much for your input and for so clearly stating the reasons for your concerns. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

---

February 17, 2012
Brent Rusco Hennepin County Bottineau Transit way, Project Management
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415
Re: Dedicated High-Frequency Transit Corridor to Northwest Suburbs
   Wirth Park/Golden Valley Segment

Project Manager:

As a resident of Golden Valley for over thirty years I encourage the development of good light rail service to our community, and to the entire northwest suburban region. The development of light rail is good public policy for many reasons involving the environment, economics, traffic congestion, housing affordability, improved urban neighborhoods and the curbing of urban sprawl.

We do not need any more highway improvements like the I-394 gorge. It is a monument to days gone by. Such highways are massive and environmentally destructive; and they are increasingly unaffordable. We need alternatives. The immediate dilemma for commuters is highway congestion, and there is no realistic way of paving our way out of the mess that has been created. In partial alleviation of our problems, light rail should help to concentrate residential growth at key inner city and inner suburban locations. That concentration should make housing more affordable and it should help to curb urban sprawl.

Furthermore, light rail would make it easier for all of us—particularly seniors—to use down town and local-area sports, entertainment, and restaurant venues. If we did not have to make nerve-racking drives, we would travel more often locally, and feel safer and more secure in doing so. This is particularly the case during the winter
months and at night. This is all very healthy for our cities and our future.

We should not be parochial about new transportation initiatives, but critics of the Wirth Park segment of the Bottineau LRT have some good observations. First, local observations regarding the impact of any large public works project on local property values and the quite enjoyment of immediate neighborhoods needs to be given considerable weight. Greater weight should be given local views than that of others who live beyond the immediate corridor. Near-by residents should not have a veto, but they should have a very significant say.

The community as a whole should be heard as well. The proposed “Wirth Park route” does not serve the greatest bulk of Golden Valley residents, and at the same time it does further bisect our community and the adjacent park land.

Some years ago an unsuccessful candidate for Golden Valley City Council proposed that a light rail line should be constructed in the HOV lane of I-394. That was an eminently good idea that would have made the best use of that costly and ill-used ribbon of concrete. But the idea was probably ahead its time. Such a project would have served a large portion of Golden Valley, St. Louis Park, and communities beyond, all the way to Wayzata. That is the type of light rail our community needs, though it is an idea that is still beyond the imagination of the concrete and highway crowd that still dominates our transportation policies.

Tom Zins
Golden Valley, MN
From: "Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us" <Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
To: Tammi Hall <btmhall@yahoo.com>
Cc: Beth Bartz <bbartz@srfconsulting.com>, "Joseph.Gladke@co.hennepin.mn.us" <Joseph.Gladke@co.hennepin.mn.us>
Sent: Fri, Feb 17, 2012 15:39:26 GMT+00:00
Subject: Re: Light rail

Ms. Hall.

Thanks very much for your input. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

Date: 02/17/2012 09:21 AM
Subject: Light rail

We are thrilled that the north and northwest metro will be gaining access to the light rail system through the proposed Bottineau Transitway.

That said, we are opposed to the option of running the light rail along the existing railroad through Theodore Wirth Park for the following reasons:

1) The park is a wonderful recreational and natural area utilized and appreciated by so many residents. To disrupt this natural area with light rail running every 10 or 15 minutes all day, not to mention the development of stations, would be a tragedy. I am shocked that the county would even consider running light rail through a park. I realize that trains run on the existing track through the park but the current disruption to the park from the railway is very minimal due to the low number of trains utilizing the track. This utilization is very different from a light rail train running every 15 minutes all day every day and the attendant people traffic with a light rail system.

2) There seems to be several drawbacks to a station on Golden Valley Road - access to the station given the current railroad is way below the road and the lack of space for any parking. For most Golden Valley residents who plan to utilize the light rail a station in Robbinsdale that offers more parking and better access would be more convenient or at least as convenient as the Golden Valley Road option. There is currently a large unoccupied space (the former Robbinsdale Farm and Garden) that would provide an
excellent location for a light rail station. It might also have a positive impact and bring traffic to the many local businesses in downtown Robbinsdale vs. bringing traffic and disruption to a natural park area. There are also several senior living complexes in Robbinsdale that would benefit from close proximity to the light rail.

3) At the community meeting we were told that due to the potential drawbacks of the station on Golden Valley Road a second option under consideration was Penn Avenue directly across from the Theodore Wirth clubhouse building. We strongly oppose this option as the development of a station would bring even further disruption to the natural area in the park.

The option of running light rail along Broadway through north Minneapolis seemed a better choice to us for the following reasons:

1) The Broadway route seems to be a better solution for meeting the goal of providing transportation to residents without their own means of transportation. According to the presentation at the community meeting there are, in some north Minneapolis neighborhoods, up to 50% of residents without transportation. It seems to me that for these residents close proximity to the light rail would be a huge plus. A route through the park and a station at Golden Valley Road is too far away for many north side residents as they would need transportation just to get to the light rail line and station.

2) With light rail comes development of stations and adjacent areas. It seems to me that the Broadway and north Minneapolis communities could greatly benefit from this development, especially considering the damage to the area from the recent tornado. The light rail should offer the opportunity to re-develop and invest in this area to create a better neighborhood for all.

We appreciate the opportunity to learn of the light rail proposals and provide feedback. We look forward to the positive impact light rail could bring to our community and the opportunity to leave our car at home and utilize this great community transportation!

Robert and Tammi Hall
2936 Perry Avenue North
Golden Valley, MN 55422
Hogeboom, Joe

From: Kelly Lowrie [klowrie@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2012 4:30 PM
To: Bottineau@co.hennepin.mn.us; mark.stenlien@co.hennepin.mn.us; Hogeboom, Joe; Harris, Shep; Clausen, Joanie; Freiberg, Mike; Pentel, Paula; Scanlon, DeDe; brent.rusco@hennepin.mn.us
Cc: Kelly Lowrie
Subject: Bottineau Transitway D1 Proposal Opinion
Attachments: GV Map.jpg

We received the “Neighborhood Alert – Light Rail in Golden Valley” letter almost two weeks ago. It was not nearly enough time to research and learn more about the proposed bus or light rail through our Golden Valley/Robbinsdale parks system.

I was able to find and review the Scoping Booklet on-line, review neighborhood maps and parks, speak with our Hennepin County City Commissioner, our Golden Valley City Planner, talk with neighbors and learn this could be a real possibility just 450 feet from our home.

As proud Golden Valley residents, we are passionate about where we live, our community and the well-being of our neighborhood. It is unbelievable that we have .3 acre lot in a secluded, peaceful, wooded nature environment just feet from my house. We look forward to relaxing in our back yard, watching birds including bald eagles, deer and hope we can see our two resident great horned owls at dusk. We can definitely hear them at night. The opportunity to have over 50 acres of parks in our neighborhood and the ability to take advantage of the walking and biking trails including 37 acre Sochacki Park, 9 acre Rice Lake Nature Area, 15 acre Mary Hill’s area and Glenview Terrace Park is breath taking. We frequently have said, “Where else can we get this so close to the city”...We like to think of it as our special retreat after a long day at work.

Believe Patrick Reusse referred to it first, in his article attached http://www.startribune.com/featuredColumns/446468172.html as an Urban Treasure. It was just a couple of years ago when we were opposing Frisbee golf and now Light Rail...what will be next.

As long time resident home owners, we fiercely oppose the light rail through Theodore Wirth, Mary Hills and Sochacki Parks. It seems ridiculous that with over 20 options reviewed that we are down to this option being considered as one of them.

I am in favor of public transportation, in fact, I take the bus every day, just 2 blocks from my house. I find it interesting that bus routes have been cut or removed in St Louis Park area where my 75 year old mother resides and she has a difficult time staying independent as she doesn’t drive. It is sad we cannot better serve our local communities for efficient public transportation currently today.

It’s incredible to have this area in the middle of the city. And this is the way we like it. Quiet.

Thank you!

Kelly Lowrie and Randy Roy
4300 Culver Road
----- Original Message ----- 
From: Commissioner.Stenglein 
Sent: 02/24/2012 02:10 PM CST 
To: Brent Rusco; Joseph Gladke 
Subject: Fw: Light Rail in Golden Valley actually this just came in 

- steve 

----- Forwarded by Steven R Gershone/CB/Hennepin on 02/24/2012 02:09 PM -----

"Cynthia Malinowski" <gcmalin@comcast.net> 

02/24/2012 12:26 PM 

To 

<commissioner.stenglein@co.hennepin.mn.us> 

cc 

Subject Light Rail in Golden Valley 

I was not able to come to the light rail meeting, but I support light rail, and mass transit in general. 

If this was in existence today, my learning disabled son of 23 yrs could have taken the light rail to Hennepin Technical College. He was able to take the bus to MCTC downtown, but to get anywhere in the suburbs is nearly impossible without going downtown first. My son would have to take 3 buses to get to Hennepin Tech. This would take 90 min to 2 hrs. On a snowy day, he would risk being late, or too exhausted to attend school. Instead, I drove him back and forth till he was comfortable taking a driver’s test to get a license. By car, it takes him 18-21 min to drive the 7.5 miles. 

My son will graduate before a decision is made on the Bottineau Transitway. There are many citizens who would gladly forgo owning a car, or cannot drive, including seniors, children, the disabled, or those of lower income. I used to wish I lived in San Francisco where owning a car is an unnecessary expense. I noted that some wondered why Golden Valley needed to be connected to the rail system. I think many of them speak from their narrow existence that they do not need it in their current existence, not the needs of others who may have chosen not to live in GV or who’s lifestyles have changed with age. Having transit gives you options you may not have dreamed about. 

From an economic stand point, all developers snap up the land, knowing what financial rewards they will reap from being near a stable transit line. The cities would profit from the property taxes. There are the usual environmental pluses. 

To address the suburban plight of why people do not use transit more, it is because the buses do not go where want to go. I do not know why metro transit does not have buses that connect the suburbs via the major highways. I worked and live on highway 100, but there is no bus that runs north south. The only way I could get to work from my home in Golden Valley off of Duluth Street to highway 394 in St. Louis Park, was take the bus downtown and that back out to SLP. I tried bicycling in fair weather, but found it extremely risky every time I crossed highway 55 on Douglas. The spokes of the system run in and out of downtown. There is no wheel connecting all of the suburbs. 

Cynthia Malinowski
Please stop the light rail from wrecking our beautiful View!!

Put this ugly thing down a busy road, not a Beautiful Quiet Park like area. Not Smart planning. Bad to the people who live here, bad to the Deer, Fox, Turkey.

I unmoored to Kewanee Way for the View, not the house. Now you want to wreck it, stop please. I need the peacefulness. I am an RN at North Memorial, part of The Trauma Team. Calm is my going grace after a long shift, Speedy, Clanging Bells, Industrial Setting, Crazy Traffic, put this monice in a High Traffic, industrial area.

Please,

Debra Jones
Kewanee Way
Please take a moment to read the attached document regarding our concerns over the proposal to develop a LRT through Golden Valley.

Thank you for your time,

William and Sue Linder
2640 Kyle Ave N
Golden Valley, MN 55422
763-521-5337

Golden Valley residents for over 23 years.
Brent Rusco  
Bottineau Transitway Study Manager  
Hennepin County  
417 N. 5th Street, Suite 320  
Minneapolis, MN  55401  
February 11, 2012

Subject: Light rail in Golden Valley

Dear Mr. Rusco,

I am writing you today to protest the light rail initiative in Golden Valley that would run through the parks of Theodore Wirth, Mary Hills and Walter J. Sochacki. The parks and green areas of Golden Valley are what set it apart from other suburbs. There is an abundance of wildlife in these parks, including deer, red fox, squirrels, rabbits and an occasional coyote. Additionally there are grasses, wildflowers, soaring birds, walking paths, picnic areas and a general sense of peace and harmony.

These parks are heavily visited by the local residents and provide a place of recreation for our young adults and teens. I have personally taken on the responsibility of keeping these parks clean and picked up for the last 23 years. You will be hard pressed to find a discarded container or other debris anywhere between 36th Street and Golden Valley Road. There are many residents like me that love, respect, and value the unique experience these parks offer.

The equipment needed to build the light rail will flatten the vegetation (look at the dredging project this past summer for flood abatement), drive off wildlife and will disrupt the peacefulness and tranquility of the parks and surrounding suburbs. The light rail is scheduled to run every 7-15 minutes during rush hours and every 30 minutes early in the morning and late at night. At present the only traffic through these parks is the BN Railroad 2x a day (10am and 4pm).

Clearly, surrendering this precious asset to a light rail project that primarily benefits those in other communities is a loss to the residents of Golden Valley that is uncompensated. Living close to this corridor, I will see the value of my property diminish as will my neighbors.

Please, you must say no to this project and save a big part of what makes Golden Valley the special place it is.

Sincerely,

William Linder &  
Sue Linder  
2640 Kyle Ave N  
Golden Valley, MN 55422
City of Golden Valley  
Attn: Public Works-Jeanine Clancy  
7800 Golden Valley Rd  
Golden Valley, MN 55427

Subject: Light rail in Golden Valley

Dear Ms. Clancy,

I am writing you today to protest the light rail initiative in Golden Valley that would run through the parks of Theodore Wirth, Mary Hills and Walter J. Sochacki. The parks and green areas of Golden Valley are what set it apart from other suburbs. There is an abundance of wildlife in these parks, including deer, red fox, squirrels, rabbits and an occasional coyote. Additionally there are grasses, wildflowers, soaring birds, walking paths, picnic areas and a general sense of peace and harmony.

These parks are heavily visited by the local residents and provide a place of recreation for our young adults and teens. I have personally taken on the responsibility of keeping these parks clean and picked up for the last 23 years. You will be hard pressed to find a discarded container or other debris anywhere between 36th Street and Golden Valley Road. There are many residents like me that love, respect, and value the unique experience these parks offer.

The equipment needed to build the light rail will flatten the vegetation (look at the dredging project this past summer for flood abatement), drive off wildlife and will disrupt the peacefulness and tranquility of the parks and surrounding suburbs. The light rail is scheduled to run every 7-15 minutes during rush hours and every 30 minutes early in the morning and late at night. At present the only traffic through these parks is the BN Railroad 2x a day (10am and 4pm).

Clearly, surrendering this precious asset to a light rail project that primarily benefits those in other communities is a loss to the residents of Golden Valley that is uncompensated. Living close to this corridor, I will see the value of my property diminish as will my neighbors.

Please, you must say no to this project and save a big part of what makes Golden Valley the special place it is.

Sincerely,

William Linder &
Sue Linder
2640 Kyle Ave N
Golden Valley, MN 55422
Mr. Rusco -

Running the disruptive Bottineau train through multiple cherished parks is unacceptable in my eyes. All of the valued community events and the peaceful joy these parks bring to a hectic city is something I will fight to keep - they are the reason I bought my house where I did. And it's not just about the disruption to wildlife; it's also about the people this will affect. There has to be a better (urban) route that this train can take. With so few parks left in a big city, we really need to fight to preserve the ones we have. Even a minimal disruption is not okay.

I also have another issue with that is destroying me. My house is located on Kewannee Way, and this will be IN my front yard. This is the first house my husband I have ever bought, we bought it to start our family in. We have already gotten the tar beaten out of us for its value during this recession. We purchased this property for $240,000. This past winter we were trying to refinance and it was valued at $170,000! Could you imagine what this project would do to our already shattered home value?! This would be a devastating blow to our lives and I don't see how we would ever be able to recover. The bottom line is this would destroy us financially through no fault of our own. This home is already a toxic asset, and will get even worse with the train, so much so I don't see how we would ever be able to sell. It doesn't leave us with any good choices.

This community and I are owed an explanation and a plan for the future. Like I said, this project will most certainly devestate my life. I don't see how I could ever recover from this.

I know the central corridor is doing a lot to help businesses that will be disrupted due to the light rail, so what will Hennepin County do for the home owners along the Bottineau rail? How will you help us? How will you make it so we are not the ones paying dearly for this project?

Will there be compensation for our home's decreased value from a result of the rail location?
What about sound proofing for our home?
What about a safety/privacy/ sound barrier/fences?
But even that would not save the peace outside the home that we are able to enjoy today.
This is a nightmare for me.

I feel I have expressed my fears and concerns.
I expect solutions.

Thank you,
Keppen Kettering

Your communication is encouraged:
Keppen Kettering
KeppenK@gmail.com
651-307-2700 (Mobile)
2350 Kewanee Way, Golden Valley, MN 55422
The D1 line is in my front yard. I live on Kewanee Way in Golden Valley.

Here are my comments I would like to submit:

1. Not only will I have to pay for this with my taxes, but I’ll also have to pay for this with our homes values too?? Even if the project gets federal money, I PAY FEDERAL TAXES so yes, I’m paying for this.

2. What kind of package is the city prepared to offer homeowners who lose in this deal? I’ve already seen my property taxes skyrocket as the value of my home plummets. Will we not have to pay property taxes for 10 years in order to make up for the value we have lost? Are there any other ideas on how to make us whole?

3. The city council was told: “home values do not decrease due to light rail being in the neighborhood or in front of a home.” I personally can’t understand how this could be a true statement. How could this not hurt our home values??? I don’t want to hear, feel, and see the train going by every 7.5 minutes. I also would never buy a home were the light rail is IN the front yard so to me this statement is an outright lie.

4. What kind of plan for soundproofing our homes is being proposed? Soundproof windows, what about soundproof walls and roofs?

5. What about a plan for the safety/privacy/sound barrier fences? What kinds of aesthetics are being talked about?

6. How can the county justify destroying three parks? What about the wetland areas?

7. The parks in my neighborhood are the reason I bought my house in Golden Valley. Taking those away would take away what I love about this part of the city. Why would it be okay for our community to be stripped of our perks? (and I know there’s the equipment rail that’s there now, but it’s hardly fair to compare a train going by once per day during the work week vs. every 7.5 minutes.).

8. Looking at the maps, I see the D1 does appear to be the easiest route, but it would not serve the most people, the proposed stops are a joke. No businesses are located at the stops and very few people’s homes are. The D2 looks to be better accessible for foot traffic, it’s near multiple businesses, and it goes to a hospital, all things I would think to be good? I just don’t understand having to destroy three parks and wetland area for the D1. And yes, I get that it’s cheaper, but you’re already proposing to spend a ridiculous amount of money, why not do the project right and make sure the most people are served?

9. In no way am I anti-light rail (or anti-public transportation for that matter). I pride myself on being extremely ecofriendly, forward thinking, and having the ability to look at the bigger picture, so I want to make that clear. I know my comments make a big point about my
home and my neighborhood, but I really do also have concerns about the parks. I don't understand how three parks can be sacrificed for this project? The parks in my neighborhood were the reason I bought my house in Golden Valley. Taking those away from me would take away what I love about this part of the city.

10. My bottom line: I'm not only expected to pay for this project with my tax money, but now I have to pay for this project with my homes value. (Value in money and value in location)

Kappan Kettering
2350 Kawanee Way, Golden Valley, MN 55422
Joe:

Will you please respond?

Jeannine Clancy | Director of Public Works | City of Golden Valley 7800 Golden Valley Road | Golden Valley, MN 55427 | 763-593-8035 | 763-593-3988 (Fax) | 763-593-3968 (TTY) | jclancy@goldenvalleymn.gov

*Please note new email address.*

-----Original Message-----
From: Keppen Kettering [mailto:keppenk@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2012 3:55 PM
To: Clancy, Jeannine
Subject: I’m a Terrified Home Owner in your city

Dear Ms. Jeannine Clancy,

Running the disruptive Bottineau train through multiple cherished parks is unacceptable in my eyes. All of the valued community events and the peaceful joy these parks bring to a hectic city is something I will fight to keep - they are the reason I bought my house where I did. And it's not just about the disruption to wildlife; it's also about the people this will affect. There has to be a better (urban) rout that this train can take. With so few parks left in a big city, we really need to fight to preserve the ones we have. Even a minimal disruption is not okay.

I also have another issue with that is destroying me. My house is located on Kewanee Way, and this will be IN my front yard. This is the first house my husband I have ever bought, we bought it to start our family in. We have already gotten the tar beaten out of us for its value during this recession. We purchased this property for $240,000. This past winter we were trying to refinance and it was valued at $170,000! Could you image what this project would do to our already shattered home value?!! This would be a devastating blow to our lives and I don't see how we would ever be able to recover. The bottom line is this would destroy us financially through no fault of our own. This home is already a toxic asset, and will get even worse with the train, so much so I don't see how we would ever be able to sell. It doesn’t leave us with any good choices.

This community and I are owed an explanation and a plan for the future. Like I said, this project will most certainly devastate my life. I don’t see how I could ever recover from this.

I know the central corridor is doing a lot to help businesses that will be disrupted due to the light rail, so what will Hennepin County do for the home owners along the Bottineau rail? How will you help us? How will you make it so we are not the ones paying dearly for this project?
Will there be compensation for our home's decreased value from a result of the rail location? What about sound proofing for our home? What about a safety/privacy/sound barrier fences? 

It even that would not save the peace outside the home that we are able to enjoy today. This is a nightmare for me.

I feel I have expressed my fears and concerns. I expect solutions.

Thank you,
Keppen Kettering

Your communication is encouraged:
Keppen Kettering
KeppenK@gmail.com
651-307-2700 (Mobile)
2350 Kewanee Way, Golden Valley, MN 55422
As 27-year residents of Golden Valley, we are opposed to light rail going through our local nature preserve and Wirth Park. The irony of this cannot be lost.

One of the attractive things about this neighborhood is we live close to the city yet we can "get away" to nature by walking or biking to the nearby nature preserve thanks to some planning on the part of wise city leaders. And, we are cross-country enthusiasts, embracing this silent sport in what has become a mecca for skiers at Wirth Park. Our neighborhood is peaceful with many people who go out daily for walks, jogs and bike rides loving what Golden Valley provides—an oasis of peace close to the city.

If the train comes and disrupts the neighborhood with engine noise, clanging and whistling as often as every 15 minutes during peak periods, we will be forced to DRIVE out of our own community to far away suburbs for peace in nature—or worse, be forced to move to get peace. Then, we'll be the ones needing the train to ride through the crumbling inner city where there is no longer a peaceful neighborhood.

Janell
763-522-8542
Will you please respond?

Jeannine Clancy | Director of Public Works | City of Golden Valley
7500 Golden Valley Road | Golden Valley, MN 55427 | 763-553-5035 | 763-553-3968 (Fax) | 763-553-3968 (TTY) | jclancy@goldenvalleymn.gov

*Please note new email address.*

From: Janell J. Siegfried [mailto:janell@siegfriedsunray.com]
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2012 3:47 PM
To: Harris, Shep; Clausen, Joanie; Freiberg, Mike; Pentel, Paula; Scanlon, DeDe; Clancy, Jeannine
Cc: siegfriedbruce@comcast.net
Subject: Citizen Input on Light Rail in Golden Valley

As 27-year residents of Golden Valley, we are opposed to light rail going through our local nature preserve and Wirth Park. The irony of this cannot be lost.

One of the attractive things about this neighborhood is we live close to the city yet we can “get away” to nature by walking or biking to the nearby nature preserve thanks to some planning on the part of wise city leaders. And, we are cross-country enthusiasts, embracing this silent sport in what has become a mecca for skiers at Wirth Park. Our neighborhood is peaceful with many people who go out daily for walks, jogs and bike rides loving what Golden Valley provides—an oasis of peace close to the city.

If the train comes and disrupts the neighborhood with engine noise, clanging and whistling as often as every 15 minutes during peak periods, we will be forced to DRIVE out of our own community to far away suburbs for peace in nature—or worse, be forced to move to get peace. Then, we’ll be the ones needing the train to ride through the crumbling inner city where there is no longer a peaceful neighborhood.

Thanks for your consideration of this situation—we understand the delicate balance between growth in the city and preserving what is good.

Janell
763-522-8542
Dear Brent Rusco:

I have been to the community meetings with my neighbors here in Golden Valley. My wife and I have expressed our opposition to the proposed D1 line at these meetings.

To us, the D2 line makes much more sense, for many reasons including environmental as well as practical. Why, for instance, would there be a need to have a Golden Valley station when we are just 12 minutes from downtown?!! Why destroy a beautiful natural environment that has provided myself and my neighbors with sightings of eagles, owls, fox, hawks, deer, not to mention the quiet and rejuvenating retreat we share with these precious animals.

The D1 line is inappropriate, and we strongly oppose it.

William Steacker and Robin Price
3900 Bassett Creek Dr.
Golden Valley, MN. 55422
Jeannine Clancy | Director of Public Works | City of Golden Valley 7800 Golden Valley Road | Golden Valley, MN 55427 | 763-593-8035 | 763-593-3988 (Fax) | 763-593-3968 (TTY) | jclancy@goldenvalleymn.gov

*Please note new email address.*

-----Original Message-----
From: wtsteacker@netscape.net [mailto:wtsteacker@netscape.net]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 4:09 PM
To: Harris, Shep; Clausen, Joanie; Freiberg, Mike; Pentel, Paula; Scanlon, DeDe; Clancy, Jeannine
Subject: Bottineau: NO on D1. YES on D2

Dear Council Members:

My wife (Robin Price) and I are strongly opposed to the D1 line and station proposed for Golden Valley. We have lived on Bassett Creek Drive for 17 years, just about 12 minutes from downtown.

Establishing a rail line parallel to the existing line will not only disrupt this park setting with its wildlife and serenity but will create neighborhood issues of on street parking, unnecessary vehicular traffic and noise and vibration issues for all our homes along Bassett Creek.

I have not seen any studies regarding noise and vibration level effects on our homes. The current rail movement on the existing line can be felt and heard in all our homes.

Robin and I urge you to vote NO on the proposed D1 line. It seems absolutely preposterous to have a station established here when, as we have heard at meetings we have attended, that very few people in our area will use the line. Traffic congestion, noise, destruction of a natural environment so close to the city (something we all cherish) and home prices will undoubtedly have a negative impact on the quality of life we all find so special living here.

We urge you to vote NO on the D1 line.

William Steacker
Robin Price
3900 Bassett Creek Dr.
My wife (Robin Price) and I are strongly opposed to the D1 line and station proposed for Golden Valley. We have lived on Bassett Creek Drive for 17 years, just about 12 minutes from downtown.

Establishing a rail line parallel to the existing line will not only disrupt this park setting with its wildlife and serenity but will create neighborhood issues of on street parking, unnecessary vehicular traffic and noise and vibration issues for all our homes along Bassett Creek.

I have not seen any studies regarding noise and vibration level effects on our homes. The current rail movement on the existing line can be felt and heard in all our homes.

Robin and I urge you to vote NO on the proposed D1 line. It seems absolutely preposterous to have a station established here when, as we have heard at meetings we have attended, that very few people in our area will use the line. Traffic congestion, noise, destruction of a natural environment so close to the city (something we all cherish) and home prices will undoubtedly have a negative impact on the quality of life we all find so special living here.

We urge you to vote NO on the D1 line.

William Steacker
Robin Price
3900 Bassett Creek Dr.

Golden Valley
III. Maple Grove
Brent Rusco  
Bottineau Transitway Study Manager  
Hennepin County  
417 N. 5th Street, Suite 320  
Minneapolis, MN 55401  
Phone: 612.543.0579

Mr Rusco,

I am a resident of Maple Grove. I attended a Bottineau Transitway Scoping open house, but I didn't fill out an input form at that time. I have a few thoughts that I would like to share.

1. I support economic analysis to determine if rail or bus service is the best choice. However, I am much more likely to use rail than a bus system.

2. I was disappointed in the apparent lack of coordination of the proposed transit way and the Maple Grove transit system. This may be a "detail to be sorted out later", but the feeder system to the rail head is critical to me. Related to this, is the fact that the rail head is not at the MG transit station parking ramp (would need to be increased in size of course).

My typical usage will be to take light rail transit to the airport or downtown for a Twins/Timberwolves/Vikings (?) game, Gophers game, or downtown / MOA shopping. In order for the trip to make sense, I need to have convenient free parking at the MG transit station. Even better would be a bus service that would allow me to walk to the bus from my home and connect via bus to the light rail system. (Best of all would be a light rail station at Fernbrook and Hwy 81, that I heard proposed some time ago.)

My daughter used MG Transit express bus service for a year to commute to the U of MN, and she uses the bus to get home on occasion now that she is living near campus at an apt. Rail needs to compete with the MG express bus speed to attract students. Given that the U is all torn up right now for the St Paul extension of light rail, it would be ideal in a few years to jump on the train in MG and attend or work at the U. My comments about parking or bus connections apply for students too.

Thank you for your consideration,

Mark Turpin  
9647 Harbor Lane  
Maple Grove, MN
Hi,

I wanted to add my comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement process for the proposed Bottineau Transitway projects.

I live in Maple Grove and commute to the University of Minnesota every day using the existing (limited) express bus transit options provided by Maple Grove Transit.

I think a light rail system going from Maple Grove (the alignment under consideration) to downtown Minneapolis would be amazing. I am so used to operating under the current system of Maple Grove Transit buses, where only a certain number of trips are offered, only going downtown in the morning and only coming back to Maple Grove in the afternoon. I can barely wrap my head around the idea of being able to travel to and from downtown at any time of day and in either direction with high-frequency service light rail.

Making the investment now in this type of infrastructure is a great idea. It will change the transit system in Maple Grove for the better, taking it from an outer-ring suburb dependent on the automobile to a more functional and accessible community that provides important alternatives to automobile travel, alternatives that I personally would be over the moon about if we had now. The sooner, the better!

Thank you,
Sara Swenson
I would be opposed to that as I catch bus (Route 782) in my neighborhood. That would mean I would need to drive to a transit station/park and ride. I like being able to walk out my door and down a block and a half to the corner. It currently takes me roughly 45 minutes from the time I walk out of the house until I am at my desk. I would imagine that to take the train would add time to my commute due to the amount of stops the train would make.

Kathryn M. Perkins
Payroll Manager
Corporate Payroll
Wells Fargo Corporate HR 625 Marquette Ave Minneapolis, MN 55479
MAC H9311-173
Tel 612-331-1162 Fax 612-667-3758
kathryn.m.perkins@wellsfargo.com
As a resident of Maple Grove and someone that has recently started using public transit to get to work I am in favor of anything that increases the times that public transit runs between Maple Grove and downtown Minneapolis (or other suburbs). I current commute between Maple Grove and St. Louis Park using public transit at 2-4 days a week. Having routes that get me from Minneapolis to Maple Grove later in the evening would be appreciated to allow me to work later hours at my office. Also my children rely on public transit to get around and they would greatly appreciate some options later in the day and later in the evenings and weekends. My son is currently looking for a job as a chef and has been unable to afford a car, so he’s been relying on public transit to get to jobs. Unfortunately the lack of public transit between Maple Grove and downtown late in the evenings and the weekends is greatly limiting his job search. I realize that the Bottineau Transitway will not be a solution for his immediate job search, but this could prevent other young adults from having the same problem in the future.

Jon Schewe
117 West Eagle Lake Drive
Maple Grove, MN 55369

--
Jon Schewe | http://mtu.net/~jpschewe
Good morning,

My name is Brooks Shannon, and I'd like to take a brief moment to share my thoughts regarding the Bottineau Transitway. I hope to attend the meeting on February 9th (if it's open to the public; it seems like it must be...) - however, I wanted to at least give an overview of my hopes in case I'm unable to attend.

In short, I strongly favor the light-rail option that terminates in Maple Grove for the following reasons:

- I travel frequently, and the convenience of riding a single train to the airport is a clear winner. My company would save a fair amount of money in airport parking fees, when I park there, and mileage reimbursement when my wife takes me to the airport.
- Taking the train would also be a great way to get to the airport when we go on vacations, making it more affordable for us.
- I also attend a lot of events downtown: Twins games and concerts, predominantly. Not having to deal with parking my car would be fantastic.
- The availability of the train also means that we would be more likely to do things downtown that we don't do as often, like go out to eat or go to bars. Again, parking can be a pain. Removing that headache would get us downtown more often.
- I suspect that a light-rail line terminating in Maple Grove would bring more job opportunities to residents of Minneapolis and the inner-ring suburbs than a Brooklyn Park terminus. (While the latter might be great for the Target employees, the folks that need jobs in the city - that would benefit from light-rail transit - are probably going to have an easier time finding work in Maple Grove than at the Target campus.)
- I also favor light rail in general, over bus rapid transit, for the sheer fact that I like trains more than buses. :) I probably wouldn't ride a bus, especially if I needed to connect to light rail from it to/from the airport.

Thank you for your time and consideration. If you'd like me to expand on any of my thoughts, by all means let me know. Otherwise, have a great weekend, and thank you for involving the community in your decisions.

Respectfully,
Brooks

Brooks T. Shannon
Lead Software Engineer
Bullberry Systems, Inc
Phone: (701) 323-9200 x7938
Web: http://www.bullberrysystems.com
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

1. Purpose and need for the project
   The project looks good on paper but will it be cost-effective? Will it be self-supporting?

2. The alternatives proposed for study
   Alternative A goes to the new target business
   Alternative B seems to make sense with the "y"s of people commuting.
   There is also between the campus and the target DT MB.

3. Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

4. Other comments

Name: Steve Hoem
Address: M.S.
email: 

Please check all of the following that apply:

[ ] Area resident    [ ] Area business owner    [ ] Community-based organization member    [ ] Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  I support the need for this project. We are very behind the times compared to other cities. The completion of this project would provide jobs as well as a way to get to new developments. Plus, it would help with transportation driving times.
  I support B - this would make the line available to more people. D - 2 trains/day, less impact on T/W, & more opportunity for riders

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  Environment - prefer LRT, BRT would have more pollution. B. would allow people to get to N. Heights College, there is a need to get to N. Tech - perhaps a shuttle - frequent

- Other comments
  Definitely support this project

Name: Barb Dahlquist
Address: 916W 710 Vagabond Ln N, MN, 55311
Email: dahlpb@comcast.net

Please check all of the following that apply:
- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
From: Terry Conn [mailto:biklab3@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2012 2:42 PM
To: Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us
Cc: Beth Bertz; Joseph.Gladke@co.hennepin.mn.us
Subject: Re: Bottineau Transitway Scoping

Unless of course it were an express after stopping in maple grove!

Terry
Sent from my iPhone
Please excuse the typos!

On Jan 28, 2012, at 2:35 PM, Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us wrote:

Thanks very much for your input. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

From: biklab3@aol.com
To: brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us
Date: 01/19/2012 02:57 PM
Subject: Bottineau Transitway Scoping

I won't make any of the Scoping Meetings, but my one comment would be

I won't take any transit system through the unsafe inter-city. I did that years ago on the "5" bus. Never again. I will stay on the 781 or 785 and take the expressway.
Thomas,

Thanks very much for your input. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

I live in Maple Grove and take the 780 or 781 bus daily.

For me, leg A would be necessary for me to use the Bottineau Transitway.

Thomas S. Breidenbach, P.E.
Patent Agent
Merchant & Gould P.C.
3200 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-2215
USA

Telephone (612) 336-4708
Fax (612) 332-9081
www.merchantgould.com
IV. Minneapolis
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

**Purpose and need for the project**

We absolutely need light rail.

**The alternatives proposed for study**

Penn, Broadway, or Foch to 17 would be good alternatives.

My concern is for the wild turkey, deer, eagle that live along the Theodore Roosevelt Line.

**Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**

1. Cost
2. Safety at stops/stations
3. Noise impact
4. Wildlife protection
5. Walking trail security

**Other comments**

Name: Melanie Kraftagdaen
Address: 2927 Washburn Ave N, Minneapolis
Email: Melanie.Kraftagdaen@hotmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

* Purpose and need for the project

* The alternatives proposed for study
  I prefer buses. It costs less and is more flexible. You can change the route, add or delete buses, etc.

* Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  Please do not put the rails on Rovey Ave. It will destroy the neighborhood like Route 4 in St. Paul.

* Other comments
  The object is to get suburban residents to the City Center. There is no need for rail stops at Physick Ave and Golden Valley Rd. Buses already exist and are working well.

Name: Peter Hoge
Address: 1204 Upton Ave N.
email: mpls_mn_55411

Please check all of the following that apply:

☒ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

**Purpose and need for the project:**

- Rail will continue to be a better long-term transportation option than buses.

**The alternatives proposed for study:**

- I would prefer the "Z" alignment to stop at Plymouth Ave then to South Dakota Ave.

**Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated:**

- Better traffic flow for the communities. Fewer "oil wells" development possibilities. It is an important segment of the metro transit plan.

**Other comments:**

- Target Corp. ... when they moved/moving out of downtown. I suggest funding cost & billing to them for any line that services their new campus.

Name: [Signature]
Address: [Signature]
Email: [Signature]

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project

- The alternatives proposed for study
  I would like option D1, but would like to see a walk/bike bridge over 81 so people from the south side would have a safer path to the station.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

- Other comments

Name: Ed Kubinski
Address: 3023 Upton Ave N
Email: ekubinski06@yahoo.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
☑ Area resident    ☐ Area business owner    ☐ Community-based organization member    ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

**Purpose and need for the project**

The project is essential to provide transportation equity to the residents of North Minneapolis, Northwest Minneapolis, and NW Hennepin County.

**The alternatives proposed for study**

Strong Support for Option D2

Why not do both A and B on the north end. Build LRT not BRT!

**Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**

- Economic justice, transit equity, job centers
- Transit to include North Minneapolis core areas
- Areas of New North, Camden, Brooklyn Center and Brooklyn Park most impacted by the mortgage foreclosure crisis 2005-2011 need the economic development boost!

**Other comments**

Areas of North Minneapolis (Camden Community Neighborhood) are underserved by transit options. No nice ride, etc., and so is NorthStar.

Name: J. E. Strand
Address: 5100 Thomas Ave. N. Minneapolis and 55418
Email: jeff-strand@msn.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

* Purpose and need for the project
  * the video should show specific areas where
    * can house adds one & an estate in type that up to 50% in public transportation dependent & families & elders
  * the environment equity in job access, equity in infrastructure, Bottineau

* The alternatives proposed for study
  * Penn alignment (1st choice)
  * Brooklyn Park (1st choice)
  * No harm to White Park & industrial
  * Equity in infrastructure, access to financial opportunities

* Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  * impact on environment & health
  * impact on access to education, work, limited mobility
  * health impact on communities
  * Safety from congestion/traffic issues

* Other comments
  * don't leave out North Dakota communities of color & low income areas
  * think to the future not the now
  * treat imported residents with fairness, compassion & equity

Name: Lynne, Hannan Resident

Address: ________________________________

email: lynne.rei@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

1. Purpose and need for the project

   There is significant non-access to transportation alternatives in geographic target areas within Hennepin County. Affordable, accessible, and equitable transportation that enables people to access job, economic opportunities, healthy food alternatives, educational opportunities, and needed health services should be at the forefront of the discussion. Communities with the highest disparities in transportation access should be a primary consideration in scoping alternatives.

2. The alternatives proposed for study

   I am dismayed that an alternative that serves Brooklyn Center and the eastern part of Brooklyn Park were not presented as an alternative given the disparities in transportation access in those areas. I am most supportive of alignment C and D2.

3. Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

   Safety, economic impact on surrounding residential and commercial communities, traffic flows on alternative roads, noise and vibration, and overall community vitality should be considered. Design and appearance and community engagement efforts are critical to providing transit systems people will take pride in and value.

4. Other comments

   

Name: Naisha Reynolds

Address: 585 Oliver Avenue N. Minneapolis, MN 55405

email: 

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date.

Thank you!

1. Purpose and need for the project
   Stick to Hwy 55 going to rr tracks & following them through Wirth Park.

2. The alternatives proposed for study
   Do NOT WANT IT Running down Penn, Queen, or Oliver.

3. Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
   - Loss of homes
   - Decimation of neighborhoods
   - Loss of home value that has this transit running through their back yard, or loss of ability to sell home

4. Other comments

Name: Rachel Crushion
Address: 1215 Newton Ave N, Mpls
Email: rahntcrun@yahoo.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  The need for this project is already pretty well established. We need more mass transit.

- The alternatives proposed for study
  The only alternatives that really impact me are between the D1 and D2 routes. D2 is the better choice. The LRT may not rely on A.Mpls riders, but they will rely on you. To ignore their need so that -
  (see other comments)

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  D2 would help bring much-needed jobs, commerce and interest to N Mpls. Yes, residents would have to deal with the rail in the neighborhood, but I think the convenience would outweigh any objections.

- Other comments
  Suburbanites have a nice view - don't have to deal with poor black people. Would be downright immoral. Even if that is not how it is meant, that is New N Mpls would see this.

Name: Jacqueline Still
Address: 1270 W. Broadway Ave., Minneapolis 55411
Email: lbm771 @ gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
- Area resident
- Area business owner
- Community-based organization member
- Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  
- The alternatives proposed for study
  
- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  Environmental degradation of ecosystems, level of degradation that would occur with BRT option. Just say no

- Other comments
  This would effectively isolate North Minneapolis. There would be short-term gain but long-term pain in the MP Skyway outweighs short-term pain

Name: John Smith
Address: 1234 Main Ave 242 Minneapolis, MN 55411
Email: jsmith@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

**Purpose and need for the project**

PEOPLE IN NORTH MINNESOTA NEED TO HAVE ACCESS TO TRANSPORTATION. If the "A" ALIGNMENT does not go through the neighborhoods, the people of the community need to have other options for access.

**The alternatives proposed for study**

- [ ]

**Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**

- [ ] Increased ridership, increased business served by LRT
- [ ] Median income for businesses & residents would need to increase considerably
- [ ] Other comments: if meets wants a station, they should pay for a station.

**Other comments**

Name: RAYMOND DELM

Address: 1211 UPTON AV NE, MPLS

Email: raymond.delm@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  To extend the LRT network northward, to serve more people with faster, high-quality transit, to maintain affordable living in North Minneapolis and the northwestern suburbs.

- The alternatives proposed for study
  I support any route that serves the site. Engineers should consider a 7th St/Freeway routing as an alternative. It would serve the center of North Minneapolis and supplement/replace the busy #5.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  Consider the number of buses that will be cut if the LRT runs down Penn/Broadway or any alternative selected.

- Other comments
  Any route should be Light Rail Transit and the County should consider an incremental approach, such as building only to Crystal.

Name: Cameron Sligh
Address: 7624 W 43rd St #4, 65410 Minneapolis
email:

Please check all of the following that apply:

☒ Area resident    ☐ Area business owner    ☐ Community-based organization member    ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  Great project to connect peoples homes to work and vice versa. Yes to LRT. No to BRT.

- The alternatives proposed for study
  Prefer Penn Avenue Route. 92C. Demolish 8
  move houses on Penn. Plenty of vacant lots
  nearby. Sound walls. Allee Alleys or Queen
  & Russell. Cite Manitoba Sound walls. Bike paths
  should be in correlated too.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  Increase transportation connection & help traffic.
  Gow on Penn. Side benefit is demolition of
  Substandard Vacant house on Penn.

- Other comments
  If 01 is chosen, a soundwall is a must
  for Highway 55 to Plymouth Ave.

Name: Brian Anderson
Address: 710 Vincent Ave No 55411 Mpls
Email: Beanea C Email.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
- Area resident  - Area business owner  - Community-based organization member  - Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project

  The need for more and manage and secure apartment properties. The need for this continues to grow, based on discussions with residents who do not own cars.

- The alternatives proposed for study

  I own West Broadway Apartments @ 66th & West Broadway.
  Go west. Act 7 would work much better than the "F" route.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

  Act 7.

- Other comments


Name: John Roder
Address: 1818 Bryan Av N. #3 MPLS MN 55411
email: Johnroder1@yahoo.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☑ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
The sooner this is built the better. We have to reduce the sprawl & congestion.

The alternatives proposed for study:
D2 option should prevail over the D1 due to: increased density reduction in sprawl, higher number of car-less homes, decreased time in underground, increased # of stations = higher # of riders, access to hospital, less interruption to peaceful park, increased business along this route that could positively impact the City of N. Minnesotan, slower commute time of only 3-5 minutes for the suburban rider should not be a deterrent to their usage.

Other comments:
Please keep in mind the demographic areas that could benefit from this project through North Minnesota that you won't hear from due to various socio-economic obstacles.

Name:  **Lori Lausch**
Address:  3554 Knoll Ave N, Minneapolis 55412
email:  lasch@comcast.net

Please check all of the following that apply:
☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

Purpose and need for the project
HOW FAR TO WALK OR DRIVE TO CROSS TRACKS? PLEASE DESCRIBE THE FENCE—HOW HIGH? CHAIN LINK? ROCK BALLAST = 8/6 MISTAKE IN OUR AREA! PLEASE SHOW DETAILS OF TURN AT PENN + OLSON HWY.

The alternatives proposed for study
IT WOULD BE BEST TO USE THE EXISTING RAIL CORRIDOR ALONG THEO WIRTH. IT WOULD BE A BIG ENRICOE TO RUN IT ON PENN & WILL FURTHER OUT OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD. IT WILL SLOW RESPONSE TIME OF EMERGENCY VEHICLES.

Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
LYNDALE-8TH INTERSECTIONS ALREADY HAVE MORE THAN 4,000 V/P/WK. HAS ANYONE DONE A STUDY OF HOW TRAIN WILL AFFECT RUSH HOUR TRAFFIC IN AREAS ALREADY CONGESTED? LYNDALE, GRAYSON, EMERSON, HUMBOLDT, PENN? FRUSTRATED DRIVERS WILL GO ONTO SIDE STREETS—JUST LIKE THE HIJINATHA LINE.

Other comments
WOULD YOU WANT THIS RUNNING A FEW FEET FROM YOUR FRONT YARD? DON'T PUT IT IN OUR FRONT YARDS! WE HAVE ENOUGH TO DEAL WITH!!!

Name: Chris Born
Address: 624 James N. Mpls. 55411
Email: Christborn@AOL.COM

Please check all of the following that apply:
☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Transit is key to revitalization!**

  North Minneapolis is poorly served, and 50% of our families have NO cars. We have only 1 supermarket, and it's on the eastern edge of the area. Revitalizing will require better transit — and not just on Broadway. A Bottineau BYPASS of the block neighborhood will be an insult, especially as several other communities nearby get light rail!

  Since the BNSF railroad turns out to be softer and wetter than previously thought, and there is an Indian burial ground claim pending there, EITHER a route down Penn or Olivier would be preferable, with stops at Lowry, Golden Valley, Penn, and Olson Memorial.

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**

  A stop at Golden Valley Rd (at Penn or BNSF) would benefit users of Courage Center, many of whom are non-drivers. There are existing, long-vacant lots on corners of Penn & Golden Valley Rd, Penn & Plymouth, which would make excellent transit centers, perhaps with a convenience store and cafe.

- **Other comments**

  The wealthy few along the BNSF don't want light rail and wouldn't use it. The working poor NEED better transit, more accessible shopping, and we ALL benefit from keeping the more poorly-maintained vehicles off the street. Much of the housing stock along Penn/Oliver is marginally habitable, especially after the tornado.

- **Name:**


- **Address:**

  1314 Thomas Ave N., Minneapolis 55411

- **Email:**

  cuupste@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  Much needed!!! Especially for North Minneapolis (D2 option)
  Less than 50% of households in this area have cars
  Increased access for riders going to and from jobs/schools

- **The alternatives proposed for study**
  I support the D2 alternative option - this would provide
  the foundations of job access and private investment
  growth in North Mpls. D2 option is an investment
  in the future - the Golden Valley option should not
  even be considered as an equivalent choice.

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**
  D2 would improve the economic viability of North Minneapolis
  D2 would encourage/give ability for residents of
  North Mpls to access work outside their neighborhood
  D2 potential to drive private investment & economic
  growth within North Minneapolis

- **Other comments**
  This D2 choice is critical! It would help provide
  a sustainable economic foundation for residents of
  North Mpls, and a long-term investment in decreasing
  the burden of poverty on all of Minnesota.

**Name:** Jody Lounsbury

**Address:** 1020 W Broadway, Mpls, MN 55411

**Email:** loun @umn.edu

Please check all of the following that apply:
- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [X] Other interested party
I live 1 block from Penn Ave N. The bus comes every ten minutes during rush hour. Even on Sunday the wait for a bus is only 30 minutes. No train is going to improve that service.

2nd, Busses are far more flexible. When we get more riders we add more busses. With busses we can react to the demand quickly and efficiently and so the riders will be better served. No riders turned away because the train is full.

3rd, trains continue to exist only between densely populated cities. I grew up in a suburb of Chicago. They built a network of trains to the suburbs while I lived there. Within 10 years the trains failed. Ridership was too low. The state of Illinois is now saddled with supplementing the cost of operation. If they had gone with busses, they could escape the mounting expenses.

Please choose busses over trains!

Tom Hatton
2301 Oak Park Ave N.
Minneapolis, MN. 55411
Brent:

There has been lots of discussion about Penn Ave...where to put the train, use Oliver and/or Russell, put everything on Penn...or put the train through the current Theo Wirth train corridor.

I have an idea I've been thinking about. Putting the train and both lanes of road traffic on Penn creates one transit corridor. I hear concerns about the loss of housing. I don't think there has to be a loss of housing.

There are plenty of vacant lots near the area. The houses on Penn Avenue North that are worth saving, can be moved to vacant lots that the city owns. The houses can be rehabbed and sold to homeowners. This saves housing, infills vacant lots with similar styles and ages of homes, provides an opportunity to improve those houses once they are relocated and then be sold as affordable homes.

With the vacant Penn, you can run the trains and cars, and also put bike lines on either side. If you build privacy fences (similar to the fence on the west side of Hiawatha) between the corridor and the alley’s of Queen and Oliver, you provide privacy for those homes.

It might be an unreasonable idea, but one I wanted to share.

Brian Anderson
710 Vincent Ave No
I was unable to attend the recent open houses, but I wanted to give my input. I would recommend lrt over bus rapid transit. While I would be excited about using light rail I wouldn’t even consider bus transit.

I would also like to commend a penn ave route over the golden valley alternative. We really can’t exclude north minneapolis from light rail transit. If we are serious about transit and development I think there is no contest over which route offers the greatest potential than a route that includes penn and west broadway.

thanks for the opportunity to provide input,

Curtis Evavold
2938 Upton ave N
Minneapolis
Comments are being taken until Feb 17th for the "scoping" process for the proposed Light Rail Transit (LRT) route thru or around N Mpls. This stage will establish the "scope" of the EIS, that is what issues that will be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement.

Note that just two alternative alignments that are set to be considered in the EIS:

"D2C" LRT and Vehicles all on Penn by TAKING THE HOUSES ALONG ONE SIDE of Penn (probably the west side) with stops at Penn/Plym, Penn/Broadway and N Memorial

"D1" along the rail track along Wirth Park with stops at Penn/Olson and either Plym/Parkway or Golden Valley/Parkway

These two alternatives were selected by the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) that on November 14th. This was despite clear community preference for some other alternative.

Note that it is appropriate to make comments like this

>> Suggested comment: <<

We need a route to serve N Mpls near Penn Av with stops near Penn/Plym, Penn/Broadway and North Memorial Hospital WITHOUT TAKING ALL THE HOUSES ON ONE SIDE of Penn. The D2A and D2B alternatives that the PAC rejected did this.

Comments can be submitted on the special form at: http://bottletransit.org/library/2011-2012_dels_scoping_documents.htm

(There is a link to this page -- "Scoping meeting exhibits" -- under "What's new" at http://bottletransit.org but it is hard to spot as a link. It has other information about the scoping process.

You could print out the PDF form, fill it out and mail it back.

EMAIL COMMENTS

You could also email comments to bottineau@co.hennepin.mn.us

To facilitate this I will send a separate message to the list with the text from the comment form so you can "Reply All" to that message and add your comments there. The bottineau address should be a recipient if your "Reply All". (Feel free to delete me (Fred / fholson...) as a recipient tho I would be interested in comments.)

NOTE that I have included the "Suggested comment" above in that message. To accept it as your comment just delete the words >> Suggested comment: << and possibly modify it.
Fred

Fred H. Olson  Minneapolis, MN  55411  USA  (near north Mpls)
Email:  fholson at cohousing.org  612-588-9532
My Link Pg: http://fholson.cohousing.org  My org:
Communications for Justice -- Free, superior listserv's w/o ads
As a north Minneapolis resident and small business owner I am disappointed to see some of the decision being made regarding the Bottineau Transitway. There should be two guiding principles: 1) serves north Minneapolis residents and 2) does not damage existing assets. This means run transit lines on corridors were people currently use transit and don't demolish more housing in the process. Thank you. T

Troy Kester
1922 Willow Av N
Minneapolis, MN 55411
612.670.6828
See my comments in RED below

Add as many comments after each of these four areas as you like:

○ Purpose and need for the project

I think there is a great need for better transit access in North Minneapolis. Either alternative would be better than what we have now, although D1 doesn't directly serve North Minneapolis. We have lots of transit users in North Minneapolis, so improving the system in North is important.

○ The alternatives proposed for study

I fully agree with the statement below: The D1 alignment doesn't adequately serve North Minneapolis. D1 would give better transit, but without a better bus network implemented in conjunction with D1, North Minneapolis would miss out. I don't want that to happen. Like I said above D1 would be better than nothing, but it's the least-ideal service to North Minneapolis.

The Golden Valley stop and the Plymouth stop for D1 are both fairly inaccessible for very many people.

We need a route to serve N Mpls near Penn Av with stops near Penn/Plymn, Penn/Broadway and North Memorial Hospital.

○ Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

○ Other comments

Name: Ryan Lee-Norman
Address: 2626 Vincent Ave N, Minneapolis, MN
email: ryanleenorman@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

___ X ___ Area resident
___ ___ Area business owner
___ ___ Community-based organization member
___ ___ Other interested party
Add as many comments after each of these four areas as you like:

- Purpose and need for the project: There is no comparable alternative to LRT. Bus rapid transit, streetcars, and bus lines serve a purpose but they differ so vastly in efficiency and reliability that they are only apparent alternatives. There is a line where quantitative aspects such as speed, frequency, and capacity create a clear qualitative divide, and there is such a divide between LRT and a streetcar. An LRT line provides a seamless gateway into the public transit network. The stark decision here is whether or not the Northside will be willfully denied an entrance ramp onto the public transit "highway," in deference to outer-ring suburbanites who fear sitting next to people of color on their commute.

- The alternatives proposed for study: I honestly can't believe that our city and county leaders are seriously considering bypassing the Northside. Doing so will permanently cement into our infrastructure the Northside's exclusion and segregation from the rest of the city. The fact that the city is willing to volunteer hundreds of millions of dollars to buy billionaires their new private stadiums shows up in glaring relief what a lie it is that cost was ever even a tiny factor in the decision to exclude the Northside from the metro transit infrastructure. It is a thin, cheap lie that is intended to be understood as such.

And the havoc that the D1 line will bring down on the wildlife at Wirth Park is in itself horrifying, even apart from the segregationist denial of service to the Northside.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated:
  1) Environmental impact of D1 route on Wirth Park wildlife, including the sound pollution, wildlife collision casualties, and other consequences.
  2) Effect of writing in infrastructure the permanent exclusion of the Northside from efficient systems of public transit.

- Other comments

Name: Michelle Lewis
Address: 1321 Sheridan Ave. N.
email: vegnation@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [X] Area resident
___ Area business owner
___ Community-based organization member
___ Other interested party

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups “WHOmail” group. To post to this group, send email to whomail@googlegroups.com. To unsubscribe from this group, send email to whomail-unsubscribe@googlegroups.com. For more options, visit this group at http://groups.google.com/group/whomail?hl=en.
Brent,

We need a route to serve N Mpls near Penn Av with stops near Penn/Plym, Penn/Broadway and North Memorial Hospital WITHOUT TAKING ALL THE HOUSES ON ONE SIDE of Penn. The D2A and D2B alternatives that the PAC rejected did this.

Name: Martha Chateleine
Address: 2215 PENN AVE N
e-mail: chatelma@comcast.net

Please check all of the following that apply:

- XXX Area resident
- ___ Area business owner
- ____ Community-based organization member
- ____ Other interested party

From: "Fred H Olson" <fholson@cohousing.org>
To: "Brent Ruscio" <bottineau@co.hennepin.mn.us>
Sent: Thursday, February 2, 2012 10:11:45 AM
Subject: [upperwillardhomewood] LRT comment form

Scoping Comment Form
BottineauTransitway
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date.

Thank you!

Add as many comments after each of these four areas as you like:

- Purpose and need for the project
o The alternatives proposed for study

>> Suggested comment: << (delete this line to accept suggestion)

We need a route to serve N MPs near Penn Av with stops near Penn/Plym, Penn/Broadway and North Memorial Hospital WITHOUT TAKING ALL THE HOUSES ON ONE SIDE of Penn. The D2A and D2B alternatives that the PAC rejected did this.

o Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

o Other comments

Name:
Address:
email:

Please check all of the following that apply:

_____ Area resident
_____ Area business owner
_____ Community-based organization member
_____ Other interested party

Reply to sender | Reply to group | Reply via web post | Start a New Topic
Messages in this topic (1)
Recent Activity:
Visit Your Group

Switch to Text-Only. Daily Digest • Unsubscribe • Terms of Use
Bottineau Transitway
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date.
Thank you!

Add as many comments after each of these four areas as you like:

- Purpose and need for the project
- The alternatives proposed for study

We need a route to serve N Mpls near Penn Av with stops near Penn/Plym, Penn/Broadway and North Memorial Hospital WITHOUT TAKING ALL THE HOUSES ON ONE SIDE of Penn. The D2A and D2B alternatives that the PAC rejected did this.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
- Other comments

I believe removing so many houses along Penn ave would prove to be detrimental to the project and the neighborhood as a whole.

Name: amy buckmeier
Address: 2323 sheridan ave n 55411
email: toadinmypocket@hotmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

_____ X__ Area resident
_____ Area business owner
_____ X__ Community-based organization member
_____ Other interested party
I would like to add my opinion for the record that as a North Minneapolis resident, I support the D1 option. I strongly feel that LRT should not run down West Broadway as West Broadway should be reserved for future street car reintroduction. Street cars are intended for higher frequency stops in dense urban settings and would therefore be a more appropriate option for West Broadway. LRT on the other hand is more about higher speeds, fewer stops, and regional connectivity. The D1 option is more appropriate for that. My biggest caveat is that *if* D1 is selected, there needs to be an adequate park and ride (similar to what is found at the Hiawatha Lake Street Station) in the vicinity of Penn Avenue and Olson Memorial Highway in order to provide a point of access for Northsiders.
Dear Mr. Rusco,

My name is Andrew Pisansky. I am currently a medical student at the University of Minnesota, a former student of public health at UMN and an alumnus of Macalester college in St. Paul. I currently live in NE Minneapolis and have been spending time working at clinics in North Minneapolis as a component of my rotations.

I have little doubt that you are familiar with North Minneapolis. We both know that as a community with a fairly consistent demographic while individuals meanwhile remain transient. As a healthcare provider in training, I have interacted with many individuals who would have benefited from more consistency in their medical care. As a student of public health, I see individuals who are at least partially the product of societal and economic decisions. I know this is abstract and likely sounds a bit idealistic, but give me one more paragraph to explain.

We so often think of illness as this thing that happens to a person because of some choice they made: they smoked, they drank, they ate fast food too often. Yet, when you really examine the conditions that lead to the promotion of these sorts of "causes" it goes so much deeper than that. Economic development that provides long-term job placement. Business investment in a community. Stable access to infrastructure. All of these are preconditions that can be absent or present; and they either discourage or promote overall wellness in a community and a people.

Now, this isn't to say that I think everyone is strictly a product of their conditions, but I don't think that we can discount these predisposing factors. In any case, I would encourage you to see the choice of a transitway through North, specifically the D2 option, as an opportunity to lay the groundwork for positive changes in a community that needs investment on the infrastructural level if we are to see positive impacts on its overall wellness and prosperity. Furthermore, the long-term investment in the community that can stem from the investment of a LRT system will, I believe, ultimately reduce the burden of poverty in this community as it creates an entrez for business investment and worker and student commuting.

The majority of people I have met while working at clinics in North Minneapolis have been honest, hard working and well-intentioned. These are people who deserve the to have alternatives to what is now available. The D2 corridor will allow many of those in the community of North to become more integrated with Minneapolis, to seek work to a greater extent within North Minneapolis as well as outside the community.

In closing, please consider what the D2 option means as you and your colleagues consider plans for this proposed transit system. I would be pleased to converse further about this topic and can be reached by email.

Best,
Andrew
Andrew J. B. Pisansky
507.358.9305
Richard Adair
<adair001@umn.edu>
02/11/2012 10:51 AM

To: bottineau@co.hennepin.mn.us

cc

Subject: D1 alignment

I live near Wirth Park and use it year-round for bicycling, XC skiing, walking. I also drive on Penn Av N frequently, with its many vehicles and pedestrians. Yesterday I walked the D1 alignment, including the treeless tornado damaged area.

AS A PARK USER I FAVOR THE D1 ALIGNMENT because it’s QUICKER and SAFER, and a second set of tracks parallel to the BNSF tracks WILL NOT INTERFERE WITH MY ENJOYMENT OF THE PARK.

Thanks.

Richard Adair
200 Upton Av S, Mpls
Dear Sir or Madam,

I attempted to send in my comments earlier today via the pdf documents on the website, but was unable to do so. I hope they are received in time to be considered as part of the draft EIS statement.

My name is Jeff Skrenes and I am a resident of the Jordan neighborhood. I am in the midst of purchasing and rehabbing a house at 2601 Penn Avenue North. Although I will soon live very close to the proposed D2 line, I have serious concerns about its impact on the community. From an environmental standpoint, I shudder to think of the tons and tons of debris that will wind up in a landfill if as many as one hundred or more homes are demolished as part of the D2 alignment. The demolition and disposal of existing homes is not the only environmental impact that the D2 line will have in this regard. New development will come in, and the manufacturing, transport, and construction of new structures carries its own energy and environmental costs. I would like to see estimates of those expenditures as part of an environmental review.

Furthermore, the acquisition and demolition of many structures along one side of Penn Avenue may still not allow for sufficient square footage and sufficient site assembly to create new viable developments at the nodes where a stop will be. If D2 is a serious option, then a broader development plan should be in place, with a detailed understanding of all environmental impacts for those nodes before that route is fully approved.

Sincerely,

Jeff Skrenes
To whom it may concern:

we are on 26xx blocks of France Ave.

1. Recreation areas disruption. With Mary hills and Sochacki parks being narrow, we are afraid that construction of rail will not leave anything of those parks. Large areas of Wirth park are used for recreation: tubing, XC skiing, golf. Unless convinced otherwise, we are sure those activities will be disrupted or sacrificed forever, depending on the exact route.

2. Cost to taxpayers (us). There are hardly any rail systems that are built in low-density urban areas with modern-day costs, that are self-sufficient. To the contrary, all or almost all of them never recoup construction, and their operation is subsidized by taxpayers indefinitely. We don’t think we and our children should be saddled with this forever

Here are some links:
http://www.streets.mn/2012/02/09/the-boondoggle-that-is-light-rail/
From:  Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us  [Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us]  
Sent:  Saturday, February 04, 2012 5:37 PM  
To:  Molly Dinneen  
Cc:  Joseph Gladke@co.hennepin.mn.us; Beth Bartz; Anna Flintoft  
Subject:  Re: Bottineau Transitway - Scoping Comment Form  

Molly,  

Thanks very much for your comments regarding the Bottineau Transitway. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).  

The Minneapolis Transportation & Public Works Committee considered draft scoping input at their meeting on 1/31/12. We understand the City of Minneapolis is continuing to investigate issues in the development of the City's scoping input.  

Brent Rusco  
Senior Professional Engineer  
Hennepin County  
Housing, Community Works & Transit  
Engineering and Transit Planning  
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400  
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843  
Direct:  612.543.0579  

From:  Molly Dinneen <dinneen2614@yahoo.com>  
To:  "Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us" <Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>  
Date:  02/03/2012 02:45 PM  
Subject:  Bottineau Transitway - Scoping Comment Form

Purpose and Need for the Project  
LRT in north Minneapolis will provide economic opportunity and improved livability for residents.  

The Alternatives Proposed for Study  
I support D2. The stops for D1 are too far for north Minneapolis residents to walk to. The University of Minnesota has reports stating that home values in north Minneapolis will rise if we select the D2 alternative.  

Project Impacts or Benefits that Should be Evaluated  
I read today that the City of Minneapolis is recommending D1 with a MOU with Metro Transit and Hennepin County for alternative transportation, including streetcars. Isn't an MOU not legally binding? Once again north Minneapolis is left out of economic opportunity. Pathetic.  

Molly Dinneen  
2614 Vincent Ave N  
Minneapolis, MN 55411  
dinneen2614@yahoo.com  

Area Resident
Thanks very much for your input. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

Brent Rusco  
Senior Professional Engineer  
Hennepin County  
Housing, Community Works & Transit Engineering and Transit Planning  
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400  
Minneapolis, MN  55415-1843  
Direct: 612.543.0579

Mr. Brent Rusco  
I am in favor of the Bottineau Transit Option D2. The D2 Option provides three stops in North Minneapolis rather than just one stop. I am a resident and homeowner in Jordan Park Neighborhood. The presence of reliable, time-efficient transportation access to both downtown and suburban areas is critical to the economic growth and stability of North Minneapolis. Residents need to have transportation to where available jobs are located.

Thank You

Kathleen M. Gulley  
2903 Thomas Ave. North  
Minneapolis, MN 55411

Disclaimer: Information in this message or an attachment may be government data and thereby subject to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 13, may be subject to attorney-client or work product privilege, may be confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise protected, and the unauthorized review, copying, retransmission, or other use or disclosure of the information is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please immediately notify the sender of the transmission error and then promptly delete this message from your computer system.
From: "Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us" <Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
To: Susan Frame <susanframe@live.com>
Cc: Beth Bartz <bbartz@srfconsulting.com>
Sent: Thu, Feb 16, 2012 21:55:02 GMT+00:00
Subject: Bottineau Comments

Thanks very much for your input. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

The Minneapolis City passed a resolution yesterday regarding the Bottineau Transitway with input relative to issues that need to be addressed in the Draft environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS). We expect to receive a copy of this document by the end of the week and can share it with you if you wish.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55445-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

From: Susan Frame <susanframe@live.com>
To: <brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
Date: 02/19/2012 10:15 AM
Subject: 

Mr. Rusco,

I understand that at a recent Transportation and Public Works Committee meeting, the City Engineer requested the City of Minneapolis to endorse the D1 alignment for the Bottineau LRT. I think the endorsement was approved, but I'm not sure.

I would like to voice my disappointment with this request. I am a resident of North Minneapolis, and I feel strongly that the people of North Minneapolis are being left out of light rail transportation with the D1 alignment. It's time to include North Minneapolis in plans for development and plans to link communities via LRT. The D1 alignment proposed stops at either Golden Valley Rd or Plymouth Ave do not serve the vast majority of North Minneapolis residents --- they are on the far western border of the city.

I believe a far better route for LRT is the D2 alignment option. Penn Ave is a major thoroughfare, near the middle of North Minneapolis rather than on the edge. It would give direct transportation access to many of our residents - - transportation to work in places like North Memorial Hospital and the north Metro area.

Thanks for taking my e-mail. I hope the City of Mpls and Hennepin County are listening.

Susan Frame
From: "Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us" <Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
To: Aneesa Parks <aneesaparks@gmail.com>
Cc: Beth Bartz <bbartz@erfconsulting.com>
Sent: Fri, Feb 17, 2012 15:17:55 GMT+00:00
Subject: Re: Bottineau EIS

Thanks Aneesa,

We've appreciated your continued engagement in the development of the Bottineau Transitway and the thoughts, ideas, and concerns you have contributed to the process. It was especially helpful for you to provide your home as a learning environment. Your current email comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

We are encouraging stakeholders to monitor the project website (www.bottineautransitway.org) for study process updates. You can also contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

From: Aneesa Parks <aneesaparks@gmail.com>
To: brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us
Date: 02/16/2012 07:47 PM
Subject: Bottineau EIS

Dear Brent,

First I'd like to say that I have appreciated the dedication you have shown to the community throughout this planning phase. You have engaged in countless hours of community forums and even came to my house for a web chat once!

I know I can't come to as many meetings as I used to when my baby slept anywhere anytime, but I am still staying informed on the issues.

I live and teach in North Minneapolis and know how important it is that this transit benefit the people that live here. I believe the EIS should include a comprehensive environmental justice analysis of the Bottineau Transitway. In addition, the EIS should include several D2 options for study.

Given the quickly changing options and uncertainty of community preference between D1 and various D2 options, it is important to have all of the D2 options (D2-a, D2-b, D2-c, D2-d and D2-w) studied as part of the EIS to fully determine the costs and benefits of each. We should not eliminate a preferred community D2 option for one (D2-c) that could potentially cause great harm to current residents.

I look forward to hearing more.

Thanks,

Aneesa Parks
1500 Queen Ave N
From: "Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us" <Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
To: Jodi Polzin <jplzn@msn.com>
Cc: Beth Bartz <bbartz@srfconsulting.com>, "Joseph.Gladke@co.hennepin.mn.us"
     <Joseph.Gladke@co.hennepin.mn.us>
Sent: Thu, Feb 16, 2012 23:09:06 GMT+00:00
Subject: Re: Bottineau LRT Scoping Comments

Thanks very much for your input. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

We appreciate you taking the time to clearly state your concerns and the basis for them. Please contact me with any questions or if you need information as the process continues forward.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

-------------------
From: Jodi Polzin <jplzn@msn.com>
To: <brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
Date: 02/16/2012 11:19 AM
Subject: Bottineau LRT Scoping Comments

Mr. Brent Rusco
Bottineau Transitway Project Manager
Hennepin County
701 Fourth Ave South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55405
Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us
www.bottineautransitway.org

Re: Bottineau Transitway EIS Scoping Comments

Dear Mr. Rusco:

Thank you for the opportunity to allow us to voice our opinions and concerns regarding the proposed Bottineau Transitway. We are 25 year residents of North Minneapolis – our home is adjacent to both the proposed D1 route and the proposed station at Plymouth Avenue/Xerxes Avenue. The direct impact this project will have on our life and property has led us to follow the project development since 1985, when it was first being studied by the Hennepin Regional Rail Authority. We accept that it is highly likely, yet not desirable on our part, that the D1 route will be selected as the preferred route. We understand that the needs of the larger community of north Minneapolis as well as greater Hennepin County outweigh our individual needs. Yet we are next door neighbors and expect the consideration and respect that is due to us as being among those with the most to lose. In effect, if the D1 route and the Plymouth Avenue station are constructed we will find ourselves in the position of having negative impacts with respect to security, privacy, health, and aesthetics. We have right to be compensated for these takings and effective mitigation of the negative effects and we fully expect to be actively negotiating with Hennepin County should this project come to fruition.
Purpose and need of project
Given the dramatic changes to the local, national, and global economy, we question the growth assumptions that support current transitway alternatives. The current dramatic reduction in infrastructure spending that has occurred in both the State and Federal capital improvement budgets, as well as the current political reluctance to fund fundamental changes to the existing street/highway network, will likely push this project back a few years, giving ample time to reassess the base growth assumptions that support the transitway. We see no urgency. In fact, we see great potential for mis-appropriation of scarce public funds on a project that is based on pre-recession economic assumptions, and not on current economic realities.

Alternatives proposed for study
Neither D1 nor D2 alignment is perfect for our north Minneapolis community. D1 bypasses the people that are in greatest need of public transit, while D2 displaces those that need this public transit. Neither enhances commercial and economic viability. We prefer and support an alignment that would strengthen the economic vitality of north Minneapolis. Currently we find ourselves purchasing essentials, such as groceries and dry cleaning, in Golden Valley and St. Louis Park. We would prefer that our money be circulating and supporting businesses in our north Minneapolis community. It is still baffling to us why the alternatives that utilize current transportation corridors were eliminated from further consideration at the start of the study, when there was little active and widespread public input. Penn Avenue is not a major transportation corridor because of the narrow street right-of-way which also limits its ability to be converted into a successful transit corridor. Lowry Avenue, West Broadway Ave, Lyndale Ave, Washington Ave, and even I-94 are well established transportation corridors that would be enhanced by LRT/BRT. Close-to-home, sustainable economic growth is neglected if D1 is selected. D2 is better for economic growth, but the actual conversion from residential to commercial is likely to take many, many years. Creating transit along current transportation corridors does ensure a healthy business community that we will be willing to support. Bypassing these commercial routes increases the real possibility of a decline in local businesses that contribute to a healthy and safe community.

Project impacts and benefits that should be evaluated
The D1 will have considerable impact on our quality of life. The negative impacts we will be expected to endure include health effects, loss of aesthetics, decrease of secu
From: "Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us" <Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
To: Tom Schmitt <tmenschmitt@comcast.net>
Cc: Beth Bartz <bartzb@srfoconsulting.com>
Sent: Thu, Feb 16, 2012 23:20:24 GMT+00:00
Subject: Re: Bottineau Transitway Scoping

Thanks very much for your input. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

---

From: "Tom Schmitt" <tmenschmitt@comcast.net>
To: Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us
Date: 02/16/2012 03:18 PM
Subject: Bottineau Transitway Scoping

I believe the entire Bottineau Transitway project should be scrapped. Political considerations rather than substantive ridership projections have determined that the Bottineau Transitway follow this proposed course. No alternative to the central Bottineau section was ever considered. I do not believe that BRT was given objective consideration by the Hennepin County Regional Rail Authority.

The Transitway planning process should be restarted with less input from Hennepin County and more input from communities that may be served by a transitway, before a route and name are arbitrarily determined.

Respectfully,
Tom Schmitt
4311 Upton Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55412
Ms. Christianson,

Thanks very much for your input. Please be assured that all comments received by the end of today are being considered. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

The clarity and supportive reasons included in your input is appreciated!

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

---

From: Karl Christianson <christianson@vial.com>
To: bottineau@hco.hennepin.mn.us, Brent.Rusco@hco.hennepin.mn.us
Date: 02/17/2012 06:03 AM
Subject: Bottineau Transitway DEIS Scoping comments

Mr. Rusco - Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit comments. I hope these comments are of use to you and that they get to you on time - I do know that the deadline for comments is today (Friday 2/17); and I also know that the city council is already considering a draft of the scoping comments dated 2/14. I would hope that all comments are considered. I am a homeowner in N. Mpls and will be affected by both D1/D2.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT
The study needs to look at how the migration of people out of their cars and onto trains will improve health and quality of life e.g. stress reduction, reduction in pollutants, reduction in car accidents, etc.
Rail transit doesn't only serve the elderly and poor who may not own cars, it also serves those who would prefer not to drive. When I worked downtown, and the rail line out to the Mall of America was built, 25% of the people in my office started taking the train, even though they owned cars and could afford to drive. It was a great improvement to their quality of life.

The study needs to look bigger picture at how the Bottineau line interconnects with other non-car transport. If the line is not integrated with other modes of transport, it will serve only a few people right next to the line or only people in the Northwest suburbs, and will bring little, if any benefit to North Mpls or the greater Mpls area.

The study needs to look at the how transport through the corridor will contribute to the revitalization of N. Mpls. It would be a lost opportunity if a line were built and it did not serve N Mpls in some way. Improved transport has the potential to give more access to shopping and services, broaden job/life opportunities for those who do not have a car, bring business into N Mpls, bring people in for cultural events, connect N. Mpls to the rest of the region, etc. As a homeowner
in N. Mpls, I would love to see my community continue to flourish.

ALTERNATIVES PROPOSED FOR STUDY
Neither the D1 nor D2c is ideal.

The D1 option in my immediate neighborhood travels through the Bassett Creek watershed and will have significant impacts on the wetlands and potentially the way the water flows in that area. It is true that there is a railway bed already there, but it is likely that with the addition of LRT/BRT lanes the area will need to be significantly shored up and wetlands and ponds will be filled to support the heavier traffic and potentially faster speeds. There is a very narrow passage under the Plymouth Avenue bridge with a stream that sometimes swells and flows very swiftly on one side and giant powerlines on the other. I'm sure there would need to be some reconfiguring to make the corridor workable for higher speed trains. Besides impacts to water flows, there will be significant impacts to habitat. Any wildlife left in that area (who were not already driven out due to the rapacious clear cutting that was recently done in the tornado affected areas of the park), will definitely move on with trains passing through every few minutes. So the turtles, eagles, ducks, possums, deer, turkeys, woodchucks, etc. that regularly visit our yards will likely no longer visit. This environmental impact needs to be recognized and mitigated for those that live right next to the rail line and Wirth Park.

D1 appears to avoid N. Mpls and have no opportunities for commercial development along the line in my immediate neighborhood since it goes through park land.

The D2 option that was chosen for study is the option that displaces the greatest number of my neighbors (D2c - cars and rail on Penn). The D2 option might have been workable if one of the other options were chosen for study, but the D2c option just doesn't seem fair to the people that live there - especially since it would be difficult to turn Penn into a commercial corridor without taking a lot more property - and the transition would take years. One thing that might change the landscape for D2c would be to know how many of the 130+ properties impacted are actually owner occupied - and how many are rentals and/or vacant. Compensation would still need to be made to the property owners even for rental or vacant properties, but if there were fewer owner occupied homes being displaced, the D2c option wouldn't have such a detrimental impact on the community. It seems less destructive to the community to relocate rental units and/or tear down vacant properties.

Degradation in quality of life for people right next to the D1 option in terms of noise pollution, light pollution, loss of green space, retreat of nature, etc. needs to be studied. If the Plymouth Avenue station is built near my house there will likely be a lot of flashing lights and bells ringing and other noises that will ruin the peace and quiet we currently enjoy. The Plymouth Avenue bridge lights already are invasive, an
Mr. Brent Rusco  
Hennepin County  
417 N. 5th St. Suite 320  
Minneapolis, MN 55401  

February 12, 2012

Dear Mr. Rusco,

I am writing to express my opposition to a light rail transit corridor running through Theodore Wirth, Mary Hills and Walter J. Sochacki Parks. My opposition is based on the following points:

1. Like many long term residents of Golden Valley, we moved here 28 years ago to escape noise, sight pollution and crime. We wanted amenities within walking distance, such as the above three parks, and the,quiet and peace that they provide. Our neighbors value these parks, whether or not they use them. The parks provide a buffer of silence and visual rest, which will be compromised should light rail run through them. Residents of Robbinsdale and North Minneapolis value them as well. The academic literature finds that people place a value on parks very existence.

2. Hennepin County may consider the above route a viable alternative because the land is cheap. It is cheap, maybe even free, as it is parkland! Yet there are likely better alternatives and development possibilities along current commercial areas, such as Broadway Avenue, where high traffic is already reflected in local land values and the need for development is great. People are aware of the traffic when they move there. It is not foisted on them after the fact.

3. The “park” route seems a politically expedient alternative to a bus route down Broadway, given Minneapolis North Side residents' opposition to Hennepin County's proposed service center in their neighborhood. If so, why should Golden Valley, Robbinsdale and North Minneapolis residents pay the price in lost peace and quiet?

4. Given the radial nature of major transportation arterials and their increasing density the closer one lives to downtown, the greater the need for the calming that green spaces and wetlands provide. Why should residents of Golden Valley, Robbinsdale and Minneapolis be asked to give up scarce park space to support residents who chose to live in a more distant suburb with far less traffic density?

I fervently wish that the County Board, acting as the Hennepin County Regional Railway Authority, will exercise good judgment and drop the parks route from consideration.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Robert R. Hagen
Ms. Carstens,

Thanks very much for your input. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

It was an honor to meet your husband Rob through his service with NTN and participation in public meetings. Rob's participation was impressive; his questions and comments were consistently insightful, clear, and respectful to everyone involved.

You can monitor progress on the Draft EIS through the project website at [www.bottineautransitway.org](http://www.bottineautransitway.org). You can also contact me anytime you have questions or need additional information.

Regards,

Brent Rusco  
Senior Professional Engineer  
Hennepin County  
Housing, Community Works & Transit  
Engineering and Transit Planning  
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400  
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843  
Direct: 612.543.0579

---

Mr. Rusco: I don't often ask for special consideration but I am asking that you take my comments into consideration. If it is not possible to officially consider my comments, I ask that you at least please read them. My husband was Robert MacIntyre. Rob MacIntyre served on the Northside Transportation Network (NTN) prior to his untimely death while he was clearing debris the day the North Minneapolis tornado hit our house and our neighborhood. I know Rob would be very disappointed if I did not voice my opinion regarding the Bottineau line. However, I have not been able to function in any normal capacity since May 22, and hence, this late correspondence.

**Purpose and need for the project**

I believe in effective public transportation. I travel frequently to Europe as well as to large US cities such as NYC, Washington DC, Atlanta, and San Francisco and can not imagine life in these cities without public transportation. Although Mpls is a much smaller city than most of the large US cities or European cities that I travel to, I believe that I and the city of Mpls could benefit from additional public transportation including light rail. However, since all indication is that the Bottineau Line D1 option
appears to be the likely option, I question the need for public transportation that does not effectively serve the Mpls city area at all - the people who benefit are the individuals who live outside the city of Mpls. since the D1 line skirts so much of the city. If the point is to serve the suburbs as opposed to the city, I believe there are better options than the D1 option.

The alternatives proposed for study
The D2 route, which would much better serve those in need in the City of Mpls, would apparently require the demolishing of the homes of many individuals. My own love for my home and property, and my love for the northside, result in my not being able to condone a route such as D2 that disrupts so many lives. My love of Theodore Wirth Park and the abundant nature result in my not being able to condone a route such as D1. If the purpose is to serve the city of Mpls. and the residents and businesses of Mpls., including the restoration of some economic vitality to the city of Mpls., then viable alternatives should receive further consideration - alternatives such as the Penn Avenue/Oliver Avenue option or some other parallel routes. If the purpose is to serve the suburbs, then existing transportation corridors should receive further consideration: there is no better way to promote ridership on public transportation than to have that public transportation go down the middle of a busy highway or freeway alongside those who are stuck in traffic. Highway 169 and Highway 100 come to mind as the perfect existing corridors that would benefit greatly from alleviated congestion.

Regarding proposed alternatives for stations given a D1 line, the station at Plymouth Avenue seems to be something that sprang from nowhere and does not seem to make sense at all when there is much more space and visibility (see safety concerns expressed below) near Golden Valley Road, and the Golden Valley Road option is much less disruptive to private residences.

Project impacts and benefits that should be considered
I have lived in my northside home for almost 30 years. My house is closest to the proposed D1 line, at least in the area between Plymouth Avenue and Highway 55. The trees formed somewhat of a buffer between my property and the proposed D1 line prior to the tornado but the tornado destroyed most of the trees on my property and most of the trees between my property and the existing railroad tracks.

Without mature trees, the proposed D1 line will result in significant disruption with respect to noise and light pollution and noticeable vibrations. With a station at Plymouth Avenue, not only will there be significant noise from the train, there will also be significant noise from the ridership of the train. I believe the proposed D1 line also poses a fire risk because of all the fallen trees in the area between the tracks and private properties between Plymouth Avenue and Highway 55 - the city, park and county have indicated they do not intend to remove these fallen trees. A station at Plymouth Avenue under the bridge creates a substantial additional security risk in an area that is well known for heavy crime, crime that includes but is not limited to: regular prostitution on Dorr Drive (previously Xerxes Ave N) and Farwell Avenue, stolen vehicles burned or set loose with a brick on the accelerator on Dorr Drive, murder victims left in the park and near the railroad tracks, arson between the railroad tracks and the residential areas, drug dealing on Dorr Drive, drug use under the Plymouth Avenue bridge, gunshots in the park and under the Plymouth Avenue bridge, men exposing themselves under the Plymouth Avenue bridge, and frequent gang related activity. I also believe that with a station at Plymouth Avenue, individuals will drive to the station and park in my neighborhood thus creating an additional safety risk given the significant number of families with small children that live on Washburn Avenue and the blatant disregard of drivers for the one-way streets in the neighborhood. The noise pollution, light pollution, vibrations, increased security risk and safety issues are all items that should be carefully considered when evaluating the impact of the D1 line.

Regarding a D1 station underneath the Plymouth Avenue Bridge, I have already expressed my concerns regarding safety and visibility. This station option should also consider the impact of EMFs given the close proximity of the proposed station to overhead power lines.

Since the D1 option has been in consideration since 1985, why has there not been an assessment of the environmental impact to date? The D1 option was immediately tabled in the early days of consideration when it became public that the train that ran on the existing tracks carried hazardous waste thus presenting an environmental hazard to those who would ride the light rail - what does that
train carry now and are there remnants in the soil from previous days? There are multiple springs that run along Bassett Creek between my property and the creek - how can it be cost effective to fill land or put in pillows to support moving the existing tracks to accommodate light rail and what is the impact on the springs? Similarly, what consideration will be given in the environmental impact to the aquifer and ground water? What wetlands will be created to compensate for the destruction of the wetlands between Plymouth Avenue and Highway 55 and where will these wetlands be located? What consideration does the EIS give to the traffic congestion and parking situation that the D1 line will create in and around the area of a station? What will happen the first time the light rail hits one of the hundreds of deer that live in the park? Will existing power lines need to be moved to accommodate space for additional rail? If so, where will these power lines be moved and what impact will there be on the nearby residents?

Other Comments
Assuming Hennepin County moves forward with a D1 option, I respectfully request that Hennepin County work directly with me and other residents whose properties border the park and the proposed D1 line to discuss how Hennepin County intends to mitigate the impact to residents of the noise pollution, light pollution, vibrations, increased security risk and safety issues should the D1 line come to fruition, with or without a Plymouth Avenue station, and to discuss how we will be compensated. This should be direct communication with the affected residents as opposed to communication with community organizations who do not necessarily act in our best interests.

I am disappointed with the proposed alternatives and that different alternatives have not been adequately considered from my perspective. Moving forward with the D2 option, an option that disrupts so many lives when alternatives exist, seems to be setting the D2 option up for failure. As Rob (a falconer) would say, I believe I have been "hood-winked" into thinking I and my northside community have any input into the decision making process - it seems clear that the decision had already been made and the task was to get buy-in from the community as opposed to input. It also seems that the park board went forward with their own best interests as opposed to engaging the northside community that enjoys Theodore Wirth Park - why else would they have cleared all the trees to the west of the existing tracks and why else would there all of a sudden be a proposed station at Plymouth Avenue? It seems Theodore Wirth park is turning into more of a playground acting in their own best interests than a nature area. I am disappointed that although I have been asked for my input, it does not appear my input matters. Therefore, I am ready to move forward with the expectation that Hennepin County will work directly with me on a plan that mitigates or compensates me for the noise, lights vibrations and security risk.

Sincerely,

Janet M. Carstens
2924 Farwell Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55411
612-522-8943
jancarstens@comcast.net

Disclaimer: Information in this message or an attachment may be government data and thereby subject to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 13, may be subject to attorney-client or work product privilege, may be confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise protected, and the unauthorized review, copying, retransmission, or other use or disclosure of the information is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please immediately notify the sender of the transmission error and then promptly delete this message from your computer system.
Toni,

Thanks very much for your input. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

Brent Rusco  
Senior Professional Engineer  
Hennepin County  
Housing, Community Works & Transit  
Engineering and Transit Planning  
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400  
Minneapolis, MN  55415-1843  
Direct: 612.543.0579

Scoping Comment Form  
Bottineau Transit way

Purpose and need of the project

Certainly the north Minneapolis neighborhoods have some times discrete and other times not pockets of residents who do not own an automobile and are depended upon mass transit. This proposal is quite ambitious as it attempts to deal with the mass transportation needs of a pretty large area - the northern portion of urban North Minneapolis, and first and second tier northern suburbs. It would appear that there is considerable variability in the current designs ability to effectively and efficiency address the primary goals of this project - enhance regional access to activity centers ... enhance effectiveness of transit services within the Bottineau transit way with connections to key activity centers... and, development that is cost effective without compromising for one the integrity of existing and older urban (North Minneapolis) neighborhoods.

The proposed Bottineau Transit way system seems to address overall regional objectives regarding growth that are not necessarily consistent with the transportation needs of North Minneapolis. These needs appear to be more specific with parameters clearly identified with an urban as opposed to suburban environment.

In addition, it would seem that the proposed Bottineau Transit way system's design is better at addressing challenges associated with suburban areas, e.g., reverse commute opportunities, timely transit options than those of north Minneapolis. These in addition to other named factors - increasing
travel demand, greater traffic congestion, people who are transit dependent - are primary considerations; however, with the exception of transit dependent residents these factors independent of other issues peculiar to north Minneapolis neighborhoods are not particularly relevant to the needs of north Minneapolis residents.

As an example, if one considers the high number of north Minneapolis residents who are mass transit dependent, it is unclear as to whether or not at least the LRT will travel in those areas. In addition, with the D-1 option there is the suggestion that a transit station be moved from Golden Valley Road which has a corridor of apartment building to Plymouth which is primarily a resident area surrounded by home owners.

The inclusion of North Minneapolis in the Bottineau Transit way system does not appear to be significant in as much as it serves as a pass through for the first and second tier suburbs. This is not a problem with a design that limits negative consequences of its development to this area.

The alternatives proposed for the study

Both alternatives , D-1 and D-2 appear to have unfortunately clearly negative effects.

D-1 travels along Wirth Parkway with 2 stops. It would be possible to park and ride the bus or LRT either at North Memorial or Olsen Highway - assuming these transit stops would have parking. Less disruption to surrounding neighborhoods.

Possible loss of access to Wirth Lake. Pathway - for walkers, bikers - would need to be re-positioned. Possible negative effects on ecosystem - wildlife, vegetation and recreation.

D-2 major permanent alterations to neighborhoods and overall community of north Minneapolis. Penn Avenue, particularly from Golden Valley Road to Olsen Highway has a significant number of houses paid for by NRP funds. Long term development goal for Penn Avenue was at one point to increase homeownership while maintaining original housing. To destroy housing on the west side of Penn would mean the loss of millions of dollars of NRP investment and would affect neighborhood/area stability and our dwindling tax base.

Although one of the contributing factors to the need for the Bottineau transit way is concern regarding the increase in traffic congestion, D-2 with additional lanes on other parts of Bottineau would result reportedly in an increase in auto traffic through the neighborhood - at least 400 cars a day. In addition, with the closure of streets, there is the increased likelihood of more auto congestions within the neighborhoods and difficulty in getting in and out of the neighborhoods. It has been suggested that the current ramps from Bottineau would be eliminated to build rails for the LRT making travel more difficult for residents who travel to "activity centers" in areas not adjacent or difficult to access from the proposed light rail.

A suggested alternative would be to have light rail travel along Bottineau Transit way on rail and intersect with highway 100, follow to highway 55 with transit stations along 55. Provide opportunity for expansion along 55 to meet demands of communities along this corridor.

Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

Repositioning bike and walking path. Evaluation of Impact on wildlife and eco-system

It would seem that the "impacts" actually outweigh the benefits as the Bottineau Transit way is currently designed. It would seemed either Wirth Parkway is compromised in some way with the possible lost of access to Wirth Lake through a walking and bike path (unless they are repositioned). In addition, there is a real possibility that the ecosystem will be compromised in some way.

Systematic investigation as to where to locate transit station - Golden Valley Road vs Plymouth - based on transit need. Maybe consider both as transit stops.

Can any of these effects be mollified? Possibility to additions to design that would mitigate affects of pollutants associated with increased traffic and those associated with
light rail

With D-2 there is the destruction of homes, increasing loss of tax base, possible decrease in property value, compromise of history of north Minneapolis per Penn Avenue, loss of investment per NRP funds, chopping up neighborhoods, increased traffic congestion, exposure to more pollutants - low intensity noise, vibration, lights, whistles, the possibility that development opportunities would be compromised and greater sense of “ugliness” on Broadway - which is really a nice winding road where increasingly there is a true lack of consideration for aesthetics with road projects.

Clarification of additional traffic needs per diversion from freeway system - including 18 wheelers and large trucks.

Other comments: Actually consideration for expanded project for North Minneapolis. It is apparent that this is primarily a transportation project geared towards growth in areas adjacent to the north side. Certainly RBT would fit however, streetcars with dedicated lanes would be better idea. There is a need for more frequent stops. In addition, there does appear to be environmental justice issues as it seems that major changes are primarily associated with changes within north Minneapolis neighborhoods that do not appear to be advantageous. Economic development appears possible on Olson Highway - this is a good idea. However, issues here tend to be more complex and inter-related.

Toni Collins
2600 Thomas Avenue North
cr45@msn.com

area resident

Disclaimer: Information in this message or an attachment may be government data and thereby subject to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 13, may be subject to attorney-client or work product privilege, may be confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise protected, and the unauthorized review, copying, retransmission, or other use or disclosure of the information is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please immediately notify the sender of the transmission error and then promptly delete this message from your computer system.
As a physician who volunteers in a free clinic in the Phillips Neighborhood Clinic, I am familiar with the challenges that citizens of a poor neighborhood such as those in North Minneapolis face. Therefore, I have worked with a colleague who works in a clinic in this neighborhood who cataloged the reasons why the proposed Bottineau Transitway D2 option is the best option.
* Less than 50 percent of households in this area have cars
* The D2 option is about making a choice with transit to improve the economic viability of North Minneapolis

*80% of riders of LRT are riding to and from jobs and school, the D2 option will provide increased access to both for a neighborhood that is typically marginalized

*Four stops in North Minneapolis may make the ride into downtown a little slower, but it may also provide significant access to potential North Minneapolis community members whose current dependence on Bus network discourages their ability to seek work outside of their neighborhood

*Four stops in NOMI are also potential nexi of private investment and economic growth WITHIN North Minneapolis.

*The D2 option is about providing the foundations of job access and private investment growth in North Minneapolis. The other route provide the suburbanites a pretty view as they slip into downtown. D2 is an investment in the future, the Golden Valley option should not even be considered and equivalent choice.

*This is about helping to provide a sustainable economic foundation for our patients, the residents of North Minneapolis, and about a long term investment in decreasing the burden of poverty on all of Minnesota by improving access to jobs and creating an environment that will encourage private investment in North Minneapolis.

Brian Sick, MD
Assistant Professor, University of Minnesota Medical School
Medical Director, Phillips Neighborhood Clinic
Dear Mr. Rusco,

My name is Andrew Pisansky. I am currently a medical student at the University of Minnesota, a former student of public health at UMN and an alumnus of Macalester College in St. Paul. I currently live in NE Minneapolis and have been spending time working at clinics in North Minneapolis as a component of my rotations.

I have little doubt that you are familiar with North Minneapolis. We both know that as a community with a fairly consistent demographic while individuals meanwhile remain transient. As a healthcare provider in training, I have interacted with many individuals who would have benefited from more consistency in their medical care. As a student of public health, I see individuals who are at least partially the product of societal and economic decisions. I know this is abstract and likely sounds a bit idealistic, but give me one more paragraph to explain.

We so often think of illness as this thing that happens to a person because of some choice they made: they smoked, they drank, they ate fast food too often. Yet, when you really examine the conditions that lead to the promotion of these sorts of "causes" it goes so much deeper than that. Economic development that provides long-term job placement. Business investment in a community. Stable access to infrastructure. All of these are preconditions that can be absent or present; and they either discourage or promote overall wellness in a community and a people.

Now, this isn't to say that I think everyone is strictly a product of their conditions, but I don't think that we can discount these predisposing factors. In any case, I would encourage you to see the choice of a transitway through North, specifically the D2 option, as an opportunity to lay the groundwork for positive changes in a community that needs investment on the infrastructural level if we are to see positive impacts on its overall wellness and prosperity. Furthermore, the long-term investment in the community that can stem from the investment of a LRT system will, I believe, ultimately reduce the burden of poverty in this community as it creates an entrez for business investment and worker and student commuting.

The majority of people I have met while working at clinics in North Minneapolis have been honest, hard working and well-intentioned. These are people who deserve the to have alternatives to what is now available. The D2 corridor will allow many of those in the community of North to become more integrated with Minneapolis, to seek work to a greater extent within North Minneapolis as well as outside the community.

In closing, please consider what the D2 option means as you and your colleagues consider plans for this proposed transit system. I would be pleased to converse further about this topic and can be reached by email.

Best,
Andrew
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

° Purpose and need for the project

The purpose of this project is to
create a easier transportation

° The alternatives proposed for study

° Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

° Other comments

Name: J. J. Mower
Address: 2814 Bryant Ave N. Minneapolis
Email: tjmaxx@hotmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
X Area resident  □ Area business owner  □ Community-based organization member  □ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

Purpose and need for the project:
The purpose for this project is because we don't need ask other people to take transportation. No need to use more gas on cars.

The alternatives proposed for study:

Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated:

Amount of people that want to take the transit.

Other comments:

Name: Kong Her
Address: 1476 Vincent Ave. N. Minneapolis
Email: kingkong@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☑️ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

Purpose and need for the project
I think they should build it because it will help out the long-term. The purpose of this but people can save their gas and help the green house.

The alternatives proposed for study
I don't know the other alternative proposed to study.

Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
- help save gas
- help stop air pollution
- help us, citizenry, get 10 degrees

Suggestions:

Other comments

Name: Kong Van Vang
Address: 5132 Queen Ave N 55410/MN 55430
email: K Vang 950 Hot mail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
☒ Area resident ☐ Area business owner ☐ Community-based organization member ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Buttineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date.

Thank you!

Purpose and need for the project:
I'm supporting this project, and feel there's a need for this. As population increasing rapidly, and to reduce some traffic, I make easier for people travel back-and-forth Suburb and downtown.

The alternatives proposed for study:
- Parking space next to the LRT stations.
- People houses compensation plan, employment opportunity during construction and after construction, energy saving, amount, percentage, increased, decrease, grey areas, and make up plan, forest, parks, etc.
- LRT station design, train design, these can put into a competition.

Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated:
- Impacts for short-term, development and long term. Also, to be considered. Benefits: business development, residential development, schools districts, re-development of the recreation areas (urban planning).

Other comments:
Please put my email below into your mailing list. Asian Media Access (AMA) will contact our members for any upcoming meetings/updates in order to deliver information easily.

Name: Julia T. Kong
Address: 2418 Plymouth Ave N, Minneapolis, MN 55411
Email: julia.kong@amasmedia.org

Please check all of the following that apply:
\[\square\] Area resident  \[\Box\] Area business owner  \[\X\] Community-based organization member  \[\square\] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

**Purpose and need for the project**

- To benefit the local community.
- And it's a green, energy-saving public transportation solution.

**The alternatives proposed for study**

- Peace Ave, North to Southbound

**Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**

- Definitely like rail station/platform locations.
- Safe, accessible for school children.
- Noise-proof equipment for neighborhood.

**Other comments**


---

Name: Henry Wang

Address: 2418 Plymouth Ave N, Minneapolis, MN 55411

Email: Henry.wang@aminamedia.org

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [x] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
V. Robbinsdale
I took a verbal comment over the phone. The caller would like his input entered into the record.

-------------------------------

Donald Hasler
3940 Noble Avenue North
Robbinsdale, MN

Donald lives adjacent to the west side of the BNSF railroad corridor. Concerned about noise and vibration on his residential property. Currently experiences noise and vibration as freight trains pass his property. Don questions the need for a transitway investment along the Bottineau Corridor.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  THE NET HAS BEEN NEGLECTED FOR TOO LONG THE
  IS NEGLECTED.

- The alternatives proposed for study
  A CONNECTION TO NORTH MEMORIAL MAKES MORE SENSE FOR
  LIGHT RAIL WOULD BE PREFERRED AS IT
  IS CLEANER, FASTER, GREENER, TRANSFERS A HIGHER VOLUME
  AND IS NOT AFFECTED AS MUCH BY SNOW/WEATHER EVENTS

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  IN AREAS WHERE LIGHT RAIL HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED,
  BUSINESS AND CONSTRUCTION HAS INCREASED.

- Other comments
  GO CRT - FORGET BRT.

Name: CHRIS
Address: 4530 BEARD AVE N. ROBINSONS
email: CJPMN2010@GMAIL.COM

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident     ☐ Area business owner     ☐ Community-based organization member     ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project

- The alternatives proposed for study

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

- Other comments

  All the ambulances go through our street and with the transit there going to have to reroute all them and it will take longer.

Name: Katrina Mad Sea
Address: 3309 France Ave North Robbinsdale
Email: Mad Sea Katrina@Rat-e-mail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

- Area resident
- Area business owner
- Community-based organization member
- Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

Purpose and need for the project

Don't like adding another car or bus. Build LRT.

Light rail is less susceptible to weather, not as much maintenance in long run. Build for future not present. What behavior do you want to drive/support?

The alternatives proposed for study

Green line (tunneling) or North Memorial line seem to make most sense to get riders. Ships are not cost effective and basically act as express for real (LRT) alternative. No population or destination, and would not be a usable system for all, only those at the end of line.

Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

What happens to home values - assume they will rise up high area of line, but lower if too loud/regular travel at transit.

Other comments

Utilize this looking toward - not reactionary. Include N Market, as this is largest draw in area - give access to population.

All areas of line - not just the end.

Name: 
Lorin Bargman

Address: 
3001 Arena Ave NW Robbinsdale

email:

Please check all of the following that apply:

☑ Area resident ☑ Area business owner ☑ Community-based organization member ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  I support the need for better transportation to the MPLS/SP area; it is must needed! I would appreciate a more convenient option for transportation (I currently commute to St. Paul)

- The alternatives proposed for study

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  Property! Some of the alternatives greatly impact resident property
  Personal suggestion would be to keep it near the BNSF rail line

- Other comments
  I understand the option that it may not take my personal property, but either way - it drastically impacts where I live. Noise congestion, resale value of home, etc. If it came too close to my home - I would consider moving - not happy about the proximity of my home - esp. the option of going on

Name: Whitney Plumedahl
Address: 306 Halifax Ave. N., Robbinsdale, 55422 34th Ave
Email: wplumedahl@hotmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party (34th & Halifax, Robbinsdale)
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

**Purpose and need for the project**

I do not see a "bottom up" desire for this particular Transitway. Nevertheless, congestion may be helped by LRT on the North side.

**The alternatives proposed for study**

Of the two routes I prefer that which uses the existing road line; it is much less disruptive to the residential neighborhood. The route by Mr. Ham seems too complex, running through existing residential areas.

**Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**

If LRT on the North side is similar to that on the South, traffic delay at intersections will greatly increase, as will background noise. Artificial lighting will increase construction will create problems on road just recently completed.

**Other comments**

I sense this proposal is not concerning itself except very superficially with local opinion. For example, little advanced notice was given of the lanes for new LRT line limited.

Name: S. Buchanan

Address: 3325 York Ave. No Robbinsdale

email: gcbuch31@me.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

- Area resident
- Area business owner
- Community-based organization member
- Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project:**
  1. I think we should build Light Rail, not bus. Light rail is faster, travel easier to board & exit, more environmentally responsible.

- **The alternatives proposed for study:**
  2. I like Robbinsdale City's proposal for the station alignment. It would locate the station closer to where more people could use it. Residents, hospital potential business redevelopment.

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated:**
  3. I think we should give green lights at intersections. It would make the trains faster this increasing ridership.

- **Other comments:**
  4. I like Segment D2 because more people would use it, even though it
     I wish we didn't have to force people to move. Could we build D2 without forcing people to move? Maybe we could.

      Re-do some of the roads around D2 so we wouldn't have to widen the street.

  5. I think we should build parking lots near the stations. People that
     live more than 10-15 minutes to the west or east of the
     stations will have to drive to the station to then
     ride. This would decrease ridership greatly. How
     else would these people get to the station? No one is
     going to walk 15-20 minutes or more.

Name: Tony Streng
Address: 5800 42nd Ave N Apt 202 Robbinsdale MN 55422
Email: tony.streng6@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  Transportation development is a key factor in economic development. The Bottineau Transitway has the potential to have a profound impact on the economic development of the North Minneapolis Community.

- **The alternatives proposed for study**
  The D2 option has 4 stops in North Minneapolis, a community in which less than 50% of households do not have cars. The D2 project provides access to jobs, both downtown and in Mapleview.

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**
  Bottom line can the route proposed help in the economic development of the communities of Minneapolis or do you just give the suburban community a "pretty ride" into downtown. D2 will provide access to jobs and private investment in the neighborhood.

- **Other comments**
  If people of the neighborhood are afraid of these changes someone needs to be explaining the real economic potential for the D2 impact on North Minneapolis.

Name:  Renée Crichlow
Address:  3914 Crystal Lake Blvd  Robbinsdale
email:  renee.crichlow

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [X] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Purpose and need for the project: You must do a better job of conveying the financial and economic impact of the D2 alternative. Get some graphics at these meetings and show people the difference.

The alternatives proposed for study: In the economic growth in their neighborhood.

Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated: You are doing a very poor job of conveying how much neighborhood improvement will come from private investment along the D2 alternative.

Other comments: Show the people in North Minneapolis how their community can be changed for the better. Make the D2 proposal about jobs and schools access and improved economic conditions for North Minneapolis.

Stop making this about some people having to change houses and MAKE IT ABOUT UPLIFTING THE ENTIRE economic foundation of the community.

Name: Renée Crichlow
Address: 3411 Crystal Lake Blvd Robbinsdale
email: renee.crichlow@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☒ Area resident    ☐ Area business owner    ☐ Community-based organization member    ☐ Other Interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project

- The alternatives proposed for study
  - The North Medical Station is too far from the hospital
  - All alternatives have too many wetland impacts
  - Should be station at 30th
  - Should end at G29th
  - Development drops off north of them

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  - Station locations are terrible
  - Why not run on W. Broadway? It has the same impacts
  - Line is not direct to downtown & like Broadway others
  - Why not run on 34th Ave instead? That's the key

- Other comments

Name: Jason Rodan
Address: 35th + Halftaf, Robbinsdale
email: 

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident ☐ Area business owner ☐ Community-based organization member ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  NONE

- The alternatives proposed for study
  NONE

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  NONE

- Other comments
  NO RAIL

Name: G. P. Hickey
Address: 3400 Halifax Ave N., Robbinsdale

Please check all of the following that apply:
- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  
  NO NEED

- The alternatives proposed for study

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

- Other comments:
  
  "Will further decrease value of home."

Name:  

Address:  

Robbinsdale

email: 

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project

- The alternatives proposed for study

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

Please note there are enough stops in Robbinsdale. The stops should have park and ride lots for the commuters. The transit hub should be a transfer point.

- Other comments

Name: Martin E. Jensen
Address: 4900 36th Av. #336 Robbinsdale
Email: jensen.martin39@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

Purpose and need for the project

Need for LRT as night service. Current buses have good alternatives but lack service for any late night service to some areas

The alternatives proposed for study

Prefer BCD

Broadway will cause too much disruption of current activities and more congestion

Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

Minimum interruption of current business

Other comments

The chosen LRT Minneapolis-St Paul

Choose University which caused business loss, street use loss, and possible damage to the state capital

Name: Lilli Jensen
Address: 9400 36th Ave N Unit 336 Robbinsdale
Email: Jensen.Lillias@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

1. Purpose and need for the project

2. The alternatives proposed for study

3. Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

Properties that are adjacent to the rail line and the remedies for those properties based on your studies.

4. Other comments

Other than the areas that are having options for a route, there is very little information on the specifics about what else might be going in, i.e., sound barriers or other sound or motion issues.

Name: Mike Salim Alousy

Address: 4252 Regent Ave N, Robbinsdale

Email: mister.sammy@yahoo.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  I think [I] agree that a need exists for this project. I have commuted down the Express Bus to downtown in the past. I would love the opportunity to more easily take transit into Minneapolis for work, sports, functions, etc. The existing bus schedule does not meet this need, but it is not as frequent as what is being proposed.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

- Other comments
  I think the A2 option would serve more people, especially over the next 30 years. Cost may be an issue, but I will certainly be more affordable to implement. I think that A2 is a better long-term transit solution.

Name: Tim Grosshuesch
Address: 4117 43rd Ave. N Robbinsdale
Email: tgrosshuesch

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [x] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project:
  I feel that we need Light Rail.

- The alternatives proposed for study:

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated:

- Other comments:
  I would love to see this Light Rail come through Robbinsdale. I live 2 blocks from the Hubbard Station. It would benefit my mobility in my retirement.

Name: Ron Olsen
Address: 4155 Quail N Robbinsdale, Mn. 55422
Email: hamlin_mason@yahoo.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

* Purpose and need for the project

* The alternatives proposed for study

* Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

  My property at 3558 Noble. The house sits only a few feet, 10' off, from the existing RR. fence. Moving the tracks even closer would greatly impact the livability and sale ability of our home. What criteria do you have for taking out homes that would be so severely impacted?

* Other comments

Name: Pat Krych
Address: 3558 Noble Robbinsdale
email: pkrych@msfamily.net

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  - It would make more sense to use 81 the whole way - we could use a light rail but not yet.

- **The alternatives proposed for study**
  - USE 304 to 100
  - USE 81 the whole way. Why cut through quiet safe neighborhoods (just to get a few riders?). They can walk to 81 just the same.

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**

- **Sound / Vibrations**
  - I live at the 3800 block of Major Ave.
  - I am concerned about signal arms all day & night

- **Other comments**

  Safety concerns -
  - Lots of children in this area.
  - What about the value of my home?

Name: Ben Flint
Address: 3800 Major Ave N, Robbinsdale
email: benjaminFflint@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
- Area resident
- Area business owner
- Community-based organization member
- Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date.

Thank you!

**Purpose and need for the project**

None. There is no purpose of going through neighborhoods, some away the BNSF, or other areas. There is no need for this at all.

**The alternatives proposed for study**

Keep light rail out of neighborhoods. Even if it means taking it out of the BNSF.

**Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**

Community, nature, environment, noise, constant ringing of alarms by intersections, vibrations - damaging safety. You will destroy Bottineau communities.

**Other comments**

My home specifically will be impacted to our neighborhood and is not insignificant. The BNSF is a bad option. Light rail is not needed at all.

Name: Flint

Address: 3830 Major Ave N, Robbinsdale, MN

email: 

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident  
- [ ] Area business owner  
- [ ] Community-based organization member  
- [ ] Other interested party
ATTN: BRENT RUSCO

I live at the 3800 block of Major and Lee in Robbinsdale.
Your current light rail plans will severely impact this neighborhood and yet it is left out of every detailed map I could find; As though it is inconsequential.

Furthermore, your current plans to build along the BNSF Railway up to Robbinsdale and then CONTINUE on that path directly through Robbinsdale residential neighborhoods, only the leave the railway and route through MORE neighborhoods, is a horrible and unnecessary plan.

I have read your reasons and explanations regarding cost and using the existing right of way paths. But it needs to leave this path BEFORE it causes damage to residential neighborhoods and streets.

These are safe, friendly, PEACEFUL neighborhoods where we live, walk, run, and where children play about.
You cannot put a cost the impact it will have on the surrounding natural environment and communities.
You cannot put a cost to the health and safety risks it will create.
Invading these residential neighborhoods and streets --- every 10 minutes --- ALL DAY and ALL NIGHT
With constant noise, constant vibrational effects, and the constant signal sounds due to crossing residential intersections will damage and disrupt our lives, our sleep, our property and our safety. Making it an unbearable place to live and destroying the existing communities.

Other options ARE available and you MUST reevaluate these current plans to keep the communities intact and keep light rail OUT of residential neighborhoods.

Ben Flint
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

**Purpose and need for the project:**

This corridor needs improved transit access.

**The alternatives proposed for study:**

I am happy with any of the alternatives and modes. I think they will all improve access to job centers and amenities.

**Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated:**

I think regional trail access should be included as part of the criteria. People walk and use bikes in connection with transit and that should be taken into account.

**Other comments:**

I am very happy that this project is proceeding and that it will connect to a linked system of corridors.

Name: Ann Becker

Address: 5063 Scott Lane, Redmond

Email: ann.becker94@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

- Area resident
- Area business owner
- Community-based organization member
- Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

**Purpose and need for the project**

Light rail is understandable. Would be nice to go see them to determine if you can walk some.

**The alternatives proposed for study**

DA - If the purpose is to provide people rides to large employers, shopping, etc. then it becomes an important issue with prosperity of area. Will our property be more valuable? Can Continue to Shuttle.

**Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**

Good idea! Fear it - Public meeting in Robbinsdale will not be there forever - they are removing all others in the area. Could totally destroy the fair in that time. Someone will.

**Other comments**

*Please no DZ. My property will become worthless.

Name: Jeannie McDonald
Address: 3239 Charles Avenue North
email: JeannieMcdonald@hastings.net

Please check all of the following that apply:

☒ Area resident ☐ Area business owner ☐ Community-based organization member ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

**Purpose and need for the project**

I like the idea of faster, more efficient mass transit. We never should have torn up the original "street cars!"

**The alternatives proposed for study**

Support plan D1 as the only reasonably sane route to follow a supporting road line not impinging the loss or disruption of homes or creating traffic congestion where it is not needed. Come through Bottineau, stop it.

**Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**

Hubbard Market Plaza & encourage supportive shuttles to "feeders" to the main stop. This route would be the most cost effective w/o loss of homes, home value.

**Other comments**

Not supportive of running it down farm for reasons of congestion & busing within a residential area. My husband works out the shuttle to Hubbard & back the train line.

Name: Colleen Patterson
Address: 4517 Peace Ave. N., Robbinsdale 55422
email: K-Cpatter@comcast.net

Please check all of the following that apply:

- ☑ Area resident  ☑ Area business owner  ☑ Community-based organization member  ☑ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  
  NONE

- The alternatives proposed for study
  
  N/D

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  
  NONE

- Other comments
  
  I HAVE NO MORE MONEY FOR LIGHT RAIL PROJECTS TO NOWHERE

Name:  Rod Melanson
Address:  4250 Abbott Ave, N Robbinsdale
Email:  r.melanson.jr@comcast.net

Please check all of the following that apply:

☒ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Purpose and need for the project:
There is a definite need for rapid transit in this neighborhood. Environmental concerns are paramount as more people move into the area.

The alternatives proposed for study:
We are in favor of rapid transit -- but very NOT IN FAVOR of alignment D2, which will run 1/2 block from our home in a quiet residential area, turning it into a busy hard-to-navigate thoroughfare. It will essentially turn a vital part of Rohrhodale.

Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated:
D2 will certainly impact that neighborhood. Whether it goes up 34 1/2 or 36 1/2, it will change the character of the neighborhood irreparably. It should also be noted that the Terrace Theater is an historic building and should not be tampered with as part of this plan.

Other comments:
We favor alignment D1, which seems like it makes the least impact to major residential areas -- both in Rohrhodale and in North Minneapolis.

Name: Joe & Michelle Hume
Address: 3321 Front Ave N, Balsam Lake MN 55422
email: flyingsauceronline2@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  
  I think this is a good project overall and it is needed. In consideration of how well-used the Hiawatha LRT is, this will be a very useful project.

- The alternatives proposed for study
  
  Clearly, the path of least resistance can be optimum provided the EIS shakes out. It seems the D2 options will have the greatest impact and disruption. I am concerned about racism/classism in N. MPLS.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  
  Consideration of property values, the condition of homes and the displacement of residents in N. MPLS. If LRT goes D2, with the destruction of property in parts of that area, from the 2011 tornado we must show compassion and provide a fair price and other considerations for compensation of any homeowners and residents. This is an idea whose time has come. Let's just make sure we do it right. When I bought my

Name: TAMRA FALK
Address: 4035 PERRY AV N     Robinsdale
email: WAG THE DOG 78 @ GMAIL.COM

Please check all of the following that apply:

✓ Area resident      □ Area business owner      □ Community-based organization member      □ Other interested party
home in 1991 one block away from the railroad tracks! I had done research on the area and what I could expect. At that time the comprehensive plan showed LRT coming up the BNSF tracks. I have been waiting.

Brent Rusco
Bottineau Transitway Project Manager
Hennepin County
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project:**
  
  We have recognized a need for this since we moved to Robbinsdale in 2003. It would be wonderful to connect to downtown via airport without having to drive.

- **The alternatives proposed for study:**
  
  LRT. We prefer the rail option over buses. If the LRT can follow Grandview’s commercial route, it would make more sense. Otherwise, we prefer DCT to grow the area. Some new people—especially those lower income who tend to walk in more.

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated:**
  
  Wetlands in the park. Noise pollution.

- **Other comments:**

  

Name: Megan & Adam Jennings
Address: 3835 Hibberson Ave N. Robbinsdale
Email: re11013@umn.edu

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [x] Area resident  
- [ ] Area business owner  
- [ ] Community-based organization member  
- [ ] Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project:
  - I live at the 3800 block of 1st & Major
  - How will you profit

- The alternatives proposed for study

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

- Other comments

Name: ___________________________
Address: _______________________

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  
  This project is essential. The D2 option is crucial in providing much needed increased economic opportunity to N. Minneapolis. Whether you care most about providing jobs and opportunities for current N. Minneapolis residents or for creating an economically viable N. Minneapolis where people will want to move to N. Minneapolis, D2 is the way to go.

- **The alternatives proposed for study**
  
  A growing N. Minneapolis community where people want to live is essential to stabilizing surrounding communities like Robbinsdale etc. Please highlighting the economic benefits do a better job of.

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**
  
  of LRT for N. Minneapolis future presentations. This is an important decision that will likely have a decades century long impact on the Economic growth of the region. North Minneapolis is ripe for redevelopment do not bypass it D2 is.

Name: NICOLE WINBUSH MD

Address: 3914 Crystal Lake Blvd Robbinsdale MN for current and future residents

e-mail: nwinbush@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [x] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party

NORTH POINT
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  
  Do it! We need it! It is 2012 and we need mass transit, end dependency on oil cars. So many people rely only on public transportation and the aging Baby Boomers (me!) will need reliable transportation.

- **The alternatives proposed for study**
  
  Please put the LRT/Big T to Target North Campus. I have worked at Target for 18 years and my whole technical area is being moved to Brooklyn Park (3000+ employees) - get Target involved! Target needs you!

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**
  
  Figure out the gas savings, highway expansion, savings - sell this thing! Get going! Let me know what I can do to help!

- **Other comments**
  
  Please please please provide public transportation for my unserved neighborhood (west of Bottineau, east of A.T. Parkway). Put a bus on Lake Drive again. Please. A bus will be needed to book this part of Rossendale to Bottineau Transitway.

Name: Martha Hoffman

Address: 4545 Beard Ave, North Robbinsdale, MN 5542

email: martha.hoffman@target.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [x] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  I agree that public transit needs to be improved in N. Mpls. For 25 yrs. I took the bus to work downtown. Now for the past 18 mos. I have had to drive because the bus routes to Robbinsdale have been decreased (the ones on Broadway).

- **The alternatives proposed for study**
  There is nothing innovative, constructive, or progressive about the project. It is backward, destructive, and regressive. This project should have been undertaken in the 60s or 70s before so much infrastructure was in place.

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**
  Destruction of wetlands, neighborhoods (one recently ravaged by a tornado), demolition of comfortable homes, stateless trees, noise pollution, devaluation of properties close to light rail track, traffic jams.

- **Other comments**
  I do not think that senior citizens will make use of the light rail unless they happen to live very close to the track. I suggest buying a fleet of small electric buses and vans that cross town to suburbs on major routes - like streets. Have tele phone stations on every other corner from which people can call to be picked up. Have a stated policy to promise that no one will wait longer than a 10 minute + 3 stop. (Where is the logistics? Do something creative.)

Name: Mary K. Harris
Address: 3538 E. Eagle Ave., No. Robbinsdale
Email: MKharris81616@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
- [x] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Now untold destruction and disruption must take place to make way for the light rail. Consider the situation on University Ave. in St. Paul. Consider the struggling businesses. Finally the Met Council took pity on them and put out $1.2 million in an effort to revitalize those poor failing enterprises. Is that someone's idea of progress? This area had a streetcar system in the 1st half of the 20th century. It was the envy of the nation. But greed and corruption united to dismantle it and to make this area's residents dependent on cars. Since the 1950s urban sprawl has advanced unchecked, the damage to the environment and to future economic growth has been done. Metropolitan Council, where were you?

Miss Mary K Harris
3538 Grimes Ave N
Robbinsdale MN 55422-2836

01 FEB 2012 PM 2:15

Brent Rusco
Bottineau Transitway Project Manager
Hennepin County
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**

- **The alternatives proposed for study**

  I was told in the meeting the population in this area is expected to increase significantly in the coming years. What kind of plan is under the table for people to come here?

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**

  I am concerned with all the noise from the train blowing the whistle when going through the intersection of 39 1/2 in Robbinsdale and from the arm of the crossing guard (noise) every time it passes through, the train tracks are very close to neighborhoods.

- **Other comments**

  The whole design is very close to neighborhoods - Penn Ave N area & Robbinsdale. The best part of the design is up 81 north of crystal up to Brooklyn Park, and if you choose to build it going through the parkway, we would hear that whistle every 20 minutes unless you didn't blow the whistle.

Name: [Redacted]

Address: Robbinsdale MN

email: [Redacted]

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [X] Area resident  
- [ ] Area business owner  
- [ ] Community-based organization member  
- [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  I don't see a strong need for this rail system. Building larger roads and/or trains will just encourage more sprawl in the NW suburbs.

- **The alternatives proposed for study**
  I am opposed (strongly) to the route going by North Memorial on 86. This will require relocation of hundreds of people and bring noise and vibration to neighborhoods. Use the Wirth Park alternative.

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**
  Destruction of perfectly good homes; noise (bells, trains); vibration; cost - it will be cheaper to use existing railway through Wirth park.

- **Other comments**
  Why not run the trains along 694/94 to downtown Minneapolis if trains must be used?

Name: Michael Colling
Address: 3337 York Ave N, Robbinsdale MN 55422
email: mike.colling@msn.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

**Purpose and need for the project**
more information on how property values would increase with a transitway adjoining to my property - given the extra foot traffic and noise pollution I don't see how this is a possibility.

**The alternatives proposed for study**
Avoid routing the Transitway through residential areas (i.e. removing homes). Robbinsdale has no options to expand removing homes would not benefit the city - reduced revenue from property taxes - reduced population.

**Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**
if structures need to be built to accommodate the transit way please consider following City Ed 81 - NCT routing through residential areas - have people who currently live along the proposed route been contacted to see if the transit way would be valuable for daily commuting?

**Other comments**
I currently live near the hospital and deal with the noise pollution of emergency vehicles 24/7 - Adding a transit platform would not benefit this neighborhood.

Name: Kari Le Gottfried
Address: 3352 Beard Ave N, Robbinsdale
email: Splantiny@msn.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
☒ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  - **No-build - Best alternative - Saves on capital investment and still serves a purpose for outlying areas and intercity areas - such as D1**

- **The alternatives proposed for study**
  - **D2 N: Memorial has job freezes. Many N: Memorial employees transferred to Maple Grove facility when it was built. Many N: Mem, employees live in Robbinsdale or close nearby, people like to live close to their jobs.**

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**
  - **Hubbard sta along G to goods D1 straight across to Plymouth Ave then along D1 to Penn, or across Golden Valley Rd to Broadway/Penn D2. Would have less impact on Robbinsdale residents.**

- **Other comments**
  - **People in Minneapolis (north) live close to downtown, Busses serve the purpose. Seniors in most areas have senior bus transport right to their doors for shopping, doctors, church, casinos, entertainment, etc.**

Name: **Gary Berner**

Address: **3531 France Ave N**

Email: **Robbinsdale, MN 55422**

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project:**
  To help reduce the cars on the road and need to find parking in places like Downtown Minneapolis. It's a cheaper solution for those commuting to jobs along the line. Unfortunately, my husband and I work in Richfield, so any bus transit system that gets us there quickly.

- **The alternatives proposed for study:**
  All of them go right by my house - I want to know if they will close 40th Ave. at Megan - which would increase the time it takes me to get access to Hwy 100 S. and many other places I go to in the area.

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated:**
  Noise volumes for houses right near the track. Vibration and structural impact - the houses in our neighborhood are 90+ years old. Mine already has interior foundation crumbling/damage. I want them to think about what it will be like for those of us hosting dingy Aspen 74-minute.

- **Other comments:**
  I am concerned about safety. I have kids who play - how will they be kept away from accessing tracks, etc? I'm concerned about my quality of life - especially sleep. I'm a really light sleeper. I would dread home at least 2 days just 1 teleconference - I often work outside - all of these things will be impacted and not for the good.

Name: Melanie Hagge

Address: 4007 Hubbard Ave. N., Robbinsdale, MN 55422

Email: melhagge@usfamily.net

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [X] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

**Purpose and need for the project**

- Bus rapid transit down Co.Rd 81 makes the most sense financially. The obsession with trains seems like an 8 year old infatuated with 'Choo-Choo trains! Keep it simple!

**The alternatives proposed for study**

- D2 is not a good idea. It'll slow down the trains, cost millions more, and destroy several nice places to live. The train corridor already exists, use it.

**Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**

- The D2 idea seems like nobody has actually been here to look and see how a big a project this would be.

**Other comments**

- I recently had jury duty. I took the bus downtown everyday and found it to be fast, convenient, and clean. Transit is good, and our transit system is better than its reputation suggests. Thanks!

Name: Kurt Coykendall
Address: 3355 France Ave N, Robbinsdale MN 55422
Email:

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

• Purpose and need for the project
  I don't believe there is purpose or need for light rail thru Robbinsdale or Golden Valley. There are plenty of Bus's and mobility sources. A lot of the Bus's are half empty.

• The alternatives proposed for study
  Perhaps more Shuttle Bus's?
  Cheaper Bus rates?

• Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  The Impact would be huge! Our neighbors and ourselves would loose houses and would no longer have a quiet neighborhood. Would it not cause more congestion with Ambulances and emergency routes? It's a huge cost to residents etc. I also enjoy Mary Hills Park and Sochaiki Park which are adjacent to Railroad and will ruin more wildlife and wreck a wonderful nature area and community.

Name: Julie Madsen
Address: 3316 France Ave N, Robbinsdale 55422
Email: 

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident ☐ Area business owner ☐ Community-based organization member ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  The purpose of the project should be to provide additional means of travel for those without vehicles and provide an alternative to a long commute alone for those who do have them.

- The alternatives proposed for study
  • 1) Stop between 41st & Plymouth

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  Bus routes which are so overcrowded as to become inefficient. Businesses which could benefit from additional foot traffic. The priority should be in providing for those with no alternative before catering to the whims of those who can explore any and all options.

- Other comments
  Having regular traffic helps to prevent crime by not allowing areas to empty out for gangs and during more regular patrols. Since the addition of the Hawattta line, the East Lake Street-Midtown neighborhood has vastly improved along with businesses. North Minneapolis has struggled for years and this line can be a chance to provide some much needed relief.

Name: Lindsay Merrick-Thompson
Address: 3332 France Ave N, Robbinsdale, MN 55422
Email: lmerrickthompson@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
- Area resident  - Area business owner  - Community-based organization member  - Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  
  
  
- The alternatives proposed for study
  
  
  
- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  
  D2 has better options for the poor community. I like D2. Bottineau would be helped by the extra stops at 50th & Broadway. Help the poor communities.

- Other comments
  
  The D1 option needs a stop between 49th & Puyallup. There should be more stops as population density increases and traffic less. Swiss Lake and 50th & 60th stop is 49th--then Puyallup around 53rd Ave.
  
  It does not make sense to go too long without a stop.

Name: Ryan Magaur

Address: 3332 N Fraser Ave

email: r-magaur@quinn.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☒ Area resident ☐ Area business owner ☐ Community-based organization member ☐ Other interested party
I am planning to attend a meeting for more information, but have one question I hope you can answer before then. After looking at the maps, if I'm looking correctly, it appears the train might run through my property in Robbinsdale. I live on the corner of France and Oakdale (3824 Oakdale Ave.) in the condos on that corner. Do you have any information about how this will affect me and my property?

Thank you,
AnnMarie Podobinski

Sent from my iPad
We are residents of Robbinsdale. We live less than a block from the BNRR track on 40th Avenue. Below you find our questions and comments after attending the meeting and reading the Scoping Booklet.

The "demand" for LRT, which we have been hearing and reading about for over 20 years, is a "demand" created on paper because government wants LRT. We have read how often it is expected that the train or busses will run and I can't imagine hearing the disruption this would cause all day and night long to residents plus how full do you really think these cars will be? We don't see ourselves ever using it mainly do to safety issues waiting for the train and while riding it. Plus if I am able to get into my car to drive to a station I can just drive to where I am going.

Being we are aware that we are going to have Bottineau Transit way constructed one way or another, we suggest that it be constructed on Bottineau Blvd, not through the middle of the residential area of Robbinsdale. Living so close to the BNRR tracks we have great concerns for traffic, vibrations and especially decreased property value and noise. At the meeting we were told the transit way will increase our property value. When this proves to not be the case what agency will be responsible for compensating homeowners? I don't think you could give a house away near the proposed route at present, leave alone selling one.

Hopefully you will consider the residents of Robbinsdale when making your decision.

Robert and Mary Beard
Wednesday, February 29
Corrine McCarty
3910 Noble Ave N
Robbinsdale, Mn 55422
W - 763-746-2663
C - 763-221-2892

Dear Mr. Rusco:
I received the Bottineau Transit notices in the mail and disregarded them assuming that if a lite railway was built it would run along the Bottineau Highway 81. But a neighbor suggested that it may run along the already existing track behind my home. I can tell you that immediately produced some strong anxiety. If that had occurred to me I would have been to the meetings with bells on. I admit I should have read the fliers and come to the meetings regardless.
But since I didn’t I’d like to tell you about my concerns. I bought this house (a foreclosure) 3 years ago as an investment. I waited for years and as many people don’t realize, waitressing offers no benefits such as retirement investments. So my home will act as a partial substitute in my retirement years.
If you put a train so close I can only imagine how that will affect my property values. I have done some research online and have concluded that initially the value will go up a bit, but as time goes by it steadily declines. I lived in Chicago for a time and believe me, the homes near the tracks were not prime real estate value, or anywhere close. Homes by major freeways and trains are doomed.
Trains mean noise, damage to foundations, crime, dirt, pollution and an unwanted foot traffic and population. It’s a frightening prospect.
If you want to put a train through Robbinsdale, please keep it in the business or industrial section of the city. Do not put it through so many people’s backyards. Run it along Bottineau as the name of the lite rail suggests.
Right now living by the railroad track is pleasant and charming. An occasional train comes through with it’s old fashioned whistle and brings up a pleasant and romantic charm. It’s not so noisy or frequent to be a bother.
My dream was always to own my own home with a lilac bush, a clothes line and within sight of a railroad track. Right now I have that, and am worried that this project will ruin it.
Sincerely,
Corrine McCarty
I am a Robbinsdale resident and I think this is a great idea and will help make the city a better place to live. It will make commuting much easier and take advantage of Robbinsdale's central location. I think the light rail provides a great option because it's better for the environment. I am very hopeful this will pass and connect Robbinsdale to the light rail.

3934 Scott Ave N
Robbinsdale MN 55422
Hello,
I am a Robbinadale resident at 34th and Grimes. I am alarmed to hear that one of the proposed transit routes is right down 34th. While I am all for the project, I am strongly opposed to disrupting what is now a very quiet neighborhood. It seems that 36th would be a better option because it is already a busy road with lots of traffic noise - residents who purchased homes there knew what to expect. I did not purchase my home with the expectation of this kind of disruption.
I have a few questions:
-The flyer I received says that there are "property impacts" between Indiana and France? Does that mean houses are torn down?
-How do bus rapid transit and light rail compare in terms of noise and disruption? What is the impact? Would a train cause my entire house to shake?
-Would the project include a noise barrier or some other effort to reduce disruption?
-Are property owners typically compensated for the loss of property value in these situations?
-How far off is the construction of this project, if all goes according to plan?
Thank you,
Anne Mazzocco
3407 Grimes Ave N
Brent—
The City of Robbinsdale has posted on FB the video regarding this. I made comments and was
told to comment here as all comments will be considered. I wish I could make it to the
meetings....suffice it to say, what makes Robbinsdale so charming is it’s small town feel, a
community, a town that has been dedicated to its lakes and parks. I have lived here since 1998
and the idea of ripping the town in half with very ugly LRT makes me sad. LRT has cost
taxpayers enough and it will never pay for itself. But we are led to believe that we so
DESPARATELY need it. The path doesn’t even take people to where the jobs continue to go
and that is the western suburbs. I can handle a bus, but the idea of the wires, etc is just visual
pollution.

Lisa Dolan
Select Products
612-751-2249
lisa@selectproductscompany.com
Check out Promo Gal on Facebook!
I took a verbal comment over the phone. The caller would like his input entered into the record.

*******************************************************************************

Donald Hasler
3940 Noble Avenue North
Robbinsdale, MN

Donald lives adjacent to the west side of the BNSF railroad corridor. Concerned about noise and vibration on his residential property. Currently experiences noise and vibration as freight trains pass his property. Don questions the need for a transitway investment along the Bottineau Corridor.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579
Mr. Rusco:

Please see the attached commentary. Please let me know if there was some problem with the transmission and you did not receive the attachment. Thank you for your attention to this matter!

Ronald Griffith Williams
BOTTINEAU TRANSITWAY ALTERNATIVES COMMENTARY

by

Ronald Griffith Williams
4368 France Avenue North
Robbinsdale, MN 55422
(763) 533-3065
tobie3065@msn.com

February 17, 2012

INTRODUCTION

Based on the 2008-2010 Alternatives Analysis Study (Alt.), I think the best alternative for the Bottineau Transitway discussed there is LRT A D1. Alternative A is the train starting from Maple Grove and alternative D1 is the train going through Golden Valley. I think this alternative is the best way to solve the transportation problems as outlined in the study’s “Problem Statement” (Alt., p. 17) in accordance with its stated goals and objectives. (Alt., p. 25)

However, I think LRT A D1 would serve its purposes better if it were amended with the following two additions: 1) A BRT line in Brooklyn Park which is designated as alternative B in the study; 2) and additional station at the railroad tracks and 34th Avenue in Robbinsdale and a BRT line (basically the D2 alternative in the study) from that point past North Memorial Medical Center to Broadway Avenue, to Penn Avenue and to Olson Memorial Highway.

I stress here something that was not even mentioned at Bottineau Transitway open forum in Brooklyn Center, September, 2011: Solving the region’s transportation problems according to the goals discussed below will be very beneficial to those who never take public transit. In fact, it will be necessary in order to avoid system-wide transportation gridlock. It is easy for those who are experts in public transit to take this for granted. However, when presenting public transit proposals to the legislature, it must not be taken for granted. It must be emphasized again and again.

A thorough and complex feeder bus system is essential to making the chosen alternative for the Bottineau Transitway work to its fullest. I cite one example of a desirable feeder bus, because it would run in my immediate neighborhood: A bus on Thomas Avenue from Lowry Avenue in Minneapolis to Lake Drive in Robbinsdale and to the Robbinsdale Transit Center where there will be a LRT station. Such a bus would serve both commute and reverse commute purposes and draw Robbinsdale people out of their cars to the train.

PROBLEM STATEMENT (Alt. p. 17)
Population growth

The seven-county Twin Cities metropolitan area is expected to grow by one million people by 2030. The area north and northwest part of the Twin Cities, including the Bottineau Corridor study area, is expected to absorb most of this growth.

Employment growth

While nearly half of the jobs in the study area are in downtown Minneapolis, most of the job growth in this area is expected to be in the second ring suburbs. Thus there is a need to facilitate reverse commute.

Traffic congestion

Already most of the several major regional highways in the study area experience significant congestion. This will only get worse with the anticipated growth.

Limited reverse commute

There are limited reverse commute opportunities in the study area. This is important because of big employers in the area such as North Memorial Medical Center in Robbinsdale and Target Corp. in Brooklyn Park. But there is also a significant proliferation of smaller employers throughout the area, a concentration which is expected to grow.

Transit options

There is a lack of competitive transit options in the Bottineau Corridor.

PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES (Alt., p. 25)

1. Enhance Regional Mobility. This is to be accomplished by maximizing total routes, serving people who depend upon transit, expanding reverse commute service, connecting existing and proposed transitways, and balancing costs (construction and operating) and benefits.
2. Expand the effectiveness of Transit Service Within the Corridor.
3. Provide a Cost Effective and Financially Feasible Transportation System.
4. Encourage Transit-Supportive Land Use and Development Pattern.
5. Support Sustainable Communities and Sound Environmental Practices.

ALTERNATIVE EVALUATION

To assess the comparative desirability of the alternatives, the study presented many tables comparing various projections pertaining to the alternatives. I present below truncated tables from that information and evaluate this limited number of alternatives, including the three most promising alternatives listed by the study: LRT A D1, LRT B D2 and LRT A D2. I do not include any BRT alternatives in these tables for discussion because, even though BRT costs about half as much as LRT, BRT does not, on its own, solve the aforementioned problems in accordance with the outlined project goals.
Serve total number of transitway riders. (*Alt., p. 68*)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB - D1</td>
<td>19,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB - D2</td>
<td>18,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - D1</td>
<td>19,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - D2</td>
<td>18,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - D1</td>
<td>16,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - D2</td>
<td>15,365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Putting LRT at Maple Grove and Broolyn Park (AB) and combining them with the Golden Valley route (D1) gives us the highest number of riders. But that edges out the cheaper combination of A D1 by only 70 riders. Each of the alternatives with D 1 surpass the corresponding D2 (Broadway and Penn in Minneapolis) alternatives by about 1,000 riders. As the study reports, a major reason why D1 is superior to D2 is that it is faster. More riders will be drawn to the faster system. Finally, each of the A alternatives surpass the B alternatives by about 3,000 riders. So my choice of A D1 is second highest in this category.

Serving people who depend upon transit. (*p. 70*)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>3,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>10,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>19,461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serving those who depend upon transit is one of the most important goals specified in the study. This table shows that the Minneapolis option serves almost twice as many of such people as the Golden Valley option. Even the Golden Valley option serves three times as many as the Brooklyn Park alternative, which serves over twice as many as Maple Grove. For reasons discussed pertaining to the first table of total transitway riders and for other reasons discussed below, I chose A D1.

But we must certainly do something about this alternative which, standing alone, underserves those who depend upon transit. That is why I chose to amend A D1 to include BRT on the Brooklyn Park route and the Minneapolis route. Each of them can serve as very effective feeder lines to the train and link the transit dependent riders to the train with its advantages. The additional cost will be relatively modest since we are adding BRT only.

Here is another important reason for the BRT in Minneapolis: It connects the train to the most important destination in the region, North Memorial Medical Center in Robbinsdale. It will be relatively easy to connect BRT to the train at 36th Avenue in Robbinsdale. Put a platform under the bridge below 36th Avenue with steps up to the street on both sides. The BRT can start there and continue to the station next to North Memorial Medical Center. It can do this without the expensive elevation engineering feats required of the LRT going through the area.

Notice that the figures for A and B added separately come to a greater sum than what is listed for AB. I have been unable to detect an explanation for this in the study. These figures suggest that AB is the train
shared by Maple Grove and Brooklyn Park. Thus one trip will be from Maple Grove and the next from Brooklyn Park. But, obviously, this is not optimal for either the people in Maple Grove or for those in Brooklyn Park. Since we have available only one train, it does not work well to divide the train tracks between two different areas.

A is better than B in securing ridership, so it would be better to start with the LRT in Maple Grove. There will be a great deal of value added by adding BRT in Maple Grove now. Some decades later we can think about putting another train in Brooklyn Park and extending the line through Champlin to Anoka and/or Rogers.

Serving low-income and minority populations. (p. 70)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>6,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>16,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>31,553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers in this table are proportionately very similar to the ones in the last table. Here the numbers happen to be somewhat larger. The numbers for Minneapolis are about twice that for Golden Valley, etc. So we have the same problem here as we had with serving those dependent upon transit since it is imperative that public transit serve low income people and minorities. This imperative is legally required:

With a foundation in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, President Clinton's Executive Order 12898 established a formal policy on Environmental Justice (EJ) in 1994 to ensure that when considering the effects of a federally funded project on human health and the environment, effects of the project on minority and low-income populations and communities are explicitly considered.

(Bottineau Fact Sheets, p. 1-3)

My proposed BRT additions solve this problem in a cost-effective way just as they do for serving those who depend upon transit. No doubt there is considerable overlap in these populations.

Serving reverse commute jobs. (p. 72)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A D1</td>
<td>30,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B D1</td>
<td>16,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A D2</td>
<td>31,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B D2</td>
<td>17,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB D1</td>
<td>33,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB D2</td>
<td>34,820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest number here, 34,820, is provided by AB D2. But notice that this number is only a little less than three thousand more than A, by itself, combined with D2. Yet B D2 serves 17,519 reverse commute jobs, almost six times that difference of almost 3,000. AB, together, will not serve the optimal number of
reverse commute jobs. This is why it is important to keep the train on one set of tracks and supplement the north end of Bottineau Corridor with BRT in Brooklyn Park.

A D1, my favored alternative, produces a relatively high number here, 30,636. However it is edged out by A D2 at 31,924. This shows that there is a greater reverse commute need in the north Minneapolis area than in Golden Valley. This need can be met by my proposed BRT through north Minneapolis and is another reason why this BRT addition is critical.

Bring new transit riders. (p. 75)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A D1</td>
<td>5,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B D1</td>
<td>4,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A D2</td>
<td>4,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B D2</td>
<td>3,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB D1</td>
<td>5,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB D2</td>
<td>4,397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A D1 produces the highest number here, 5,215. Since it is very important for the system to bring in new riders, the results of this table is a major reason to select A D1 as the best alternative. This table is an indication that A D1 is the best choice to reduce traffic congestion in the Bottineau Corridor. Notice that if you add BRT at Maple Grove and Minneapolis, you will add to this top new transit riders figure.

Riders per vehicle hour. (p. 75)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A D1</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A D2</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B D1</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B D2</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB D1</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB D2</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again A D1 yields the highest number, 141 per vehicle hour. This is an important statistic because it speaks to the efficiency of the system and to the number of people it serves. Notice that A D1 here surpasses AB D1 and A D2 surpasses AB D2. This is another indication that splitting the train service at the north end of the Bottineau Corridor will not work to the system’s advantage. Furthermore, if you would add the two BRT’s I suggest, then you would also significantly increase the riders per vehicle hour to perhaps 200.
Traveler time saving (regional minutes per weekday) (p. 75)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A D1</td>
<td>189,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A D2</td>
<td>162,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B D1</td>
<td>192,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B D2</td>
<td>165,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB D1</td>
<td>161,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB D2</td>
<td>134,223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here B D1 shows the most minutes per weekday saved, 192,522. But this is only 1.6% more than the amount for A D1, the alternative that I have chosen for the best. The highest split train amount here is 16% less than the 192,522 top amount. Again, if you add BRT in Maple Grove and Minneapolis, you will have significantly greater regional minutes per weekday than the highest amount shown here.

Reduction in vehicle miles travelled daily, 2030. (p. 85)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A D1</td>
<td>28,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A D2</td>
<td>22,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B D1</td>
<td>27,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B D2</td>
<td>21,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB D1</td>
<td>33,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB D2</td>
<td>27,618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest number here is garnered by AB D1, one of the split-train routes, at 33,533. However, it is only 13.7% higher than that provided by A D1. B D1 also shows a relatively high number, 27,123. This means that if you add BRT at Maple Grove, a significant number of vehicle miles will be added. More would be added with BRT in Minneapolis as well. With my proposals, the reduction in vehicle miles travelled daily would surely top the 33,533 figure here.

Capital costs (millions). (p. 106)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A D1</td>
<td>$885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A D2</td>
<td>$929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B D1</td>
<td>$932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B D2</td>
<td>$963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB D1</td>
<td>$1,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB D2</td>
<td>$1,135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fortunately for my chosen option, A D1, it comes in as the cheapest one at $885 million. However, there is more to discuss since I have proposed additions. Let’s look at it this way: If you didn’t care so much about things like the greatest ridership and just want to focus on environmental justice, then we would choose B D2 and put LRT in Minneapolis and Brooklyn Park, accommodating minorities and low income people to the fullest. However, this would cost $963, more than the lesser amount cited above. Adding the two BRT lines would only modestly increase the total cost to perhaps the $1.1 billion cost of the AB D1 line. But this would mean that we would have a Bottineau Transit Corridor system which would meet
all the goals set out at the beginning. And it would be achieved at a cost of only 12.8% more than the B D2 alternative which would satisfy environmental justice concerns while ignoring all the others. This would seem to be a taxpayer bargain!

**Operating costs per year (millions).** (p. 107)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A D1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A D2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B D1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B D2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB D1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB D2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again A D1 is the best alternative here because it costs the least at $17.5 million per year. My proposal to add BRT lines would add perhaps $2 to $3 million to this cost. So, let’s say that the annual operational cost for my collective proposals is $20.0. Then let’s divide the capital cost of the project, $1.1 billion, by 50 to spread the cost over 50 years. (Sorry to be so crude, but I don’t have time to do an amortization schedule now.) The result is $22 million. So the project costs about $42 million a year.

Now consider that this project will reduce daily vehicle miles travelled by about 33,000. Multiply this by the 352 days of the year to get 11,616,000 vehicle miles reduced annually. This costs $42 million. So it costs 42 million/11,616,000 or $3.61 for each mile reduced. But this ignores the fact that this project serves the greater good of the total transportation system by assuring gridlock-free miles driven. Surely such miles are many times that of the vehicle miles reduced. If they are 10 times each mile reduced, then the cost for them is 36 cents per mile. If they are only five times, then the cost is $1.80 per mile. Providing good system-wide transportation is not cheap. But considered in this light it seems cost effective.

**Cost effectiveness index (CEI).** (p. 108)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A D1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A D2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B D1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B D1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CEI here is the annualized project cost divided by the transportation system user benefits. Again, A D1 wins as the best alternative.

**SUMMARY OF CHOOSING LRT A D1 COMBINED WITH MINNEAPOLIS AND BROOKLYN PARK BRT**

LRT A D1 scores #1 on bringing new transit riders, riders per vehicle hour, reduction in vehicle miles travelled, capital costs, operating costs and cost effectiveness index. It also scores #2 on total transitway riders, serving reverse commute jobs, traveler time saving (regional minutes per weekday) and reduction
in vehicle miles travelled. No other alternative comes close to doing so well in the projections of these ten measures. Here's the thing: These measures are the heart of why you invest in public transit, to efficiently move people throughout an area and reduce vehicular traffic so that the whole transportation system works.

There were two measures on which LRT A D1 did not score well: On serving people who depend upon transit and on serving the low-income/minority population. This is why I recommend the addition of BRT in Brooklyn Park and Minneapolis. Remember, environmental justice in this context is legally mandatory.

**LRT EFFECTS ON PROPERTY VALUES**

The experience of the Twin Cities is both very limited and very recent. However, LRT has been present for many decades throughout the country and has been studied extensively. I think it is worth considering at least briefly.

A 2007 study of Buffalo, New York, examined the impact of LRT on property values near LRT stations:

"The model suggests that, for homes located in the study area, every foot closer to a light rail station increases average property values by $2.31 (using geographical straight-line distance) and $0.99 (using network distance). Consequently, a home located within one-quarter of a mile radius of a light rail station can earn a premium of $1300–3000, or 2–5 per cent of the city's median home value." (Hess, p. 1041)

This is especially interesting since, for several decades, Buffalo had been losing population in the area in question. The authors of the study also said, "Rail transit substantially increases property values where transit investments can be co-ordinated with new development in nearby neighbourhoods;..." (Id., p. 1042) But if such development is not coordinated, transit investment may relieve traffic congestion without necessarily contributing to economic growth and urban revitalization. The authors cited studies pertaining to the following cities where transit station properties experienced up to a 32 percent premium: Washington D.C., St. Louis, San Jose, San Francisco, San Diego, Sacramento, Portland, OR, Philadelphia, Queens, NY, Dallas and Atlanta. (Id., p. 1047)

**LRT VS. BRT**

One online article reports that, for new starts in the corridors of the core areas of U. S. Canadian cities, BRT has attracted only one-third of the rider trips estimated for them by the Federal Transit Administration-approved modeling. In contrast, LRT attracted 122 percent. Some cities considered were Pittsburgh, Los Angeles, Ottawa, and Washington D.C.

---
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Fact Sheets, September 2011, Bottineau Transitway brochure distributed during the public forum at Brooklyn Center Government Center.

From: "Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us" <Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
To: scott hagen <sshagen3911@yahoo.com>
Cc: "thirwardgeorge@aol.com" <thirwardgeorge@aol.com>, Beth Bartz <bbartz@srfconsulting.com>
Sent: Thu, Feb 16, 2012 22:05:29 GMT+00:00
Subject: Re: Light Rail through Robbinsdale

Scott,

Thanks very much for your input. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

One of the key issues to be studied in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) will be the study of impacts for residential properties along the transitway alignments. You can monitor Draft EIS progress using the project website at www.bottineautransitway.org or contact me any time with questions or concerns.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

From: scott hagen <sshagen3911@yahoo.com>
To: "brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us" <brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
Cc: "thirwardgeorge@aol.com" <thirwardgeorge@aol.com>
Date: 02/13/2012 06:28 PM
Subject: Light Rail through Robbinsdale

Brent,

I wanted to express my concern over the proposal for running light rail through our neighborhood at the intersections of 39 1/2, Major, and Lee Avenues N in Robbinsdale.

First I feel the houses are too close to the tracks if the proposal includes running two more rail lines in the existing space. Also the noise and frequency of trains would damaged housing values even further than what we have experienced over the last few years.

If it is decided to run light rail down this existing line, I would insist on the crossing at 39 1/2 Ave N be closed to reduce traffic streaming through our neighborhood. 39 1/2 Ave N is too narrow to handle the traffic as it exists now, the prospect of traffic stopped on our street waiting for trains would be intolerable.

Finally, much like they have done along the Hiawatha line in Minneapolis, earthen berms should be built between the homes and the tracks to reduce noise for the homeowners.

I am a supporter of light rail, however, steps should be taken to ensure it is a good neighbor to homeowners along its route.

Scott Hagen
3911 Major Ave N
Robbinsdale, MN 55422
From: “Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us” <Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
To: Frye Family at Home <mfrye3831@comcast.net>
Cc: "thirdwardgeorge@aol.com" <thirdwardgeorge@aol.com>,
"Joseph.Gladke@co.hennepin.mn.us" <Joseph.Gladke@co.hennepin.mn.us>, Beth Bartz
<bbartz@srfconsulting.com>, "Joseph.Gladke@co.hennepin.mn.us"
Subject: Re: Scoping comments- Bottineau Transitway

Thanks very much for your input and for clearly stating your concerns and ideas. Your comments will be
included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

Please let me know if you have questions or need additional information. You can also monitor
progress of the Draft EIS on the project website at www.bottineautransitway.org

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

From: “Frye Family at Home” <mfrye3831@comcast.net>
To: <brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
Cc: <thirdwardgeorge@aol.com>
Date: 02/14/2012 11:17 PM
Subject: Scoping comments- Bottineau Transitway

Hi,

I am emailing my major concerns in regards to the Bottineau Transitway. I understand the need for the project,
however I do not agree with bringing light rail through the residential housing area in Robbinsdale. To run light rail
trains every 7.5 -15 minutes through the front and back yards of the residents of Robbinsdale homes is
courageous! This would dramatically increase noise, pollution and vibration damage to the homes. Not to
mention safety issues trying to cross the tracks at the intersections in our neighborhoods. I am concerned for my
children’s safety when they walk to school and have to cross the tracks daily at 39% Ave N. We will no longer be
safe walking to visit Dairy Queen, Church or other areas in downtown Robbinsdale. Adding light rail with trains
running every 7.5 -15 min will destroy the small town, pedestrian friendly neighborhoods. This will destroy the
standard of living that drew me to Robbinsdale and destroy our home values. Who is going to want to live in a
neighborhood with light rail trains going by constantly. Who is going to buy my house which has the train tracks in
my front yard? This will destroy Robbinsdales neighborhoods.

Now my solution – Why not run the light rail down Bottineau Blvd. It’s a busy street with commercial businesses
and North Memorial is right there. It would be far enough away from the residential housing and more accessible
to the businesses in Robbinsdale yet it would be close enough for Robbinsdales residents to use. Not to mention
closer to senior housing like Copperfield Hill. To add a set of tracks alongside the street shouldn’t be that difficult.
They did it on the Hiawatha line in Mpls. This solution saves the neighborhoods from the noise, pollution,
vibration damage to our homes, safety to pedestrians and increases visibility to the Robbinsdale business district.
A win-win solution for all.

Mary and Mike Frye
Robbinsdale Residents
3010 Abbott Avenue North  
Robbinsdale, MN 55422  

February 17, 2012  

Mr. Brent Rusco  
Bottineau Transitway Project Manager  
Hennepin County  
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400  
Minneapolis, MN 55415  

Dear Mr. Rusco,  

I am a resident of Robbinsdale, Minnesota, and attended the January 31st Bottineau Transitway Scoping Open House. I have spent some time reviewing both the Scoping Booklet (SB) and the Bottineau Transitway Alternatives Analysis Study Final Report (AAFR) and am writing to express some of my questions and concerns.  

Both the SB and the AAFR indicate that anticipated population growth is one of the primary factors contributing to the need for the Bottineau Transitway Project (BTP). The AAFR refers to estimates of population growth between the years 2000 and 2030 and cites as sources the 2000 census as well as the Metropolitan Council 2030 Regional Development Framework. Given that over one-third of the 2000 to 2030 period is now in the past, how much of the projected population growth for that period has actually occurred? If approximately one-third has not come to pass, why has it not and why should we place faith in the accuracy of these estimates? Given that these estimates were most likely produced prior to the economic downturn we have experienced during the past few years, are the assumptions upon which they were based still accurate? The SB refers to estimates of population growth between the years of 2010 and 2030 and cites no source(s). What is/are the source(s) of these estimates? If they are the same, the same questions apply. If they are different, why should we believe that the population of the Bottineau Transitway communities (BTC) will increase by 140,000 people during the next twenty years (as stated in the SB) when the population of the same area was only expected to increase by a little more than that over the same period plus the previous ten years (per the AAFR)?  

Both the SB and the AAFR devote half of their respective “People Who Depend on Transit” sections to senior citizens and suggest that the existing senior population as well as anticipated growth of that population in the BTC is another significant factor contributing to the need for the BTP. As a former resident of North Minneapolis who made occasional use of both Metro Transit’s Route 5 (bus) and Hiawatha Line (light rail), I seriously question this implication. My personal experience would suggest that the percentage of the senior population that uses public transit is extremely small. Further information is needed to support the implication, made in both documents, that seniors are an important market segment for the BTP. The AAFR provides the percentage of both zero-car households and seniors in the BTC but provides no combined statistic. How many of the seniors who live in these communities are also members of zero-car households? What percentage of the seniors who currently live along local public transit routes
with similar operating characteristics (The AAFR cites the existing Hiawatha LRT service as consistent with that being proposed for the BTP.) use them twelve times per year or more?

An anticipated increase in traffic congestion is also cited as a factor contributing to the need for the BTP. The SB contains many general statements pertaining to traffic congestion in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area as a whole. While these statements might all be very true, they alone do not demonstrate a need specific to the BTP. The AAFR presents a traffic volume growth forecast specific to the BTC in Figure 3-4. However, many of my questions pertaining to the forecasts of population growth apply to this as well. What is the source of this forecast? Since it is a forecast of growth between the years 2005 and 2030, it seems likely that it was generated during a period of much more optimistic economic outlooks. What are the assumptions upon which it was based? Are those assumptions still reasonable?

I could go on with questions and concerns related to the need for this project, but I would also like to include some of my questions and concerns related to some of the build alternatives proposed for study in the Draft Environment Impact Statement (DEIS). As a resident of Robbinsdale, I am particularly interested in the D1 and D2 alternatives.

First and foremost among my areas of concern is access to North Memorial Medical Center (NMMC). NMMC provides the nearest emergency room to a large geographical area, especially to the west of the hospital. Due to a lack of existing infrastructure, direct routes to the hospital are already somewhat limited. A difference of a minute or less in transit time to an emergency room can be the difference between survival and death in some emergency situations. Furthermore, not everyone who arrives at the hospital in need of emergency care is driven there by an ambulance driver or someone else familiar with the streets immediately surrounding the hospital. While the D1 alternative offers no change to the existing accessibility of the hospital, even the best of the D2 alternatives increases the potential for longer emergency transit times. The omission of “Access to Emergency Services” (or some similarly titled measurement) from the impact evaluation measures in the AAFR should be corrected in the DEIS. Furthermore, legal advice should be sought on this issue. If a D2 alternative is built and results in longer emergency transit times and reduced survival rates (data which, if not already available, could almost certainly be gathered), is there any risk of litigation? If so, what might the costs of that litigation be? Those costs (if any) should be included in the assessment of the D2 costs in the DEIS.

I also have significant questions about the noise and vibration assessment as reported in Table 7-10 in the AAFR. What information was used to reach the conclusion that the noise impact for the D1 alternative would be “Moderately High” while the noise impact for the D2 alternative would be “Moderate?” Without data to support the assertion, it is extremely difficult to believe that LRT along a relatively straight, long-established, and in use railroad track would have a greater noise impact than LRT down city streets where no rail transit currently exists and which would require at least two sharp turns and many crossing signals. Additionally, how were the overall noise/vibration impact scores calculated? Without explanation, they seem very arbitrary. For example, for the D2 LRT alternative, a “Moderate” noise impact plus one facility (NMMC) potentially impacted by vibration yields a “Moderate” overall score. For the D3 LRT alternative, a “Slight” noise impact plus the same facility (NMMC) potentially impacted by vibration also yields a “Moderate” overall score. Why does the overall score increase from the noise score for
one but not the other when the vibration impacts seem to be the same? There are multiple similar examples of seemingly inconsistent overall scores in this table, and explanation is required.

Thank you for taking the time to review this partial list of my questions and concerns related to the BTP. I look forward to seeing these addressed in the DEIS.

Thank you,
Emily Kaess
4815 Culver Road  
Golden Valley, MN 55422  

02-12-12  

Brent Rusco  
Hennepin County  
701 Fourth Ave. S., Suite 400  
Mpls., MN 55415  

Dear Sir:  

I am writing to express my concern about Hennepin County's possible plans to construct a light rail line in Golden Valley. The proposed line would cut through Theodore Wirth, Walter J. Sochacki and Mary Hills Parks, wildlife and recreation areas.  

A light rail line through these areas would have a tremendous negative impact on these areas and the surrounding neighborhoods. The people that designed these parks and other parks in the city were very wise. They knew that in order to have a healthy city, we needed quiet places where people could feel a connection with nature. Light rail through these areas, although relatively quiet, would be very disconcerting to hear and to see.  

1. Nature areas play an essential part in the physical and emotional health of people living in the city. Sochacki and Mary Hills parks are profoundly quiet and are used by many people every day for exercise and relaxation. A light rail line would cut off access for the residents living on the East side of the park, would be a danger to wildlife that live in the parks and to children playing in the park. If the tracks were fenced, this would be an added negative visual impact.  

2. There would not be a benefit to this area. We already have good express bus service to downtown within walking distance. The possible stop at Golden Valley Road would not make sense, as people would have to drive there and there is no room for parking. The stop would be below grade and would be isolated and not secure.  

3. Theodore Wirth is also such a treasure and is used by people from all over the city in every season. When I tell people that a light rail line could be going through this park, their jaws drop and then they say, "I can't believe it!" We need to fiercely protect this park for future generations.  

4. When we moved here twenty-eight years ago, we specifically looked for a house in a quiet neighborhood with bus service my husband could take to work downtown. Although we support light rail generally, we do not think it should be used to encourage more urban sprawl. People should be encouraged to be more responsible and to live nearer to their place of work, but in order for this to happen, we need cities to be livable and this would have to include parks and nature areas. We love our neighborhood and do not feel the need to race out of town every weekend to escape to a cabin. This is another type of "rush hour" traffic.
5. Light rail is costly; it needs to be built where it can do the most good and the least harm. I supported light rail construction down Hiawatha and University Ave., but these were already busy corridors. I do not support putting light rail through residential neighborhoods and wildlife areas. This is excessively punitive for people living in these areas.

6. Some might say, “Well, you already have a rail line running through these parks”. Yes, but I believe there is only one train that runs through once a day in the middle of the night. The effect is negligible.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I hope that an alternative route for this light rail line can be found that will be beneficial and will help make the city more livable. If not, I hope that other options will be found.

Sincerely,

Sheila Bahl
From: "Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us" <Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
To: Nathan Supplee <nathansupplee@yahoo.com>
Cc: Beth Bartz <bbartz@srfconsulting.com>
Sent: Thu, Feb 16, 2012 23:18:17 GMT+00:00
Subject: Re: Bottineau Transitway - Local Resident Feedback

Thanks very much for your input. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

We'll be sure to put your email on the information distribution list for the Bottineau Transitway. We encourage you to monitor progress on the study process through the project website at www.bottineautransitway.org. You can also contact me with questions or if you need information.

You can be assured that noise and vibration impacts on properties along the alignments as well as parkland impacts will be assessed as part of the study process.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55403-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

---

From: Nathan Supplee <nathansupplee@yahoo.com>
To: "bottineau@co.hennepin.mn.us", "bottineau@co.hennepin.mn.us", "brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us"
Date: 02/16/2012 01:48 PM
Subject: Bottineau Transitway - Local Resident Feedback

To Whom this May Concern:

We are very concerned about this proposed Bottineau Transitway. Everything about this project will ruin our backyard, our outdoor activities, our comfort in our own home.

Our house is situated no more than 100 feet from the existing train tracks with a crossing that goes through Robbinsdale. We are a couple houses in from the corner of Lee Ave and 39 ½ Avenue.

And although we realize that there are already trains going by our house, it is only once or twice a day, NOT every 7 minutes.

Our backyard will be ruined. No longer will we be able to partake in outdoor activities, such as BBQ’s, without the constant sound of lightrail trains going by. Our children like to play in our backyard, how will the constant noise affect them? Will their hearing be hurt? We have dogs that spend time in the backyard, will the constant trains cause any negative behavior in them?
Our house is 98 years old right now. The trains that go by right now (\textit{only once or twice a day}) shake the house a lot and rattle the windows. Will anything be done to help minimize the fact that every 7 minutes our house will be shaking? What about structural concerns? Who is to say that our house or foundation can withstand the massive increase in vibrations?

What about the noise? We have small children whose bedroom faces the tracks. Our walls are thin and the windows are old and not very sound proof. The sound of constant trains will be a nuisance for our household. We are also very close to a crossing. From our understanding, the light rail cars start sounding a bell when they are a certain distance from the crossing. This will most certainly be right in line with our house. We don't want our children to lose sleep because of the constant trains and bells.

What about the value of our house? Although being close to this form of mass transit can be beneficial, nobody will want to ever live this close to the actual tracks.

What about the construction phase of this project? The strain on the neighborhood will be too much. Construction crews and their vehicles will be all over the place. The sound disturbance will be too much.

Another area of concern that we have is that the two parks (\textit{Triangle Park & Lee Park}) that we take our children to are right next to the current train tracks. So close that we worry the parks will be unusable or possibly even removed for this project.

\textbf{Please take our concerns into account when considering this project. We very work hard for our homes and neighborhoods. While the arguments for the greater good are understood, you also have to take care of the people that live here now.}

**We would like to be kept informed of any updates regarding this project.**

\textbf{Nathan & Michelle Supplee}  
\textbf{3848 Major Ave N}  
\textbf{Robbinsdale, Mn 55422}  
\textbf{763-971-7950}
To Whom this May Concern:

We are very concerned about this proposed Bottineau Transitway. Everything about this project will ruin our backyard, our outdoor activities, our comfort in our own home.

Our house is situated no more than 100 feet from the existing train tracks with a crossing that goes through Robbinsdale. We are a couple houses in from the corner of Lee Ave and 39 ½ Avenue.

And although we realize that there are already trains going by our house, it is only once or twice a day, NOT every 7 minutes.

Our backyard will be ruined. No longer will we be able to partake in outdoor activities, such as BBQ's, without the constant sound of lightrail trains going by. Our children like to play in our backyard, how will the constant noise affect them? Will their hearing be hurt? We have dogs that spend time in the backyard, will the constant trains cause any negative behavior in them?

Our house is 98 years old right now. The trains that go by right now (*only once or twice a day*) shake the house a lot and rattle the windows. Will anything be done to help minimize the fact that every 7 minutes our house will be shaking? What about structural concerns? Who is to say that our house or foundation can withstand the massive increase in vibrations?

What about the noise? We have small children whose bedroom faces the tracks. Our walls are thin and the windows are old and not very sound proof. The sound of constant trains will be a nuisance for our household. We are also very close to a crossing. From our understanding, the lightrail cars start sounding a bell when they are a certain distance from the crossing. This will most certainly be right in line with our house. We don't want our children to lose sleep because of the constant trains and bells.

What about the value of our house? Although being close to this form of mass transit can be beneficial, nobody will want to ever live this close to the actual tracks.
What about the construction phase of this project? The strain on the neighborhood will be too much. Construction crews and their vehicles will be all over the place. The sound disturbance will be too much.

Another area of concern that we have is that the two parks (Triangle Park & Lee Park) that we take our children to are right next to the current train tracks. So close that we worry the parks will be unusable or possibly even removed for this project.

Please take our concerns into account when considering this project. We very work hard for our homes and neighborhoods. While the arguments for the greater good are understood, you also have to take care of the people that live here now.

**We would like to be kept informed of any updates regarding this project.**

Nathan & Michelle Supplee
3848 Major Ave N
Robbinsdale, Mn 55422
763-971-7950
Hi Allison -

I am a member of the Bottineau Boulevard Community Advisory Commission and have been attending meetings regularly. George Selman, another Robbinsdale Council member, is the Chairman of the group and has been attending meetings for many years. Mayor Holtz and I attended a bus trip along the proposed line with interested community leaders from throughout the area last fall. Mayor Holtz and city manager Marcia Glick attend the Policy Advisory Commission frequently. The entire council is also aware of the proposals and we have all seen and discussed plans several times. So you can rest assured that Robbinsdale is well represented as the planning moves forward.

There are still several options for the line, including two through Robbinsdale - D1 and D2. The D2 plan also includes three separate options around Terrace Mall/North Memorial area. The 34th Ave option is one of those. Nothing has been decided yet, but things are moving quickly right now.

The process is currently in the "Draft Environmental Impact Study" phase, where a detailed plan is created for the line. This plan will eventually be sent as part of the official request to Washington DC for approval and funding.

I can let you know that there will be a meeting at Robbinsdale City Hall on January 31st from 6:00 to 8:00 pm to answer questions and gather feedback and comments regarding the options for the line - both specifically through Robbinsdale and the entire line.

Also attached is the Scoping Booklet that is available to help answer questions and gather feedback. The booklet just came out last week, so we're not too behind the curve on that one! Please feel free to pass along this email or just the booklet.

I am happy to receive comments and pass them along to our Council and Brent for inclusion in the public record.

As this is primarily a county effort, Brent can answer the questions concerning notifying the affected neighborhoods - I am not sure of their communication plan.

Feel free to call or email with any additional concerns or comments!

Pat Backen
763-439-6454
On Tue, Dec 27, 2011 at 1:17 PM, Alison Garey <A.Garey@hga.com> wrote:
To whom it may concern:

I am writing to verify if Mr. Harper is/will be working on the future light rail route(s) through Robbinsdale? We need a Robbinsdale contact to voice concerns for our neighborhood. Or should we contact Mr. Backen about this information.

We live in the neighborhood near 34th and Halifax Ave – Ward 4. Even though my husband and I have been keeping up with the Bottineau Boulevard Transitway Study, it appears that our neighborhood is not being informed of the decisions being made to run a light rail dividing our neighborhood and reducing our property values further. Right now one option shows the train on top of our neighbors house – right next to our house. We have three children and a dog and do not want to live on a train line. Our daycare lady is in the neighborhood, we have friends in the neighborhood and we are concerned about the impact to our neighborhood. Many of our elderly neighbors do not have access to the internet and do not know much if any about the line proposed.

We would like to know what types of efforts you have done and will be doing in the future to inform the neighborhood of this “proposed” line. We have seen the surveyors and some people have talked to the random people walking through our neighborhood taking pictures for “historical” or “environmental” impact studies, but no one has received any further information.

Please email contact information at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Alison M. Garey
Alison:

This planning effort is being led by the Hennepin County Regional Rail Authority with participation by the local communities on various committees. I noted that you had copied Brent Rusco who is the project manager for Hennepin County. They are responsible for the process. There have been several open houses and more are planned. There are a series of open houses scheduled for the last 2 weeks in January. The Robbinsdale open house is scheduled for January 31. The schedule of open houses and their locations should be on the Bottineau Transitway web site. I recommend that you attend this meeting and tell your neighbors. It is not a formal public hearing, but all comments are accepted and will be included in the environmental scoping report. This environmental scoping report is a lead into the environmental review process. I am also copying Brent in case he needs to correct my response to you.

There are several route options that are still on the table. Pat Backen and the other City of Robbinsdale Council members have not yet taken formal action regarding the Robbinsdale preference. However, I am certain that the City Council would strongly prefer the route called D-1 which keeps the LRT in the Burlington Rail Corridor until it aligns with Hwy 55/Olson Memorial Highway, then heads east into Minneapolis. One of the many reasons they are expected to endorse D-1 is because it has the least impact on residential properties in Robbinsdale.

It is important to note that the Robbinsdale City Council does not have the final say on which route is picked. They will take action endorsing their preference, but ultimately, the decision is expected to be made by the Hennepin County Board and the Metropolitan Council. There is a policy committee (PAC) made up of elected officials from the various cities that will be making the recommendation to the Hennepin County Board. George Selman, Council member for Ward 3, and Mayor Mike Holtz have been serving on the PAC.

You are welcome to contact me if you have any questions. E-mail works, but you can also call me at 763-531-1266.

Rick Pearson

---

From: Alison Garey [mailto:AGarey@hga.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 27, 2011 1:17 PM
To: Rick Pearson
Cc: brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us; Chris Garey; Pat Backen
Subject: Bottineau Boulevard Transitway study - Contact

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to verify if Mr. Harper is/will be working on the future light rail route(s) through Robbinsdale? We need a Robbinsdale contact to voice concerns for our neighborhood. Or should we contact Mr. Backen about this information.

We live in the neighborhood near 34th and Halifax Ave - Ward 4. Even though my husband and I have been keeping up with the Bottineau Boulevard Transitway Study, it appears that our neighborhood is not being informed of the decisions being made to run a light rail dividing our neighborhood and reducing our property values further. Right now one option shows the train on top of our neighbors house - right next to our house. We have three children and a dog and do not want to live on a train line. Our daycare lady is in the neighborhood, we have friends in the neighborhood and we are concerned about the impact to our neighborhood. Many of our elderly neighbors do not have access to the internet and do not know much if any about the line proposed.

We would like to know what types of efforts you have done and will be doing in the future to inform the
neighborhood of this "proposed" line. We have seen the surveyors and some people have talked to the random people walking through our neighborhood taking pictures for "historical" or "environmental" impact studies, but no one has received any further information.

Please email contact information at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Alison M. Garey
Phone 612-716-1823
VI. Other Cities
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  
  There is no need for the project.

- The alternatives proposed for study
  
  We have sufficient basis.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  
  The cost should be evaluated.

- Other comments
  

Name: Mary O'Connor
Address: 5420 Lyndale Ave N, Brooklyn Center, MN 55430
email: 

Please check all of the following that apply:

☑ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
From: "Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us" <Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
To: "amyh@usfamily.net" <amyh@usfamily.net>
Cc: Beth Bartz <bartz@srfconsulting.com>
Sent: Thu, Feb 16, 2012 22:42:30 GMT+00:00
Subject: Re: Bottineau Transitway Scoping Feedback

Amy,

Thanks very much for your input. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

Thanks for passing along your input on mode preference, security, and existing bus route service and concerns about future changes. All of these issues will be addressed in the study process.

You can monitor progress on the Draft EIS via the project website at www.bottineautransitway.org or contact me anytime you have questions or concerns.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

---

From: amyh@usfamily.net
To: brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us
Date: 02/15/2012 07:29 PM
Subject: Bottineau Transitway Scoping Feedback

Hi Brent,

I'm a resident of Brooklyn Center and work in downtown Minneapolis. I have some comments about the Bottineau Transitway project to share for the scoping period:

1. I prefer LRT to BRT. I like the idea of taking LRT all the way to the airport. I'm also concerned that buses will fill up too quickly at rush hour. I'm thinking more people/trip can be moved via LRT.

2. I am concerned about security, though. The route 5 bus has a reputation of being one of the rougher routes. And I gave up on the 724, because I got tired of problems. E.g. a drunk passenger once falling asleep on my shoulder. And a guy who pretended to be hurt when he wasn't, bringing the bus to a stop while that was sorted out. If this is built, will people feel safe enough to use it?

And will trouble-makers use it to expand the range of their activities? This is where I see a drawback to LRT, since the driver isn't present in the cars with
the passengers. Troublemakers may feel freer to cause problems.

3. D2 concerns me more from a security perspective than D1. But I think D2 better meets the goal of serving people who rely on public transportation and don't have alternative means of transportation. I also like the idea of being able to get to North Memorial.

4. A vs. B is a tough decision. I personally shop at lots of businesses in Maple Grove that would make A my preferred route. But my perception is that there are few high-paying jobs there. B at least has the Target campus, and that would make the route more attractive to professionals, in addition to people with lower incomes. I think the route is most sustainable in the long run if it appeals to a mixture of people.

5. I am very worried that this project would take away bus route 760, which I rely on to get to work. I have health problems that make it hard to drive to a job, and I bought my house specifically because I only need to walk a block to catch the 760. I'm worried this project could take that away and either force me to drive for part of my commute, or lengthen the time of my commute if I have to catch a bus to transfer to BRT/LRT. That would pose quite a challenge for me.

I'm hoping that this project would instead expand my options. That the 760, (which has fewer trips than it had when I bought the house) would still be there. But that there would be a feeder route down 63rd ave to the BRT/LRT stop. This would a) provide options to get to downtown (as well as other destinations), and b) provide service in the middle of the day--something I don't currently have now that I don't feel comfortable on the 724. Presuming the BRT/LRT doesn't simply acquire those same problems. I should note the other problem with the 724 is how long it takes to get home. It's just not worth it.

Mostly, though, I'm excited for this project and I support building better infrastructure to meet transportation needs without relying solely on cars. I drive so little that I only fill my tank once every 4 weeks, and my maintenance costs are nice and low.

Thanks for considering my input!

Amy Harth
Brooklyn Center, MN
amyharth@usfamily.net
It's a great idea! But for my vote somehow tie the line in with the north star out of Big Lake there are a lot of people coming down 94 in the morning from that direction that would ride. I am sure 3 of us at Crystal for sure. Thanks! MARK
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  
  LRT is the preferred mode for the Transitway to link the NorthWest Metro to the present and future transit system. LRT is vital to the movement of increasing populations between work centers where highway and road construction alone is unsustainable.

- **The alternatives proposed for study**
  
  Both A & B alternatives are best to serve the outer opportunities for jobs, schooling, shopping, and commutes. D2 is the best route for the LRT line in that it better serves a demographic in the North.

  **Need:** D1 should be considered for a North Park Bike Trail, while in negotiations with BNSF railroad running adjacent to the trains in the Park.

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**
  
  While LRT along Bottineau Blvd servicing apple grove and Brooklyn Park branches would be beneficial to the growing areas, the most constructive and serviceable location is for North Minneapolis.

  Utilizing the D2 Broadway to Beacon route to revitalize the area. This would encourage new construction and provide transportation where it is most needed.

- **Other comments**
  
  LRT is an alternative, but LRT is the best choice to connect with a system needed for an ever growing Metro population where projections demonstrate most increase is expected Northwest of Minneapolis. LRT is the means to keep up with it and move the largest number of people most efficiently. Good job.

Name: **Bill Felker**

Address: **4812 Quail Ave N, Crystal, MN 55429**

Email: **bill@wisi.com**

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [x] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date.

Thank you!

- D2 will facilitate the needs of the community.
- D1 could be a bike green way that would allow green access to other bike routes and downtown.
- Important for NW suburbs to have LRT!

- The alternatives proposed for study
  - A & B are both needed (for commute workers)
  - D1 could be BRT & facilitate transport to D2, LRT.
    (Green line could serve the LRT on D2)
    - Important that NW suburbs connect to regional transitways.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  - Greenway along Theodore Wirth - preserve the park.
  - Sound impact going thru residential neighborhoods.
  - Overall appearance of area around said - (i.e. planting trees, etc.)

- Other comments
  - N. Mpls public meeting was informative and being able to ask questions was helpful! Great job! Also the video - thought it fell to life

Name: Taneli Felker
Address: 4802 Park Ave N Crystal
Email: felker@visi.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date.

Thank you!

a) Purpose and need for the project
I would really like Minnesota Twin Cities to invest in transit options. Highways seem unlikely to improve our access to central business areas or vital to invest in what Minnesota is great at (tech, business).

b) The alternatives proposed for study
1. I prefer the D1 alignment. It still has a potential streetcar.
2. I think the final D1 route will serve more people in the long term.
3. Consider adding a station between Robbinsdale & Bus Lane. 2. Give access to more mid-rise residents.
4. Good that line connects to Hiawatha if LRT chosen.

c) Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
1. Options to add parking to stations should be planned for implementation if successful.
2. Robbinsdale station—consider social benefits and public by public route to serve LRT—
3. Local shopping/dining—development opportunity for Robbinsdale
4. What does the benefit of the LRT look like in context of a potential Mpls streetcar?

d) Other comments
1. Rail & speed should be priorities. As better for the long term.
2. Study should propose feeder bus routes for public evaluation.
3. Bike access/parking would increase ridership & stations
4. How disruptions will the SS LRT segment be to traffic & what will it do to the SS/I4 intersection.

Name: Matt Hetler
Address: 5108 48th Ave N Crystal MN 55429
email: m.hetler@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
□ Area resident  □ Area business owner  □ Community-based organization member  □ Other interested party
Hello,
I was very excited to read about the plans for the Bottineau Transitway project in today’s edition of the Star Tribune. I work at Target’s Corporate office in City Center, downtown Minneapolis. I am part of the Target Technology Services (TTS for short) group. It was announced a month or so ago that the entire TTS group will be relocated to the Target North Campus in Brooklyn Park by 2014.

My mode of transit is biking to work from New Brighton in the AM, and then I put my bike on the bike rack of an 825 bus to go home in the evening. The relocation to Brooklyn Park will mean my public transit days are likely over unless the Bottineau Transitway northern route goes to the Target Brooklyn Park campus.

Several of my co-workers who live or commute downtown are also concerned about transit options to the Brooklyn Park campus. The Bottineau Transitway would make it possible for many of them to have a reliable and environmentally friendly mode of transit to the Brooklyn Park campus.

I also support service running throughout the day between DT Minneapolis and the Target Brooklyn Park campus. This would allow Target employees and vendors to commute efficiently between Target’s offices in DT Minneapolis and the North Campus location for on-site meetings at both locations.

I like the train option between bus and train, but not so much that I think it’s worth twice the cost to build and maintain. If there is inclement weather the train option would be preferable due to higher reliability. So, if cost weren’t an issue, I think the train option would be better.

In summary, I fully support the Bottineau Transit route option that goes to the Target North Campus location. By 2018 there will be thousands of employees at the North Campus location and those employees will be heavy users of the Bottineau Transitway system.

Respectfully submitted,
Rick Brauer
651-470-1034
130 Brentwood Drive
New Brighton, MN 55112
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  
  THE NEED IS HERE FOR THE NW METRO AREA. THE ROUTE IN MY OPINION SHOULD BE W. ON HML 55, NORTH ON OLIVER AV. & BROADWAY TO BSF REN.

- **The alternatives proposed for study**

  THE LOOPS AT OSSEO/M6 MAKE NO SENSE TO ME AT 63 AV. GO NORTH ON ZANE AV. WITH ONE TRACK ONLY, LOOP IT ACROSS NO. #610 & WEST TRL W OF SFR. NW OF BSF OSSEO. LOOP THIS

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**

  SINGLE TRACK INTO BSF ALONE SO. SIDE OF EVIL GREER BRIDGE, WITH SINGLE TRACK (LATER 2 ADD 2ND TRACK TO COVER NW METRO SO. OF MISS R) PEOPLE WILL

- **Other comments**

  NOT COMPLAIN IF IT'S "ONE WAY" AROUND THIS LOOP, NOR IF IT TAKES 10 MINUTES MORE AM OR PM. BECAUSE THIS IS TOO NICE. IT SERVES MORE PEOPLE FOR THE DOLLAR OUTPUT AT THIS TIME THAN YOU!

Name: M. R. Gage, Civil Engr.
Address: 9320-46 Av. No, New Hope 55428
Email: 612-744-7045

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project

  The project is needed. These aging drivers need an alternative transportation source. Hurry up; no one's getting any younger.

- The alternatives proposed for study

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

  Reduces congestion, less pollutants, transportation options for the elderly.

- Other comments

  Start building. Hurry up. Keep motorcycles in mind during design.

Name: Jancy Lindell
Address: 7315 62nd Ave N 55428 New Hope
Email: 

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  
  Public Transit would boost the economy. All roads lead to solutions, and the answer is improvement to a public transportation system. Encourage people to use it day after day again.

- **The alternatives proposed for study**
  
  Alt 1 or Alt 5 DTC

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**
  
  Maybe sometime in the future, extend the transitway to Hopkins and possibly Albertville.

- **Other comments**

  ________________________________________________________________

Name: **Joel Miller**

Address: **1085 Montreal Ave Apt 909 Saint Paul, MN 55106**

email: __________________________________________________________

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [X] Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

* Purpose and need for the project

Not enough traffic to build a light rail.

* The alternatives proposed for study

If so, it’s possible, the Penn Stop is important.

* Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

* Other comments

I think the city need to focus on building the rail to Duluth first.

Name: Young Ho Yu
Address: 8730 Morris Rd. Bloomington, MN. 55437
Email: 

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

* Purpose and need for the project

   Easy transportation.

* The alternatives proposed for study

* Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

* Other comments

Even though this project sounds like a great idea, there's already good transportation in areas such as the city bus. Not many people use city buses, why need a train?

Name: Pang Nhia Lao
Address: 4668 3rd St N E Fridley MN
email: laopangnhia@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident   ☐ Area business owner   ☐ Community-based organization member   ☑ Other interested party
Bottineau Transitway
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

• Purpose and need for the project
  _Faster and easier transportation from St. Paul to Minneapolis

• The alternatives proposed for study
  _N/A

• Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  _Will attract more projects to those areas where the light rail travels at.

• Other comments
  _I may not take the transportation because I usually drive from and to Minneapolis, but this light rail transportation will be very useful to many people who need transportation.

Name: See Xiong

Address: 1541 Barclay St., St. Paul, MN 55106

Email: see.xiong@amamedia.org

Please check all of the following that apply:
  ___ Area resident
  ___ Area business owner
  ___ Community-based organization member
  _✓_ Other interested party
VII. Unknown Locations
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

* Purpose and need for the project
  - Golden Valley, Robbinsdale & Minneapolis are not experiencing notable growth. The project seems to be tailored to second-ring suburbs, encouraging/promoting sprawl versus building city infrastructure.
  - CV, Robby & Mpls already have adequate transit

* The alternatives proposed for study
  - D1 is not a preferable option for several reasons:
    - already transit available to arrive downtown in 10 min
    - corridor is natural and additional noise and traffic will disrupt ecosystem
    - D1 does not serve a high ridership, nor does it provide an opportunity for economic development

* Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  - cost of living will be impacted while not providing benefit to the surrounding community
  - wildlife in the north includes endangered species

* Other comments
  - PLEASE MAINTAIN THE INTEGRITY OF OUR PARK & FOCUS THE LINE ON BUSINESS CORRIDORS ONLY.

Name: ___________________________________________  Theo Widholt
Address: ___________________________________________
Email: ____________________________________________

Please check all of the following that apply:
☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

Purpose and need for the project

Use what we have and improve it.

The alternatives proposed for study

Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

- Taxes
- Environment & habitat, animals
- Noise issues, more people, more buses, more cars
- More pollution, etc. This is going to ruin Bottineau valley

Other comments

Will increase crime

The people who need this need it in their backyards so they can get on and use it.

Name: ____________________________
Address: ____________________________
email: ____________________________

Please check all of the following that apply:

☒ Area resident ☐ Area business owner ☐ Community-based organization member ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project:**
  The need for 50% of households without a car (interview) is in some neighborhoods in North Minneapolis but not Golden Valley. Put the rail where it would have the most riders.

- **The alternatives proposed for study:**
  D1 Makes no sense! Too heavy environmental impact and too few ridership. D2 Which goes by North Memorial and 400. Makes much more sense.

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated:**

- **Other comments:**
  It makes me feel ill to think folks are even considering going through Wirth Park. Please don't do that!

Name: Marlene Jacobs
Address: Theo Wirth Otto
Email: marle2915@yahoo.com

Please check all of the following that apply:
- ☐ Area resident
- ☐ Area business owner
- ☐ Community-based organization member
- ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

Purpose and need for the project:
Use what we already have and find ways to improve it.
Stop wasting our tax dollars!

The alternatives proposed for study:

Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated:
Huge mistake going through Gothen Valley. It will lower the property value and raise taxes and the residents do not need it.

Other comments:
Bad for our existing trails. Bike paths taste Theodore Wirth. Bring in unwanted traffic.

Name:

Address:

email:

Please check all of the following that apply:
☐ Area resident    ☐ Area business owner    ☐ Community-based organization member    ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

1. Purpose and need for the project.
   The study is needed, as a transit route is needed.

2. The alternatives proposed for study.
   Any option would have negative and positive impacts. The alternatives study is clear, as long as the T1 are studied.

3. Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated.
   An important issue is cost-benefit analysis. Also, consider to prioritize travel infrastructure.

4. Other comments.
   The venue of this site is perfect.
   I think the wording is good, allows people to understand clearly.

Name: Jeff Smyser
Address: Tico with O.H.
email: JDSMYSER@HOST.COM

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  I believe we need more transit options than just personal cars.

- The alternatives proposed for study
  I am strongly in favor of O2 through Robbinsdale and on Penn Avenue. I oppose M1 as just a way for suburban commuters to avoid racial diversity.

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  I believe the number of jobs and residences served by the line is the most important consideration.

- Other comments

Name: ____________________________
Address: __________________________
email: _____________________________

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project

- The alternatives proposed for study

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

- Other comments
  - Going to move if you run it through Golden Valley.
  - Don't want more buses in the area to bring in people to get on the train. Take it to the people who need it.

Name: ___________________________________________  Theo Wirth Ott.

Address: ___________________________________________

email: ____________________________________________

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project

- The alternatives proposed for study

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

- Other comments

  This system will NOT bring business to North Memorial Medical Center.

  When you get hurt, you either have a family member drive you or others will take a taxi. Taxis pick you up at your doorstep.

Name: __________________________
Address: _______________________
email: _________________________

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party

Theo Wirth, City
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

* Purpose and need for the project
  It would be beneficial.

* The alternatives proposed for study
  I think the Maple Grove line makes more sense.

* Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  Please do not get rid of Wagner's drive in.

* Other comments
  Hire local workers.

Name: Neil Rock

Address: 

Email: mthiessen@yahoo.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident   ☐ Area business owner   ☐ Community-based organization member   ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

* Purpose and need for the project

  The Twin Cities area is so far behind in mass transit compared to other metropolitan areas. Having mass transit available more areas and more often to help business development along I-35
day and night helps commuters avoid the traffic.

* The alternatives proposed for study

  The E Option would help 16,000 business development.
  It would also have a stop at the new BP Library which would be nice. I would prefer I-35 to 35W.

* Project Impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

  What would Option A do to transportation options for the new library?
  How close does any option come to Brookdale?
  Can any necessary landscaping be done with native plants?

* Other comments

  Don't want!! BP needs more mass transit options.

Name: _____________________________
Address: _____________________________
email: _______________________________

Please check all of the following that apply:

☒ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

* Purpose and need for the project

* The alternatives proposed for study

* Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

* Other comments

---

Name: __________________________
Address: _________________________
Email: ___________________________

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other Interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project

- The alternatives proposed for study

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  I am skeptical about whether operating costs of this project can be funded. A year or two ago, the Met Council was threatening to eliminate weekend bus service and eliminate 40% of service. If transit funding is that shaky, I have a hard time imagining how a vastly expanded service will be funded. Even if the federal government funds a significant portion of the tracks and stations, operating costs could be substantial.

Name: Steven Stuck
Address: Robbinsdale, MN
Email: bicyclingelephant@yahoo.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☐ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date.

Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  - **we Don't WANT ANY**

- The alternatives proposed for study
  - **none**

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  - **none**

- Other comments
  - **Don't WANT**

Name: ____________________________
Address: ____________________________
email: ____________________________

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [x] Other interested party

Robbinsdale Att.
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

* Purpose and need for the project:
  - Expand transit use. Connect regional amenities. Serve transit-dependent populations. Connect to major employers. Interline with existing Light Rail service at the interchange.

* The alternatives proposed for study:
  - D2 along Penn is vastly superior. To avoid Northdale entirely (D1) would be a crime. D1 would not serve North Memorial Hospital, that could be a missed opportunity to serve Robbinsdale's largest employer. Ridership and employment should weigh higher than cost and travel time.

* Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated:
  - Ridership would be extremely low on D1. D2 serves transit dependent populations. D2 provides a one-seat ride to the airport and MCA (Interline w/Hennepin).
  - D1 alignment through Wirth Park would drastically reduce ridership and possibly affect sensitive wetlands or wildlife.

* Other comments:
  - If the Maple Grove terminal is chosen, it must serve Arbor Lakes. Your current map has the station too far from the mall to be useful. Brooklyn Park looks more promising & connects to rapidly growing Target North campus.

Name: Matt Brillhart
Address: Robbinsdale, MN
email: mbrillhart@gmail.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☑ Area resident ☐ Area business owner ☐ Community-based organization member ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project

- The alternatives proposed for study

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

- Other comments

Name: ____________________________
Address: __________________________

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident ☐ Area business owner ☐ Community-based organization member ☐ Other interested party

Robbinsdale 0.44
You always say it's for "improvements." But you LIE! Rubak is now calling it the "Sports Train" and you sell us all out with covering the train with corporate advertising!
Scoping Comment Form

Bottineau Transitway
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project

There is a strong need for this project and how it could serve as a catalyst for economic development.

- The alternatives proposed for study

LRT

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated

Please evaluate the racial, environmental, and health impacts of the transitway project. What impact will there be on homeowners?

- Other comments

What are the environmental implications of the project and to what extent it will have on minority business owners.

Name: __________________________
Address: ________________________
email: __________________________

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☑ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date.

Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  
  "Think the light rail should serve more people in the community - not just for the folks in the suburbs -"

- **The alternatives proposed for study**
  
  "Would be great if something could be figured out without taking all the homes along Penn Ave."

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**
  
  "Environmental impact of D1 - D1 would come directly behind my property and to be honest I would not care for that"

- **Other comments**
  
  "Really feel option D1 should be left as a nature area. Penn Ave. is already filled up w/ people - already impacting that area. Please leave some areas natural - do we have to be everywhere?"

Name: Lisa Parks

Address: 

Email: parks3459@msn.com

Please check all of the following that apply:

☒ Area resident ☐ Area business owner ☐ Community-based organization member ☐ Other interested party
To Whom It May Concern:

I read the article about the proposed northwest suburban transit options. First of all, the NW suburbs is definately in need of this project. Secondly, I am very much in favor of a light rail option instead of bus rapid transit. The light rail that is currently in Mpls is highly successful. Let's just use their same winning format and continue that light rail line into the NW suburbs. Please don't create a new system! Keep one system and make transfers, fares, connections easy.

Why would you do a bus rapid transit that still uses gasoline and emits CO2? These are the fundamental problems that the US has to solve - not create more of them. Light rail is the answer.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

Diane Baltes
I am in favor of light rail rather than buses!
If light rail is chosen for the Bottineau Corridor will light rail trains share tracks with BNSF freight trains or run on streets? Could the Bottineau Corridor be extended farther northwest if demand warrants?
Dear Mr. Brent Rusco,

I am a resident of the Twin Cities, and while I cannot attend any of the public meetings regarding the Bottineau Transitway Project, I'd like to express my support for building light rail. I'd further ask you to choose the from the A/B and D1/D2 alternatives those that will maximize ridership.

Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,

Matt Zabka
I think it’s stupid to put a big stop right before a neighborhood that terrifies most people from the suburbs. They won’t ride it if they have to be afraid of the last stop passengers. I doubt it will serve north Minneapolis residents as it is too far away from the core of the north side.

Kathryn Brandt
Realtor
Cbburnet
763-670-1564
Kabrandt@Cbburnet.com
Hello,

I would like to voice my opinion on the project. I have been going to school in the Brooklyn Park area for 5 years now and I know of many students who wish the transit options were better in speed and efficiency to and from the school(s). I personally live in elk river so my transit options are typically more limited but I typically go to the Brooklyn Park area to ride the bus down to the cities which typically takes an hour to an hour and a half because of bus frequency to the area and having multiple transfers. I would prefer the LTR option better because I believe it would be an extension of the blue line going to the mall of america so I would be able to go to maple grove get on one train and ride all the way to the mall of america instead of having to drive around the city, which could be backed up with (rush hour) traffic. As implied I like the A alignment though I also see the benefit for Target and North Hennepin Community College, which is why I would prefer both options being built or having a BRT for the B Alignment from the split or 71st Station following West Broadway north to the Target campus. As for the Robbinsdale alternatives I feel that the local impact would be a lot less to follow the BNSF railway all the way to 55 though I see the benefit in having Penn Avenue utilized I just wish it didn't impact so many homes/businesses, Which I think could be mostly eliminated through having Penn Ave becoming a one-way south bound and utilize Oliver Ave as a North bound one-way connecting to Logan/W. Broadway intersection next to the christian academy this would allow for the same amount of parking on both streets though with less stop light/sign service needed and dedicated turn lanes and more traffic I feel is traveling south bound to 55 anyways. I hope this helps I really am excited about a light rail going to maple grove/ Brooklyn park I think the protege of Light rail will go well with maple grove's image and also increase the value of the corridor as well. I feel that buses really do not have the image to increase value and for Maple grove I think that in Brooklyn park they would be happier with a light rail though they would be fine with a bus to their terminus as it would still increase the amount of frequency and convenience of the west Broadway's current system, which I do not believe to be really making an impact and if the revenue is there after the BRT is put in it would be fairly easy to have the LRT put in the dedicated route of the BRT to expand the LRT system. I also think it would be a good idea for the NE corner of 85th and W. Broadway to have a parking ramp built, which would be able to flow into the College campus located there (even though all the campus buildings are currently on the SE corner) This would increase ridership because of the ramp as a park and ride for the area (with its convenience from 169's new ramps making it a better connection area then the Starlite transit center) and students coming in for school. Again I hope this information helps.

Please email me if you would like to as more questions.

Sincerely,

Derrick Schultz
North Minneapolis should not be skipped over during the building of the bottineau transitway. I prefer the d2a and d2b routes that do not take an entire side of Penn Avenue's homes. Though there are blighted areas of penn south of broadway, there are many homes that should stand alongside a vibrant transit corridor. Either way I prefer the penn and broadway alternatives to cutting through Theodore Wirth Park. I would not support any route that bypasses the heart of North Minneapolis without guarantees of a future street car line on Broadway.

--
Scottie B. Tuska
scottie.tuska@gmail.com
414.795.4652
I was not able to attend the open houses but I wanted to let you know that I think a train would be a much better option for the NW suburb area. I would train whereas I would be much less likely to ride a bus. I also like the idea of getting more people off the busy roads.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Schurrer
Paul,

Thanks very much for your comments regarding the Bottineau Transitway. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Brent Rusco  
Senior Professional Engineer  
Hennepin County  
Housing, Community Works & Transit  
Engineering and Transit Planning  
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400  
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843  
Direct: 612.543.0579

From:  Paul Swenson <pswenson@hotmail.com>  
To:  <brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>  
Date:  02/01/2012 10:56 AM  
Subject:  Bottineau Transitway

Brent:

I support the concept behind the Bottineau Transitway but please be respectful of our tax dollars. A bus rapid transit system will serve the need just as well as a light rail transit system. There is no need to incur the extra initial cost and the additional operating expenses of LRT.

Thank you.

Paul G. Swenson  
612-382-9659

Disclaimer: Information in this message or an attachment may be government data and thereby subject to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 13, may be subject to attorney-client or work product privilege, may be confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise protected, and the unauthorized review, copying, retransmission, or other use or disclosure of the information is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please immediately notify the sender of the transmission error and then promptly delete this message from your computer system.
From: "Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us" <Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
To: Karen Lee Rosar <karen.rosar@comcast.net>
Cc: Beth Bartz <bbartz@srfconsulting.com>
Sent: Thu, Feb 16, 2012 21:42:51 GMT+00:00
Subject: RE: Bottineau LRT Scoping Comments

Karen,

Thanks very much for your input. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

From: "Karen Lee Rosar" <karen.rosar@comcast.net>
To: <Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
Date: 02/09/2012 10:42 AM
Subject: RE: Bottineau LRT Scoping Comments

Greetings Brent

I just wanted to add another personal comment. I know it was addressed and dismissed long ago...but I still think a good alternative for Bottineau would be West Broadway to Washington Ave and then into The Interchange.

Thank you,

Karen Lee Rosar
612-220-5390
karen.rosar@comcast.net

From: Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us [mailto:Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us]
Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2012 2:44 PM
To: Karen Lee Rosar
Cc: 'Heinle, DJ'; Beth Bartz; Joseph.Glocke@co.hennepin.mn.us
Subject: Re: Bottineau LRT Scoping Comments

Karen,

Thanks very much for your scoping input for the Bottineau Transitway Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Thanks very much for your input. Your comments will be included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

We encourage you to be involved in the study process which can be monitored on the project website at www.bottlineautransitway.org. The issues you raise regarding need for transit improvements, impacts, demographics, and financial feasibility will be addressed as part of the Draft EIS.

You can also contact me anytime you have questions or need information.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

--
It's obvious that someone has done a lot of work to research alternatives for transportation in the northwest metro but there isn't the same pattern of congestion in the northeastern corridor as there is in the southeastern metro, especially since they addressed the issues at 169/85 and Highway 10. Maple Grove has traffic problems because of the intentional concentration of retail shops. Both Target and North Memorial have concentrations of employees with inadequate parking facilities. But the majority of citizens living in the north metro do not need LRT or bigger buses. They need better bus routes with more frequent service and smaller vehicles. People with disabilities and seniors will continue to use private transportation because it is more convenient and easier than driving or walking and waiting at a public transit station.

Although the existence of current rail lines appears to be advantageous, it would require an additional set of lines to accommodate LRT and lots of excavation in areas which are currently public parks, resulting in disruption of their use and displacement of wildlife. It would also result in forced displacement of people who have been living in these quiet neighborhoods. Why can't public transportation use the existing transportation byways such as Highway 100 instead of cutting through the neighborhoods and parks?
Also, I question your statistics in the Bottineau Transitway Draft Environmental Impact Statement. According to Twin Cities Business, 3/21/11, Minneapolis’ population hasn’t grown in a decade and the region’s population only increased 8% compared to the previous decade of 15% growth.

According to the US Census Bureau Quick Facts, Hennepin County has experienced only 3.2% growth in the last decade compared to the 7.8% in Minnesota. Not the 31% increase this document suggests for Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott and Washington Counties.

I’m not sure how a job growth of 0.46% over the past year for Hennepin County translates to a projected growth of 32% increase over the next decade for the aforementioned counties.

I do believe:
The per capita income in Hennepin County is $35,082.
The median household income is $63,796.
The unemployment rate is currently 6.10% with job growth of 0.46%.
The sales tax is currently 6.65%.
The income tax is currently 7.85%.

Who do you think is going to pay for the LRT starting in Maple Grove and ending in Minneapolis? Not Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Ramsey, Scott and Washington Counties. Who can afford this?


http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/27/2743000.html

http://www.bestplaces.net/economy/county/minnesota/hennepin
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Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

* Purpose and need for the project
  not enough traffic

* The alternatives proposed for study
  study other neighborhood and justify the priority of other location

* Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  resident area, construction noise

* Other comments
  I think the bus system works well already

Name: ____________________________________________

Address: ____________________________________________

e-mail: ____________________________________________

Please check all of the following that apply:

☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☑ Community-based organization member  ☐ Other interested party
Scoping Comment Form

Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- Purpose and need for the project
  I think the project should continue as some transportation options are always good and infrastructure brings jobs and helps the economy.

- The alternatives proposed for study

- Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated
  Ensuring the light rail does not interfere with sensitive equipment and seniors along the route.

- Other comments

Name: [Name]
Address: [Address]
Email: [Email]

Please check all of the following that apply:
☐ Area resident  ☐ Area business owner  ☑ Community-based organization member  ☑ Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

**Purpose and need for the project**

This project is to determine whether or not the community feels a need for a light rail train to come through the neighborhood.

**The alternatives proposed for study**

A line going through

**Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**

- The homes that may be destroyed during construction
- The positive and negative impacts of raising a LRT line to the Northeast community, businesses that will be affected
- Noise and traffic congestion

**Other comments**

Name:

Address:

email:

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [ ] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Please help us determine the scope of issues to be studied during the Bottineau Transitway Draft EIS by providing comments on the areas outlined below. The scoping period closes on February 17, 2012. All comments must be received by that date. Thank you!

- **Purpose and need for the project**
  I feel like there is not a purpose or need for the project because this is a residential area, we should not combine business w/residential like in other countries such as Thailand or China.

- **The alternatives proposed for study**
  I do not like the idea of the light rail to come through 34th Ave. It needs to be divided business vs. residential.

- **Project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated**
  Are we making this country like that of exported China/Thailand? We (residential) need peace & quietness to live, learn, & grow.

- **Other comments**

Name:

Address:

email:

Please check all of the following that apply:

- [ ] Area resident
- [ ] Area business owner
- [x] Community-based organization member
- [ ] Other interested party
Stop the light-rail obsession. (We'll save money if we get off.)

Article by DAVID CSMEK  Updated: February 1, 2012 - 6:32 PM

Stop the light-rail obsession. (We'll save money if we get off.)

But this is not the true cost of a ride, as it does not include the 30-year amortized costs of bonding for the build-out of the line. Adding these costs is, at a 4 percent bond interest rate, a single ride actually costs $0.42, which means each ride is subsidized by 85 percent.

If a family of four rides the Hiawatha Line to a Twins game, the public is paying a total of $43.36, while the riders are contributing $3.90.

Right now, we are paying over $15 million each year to keep the Hiawatha Line operating. Adding in the amortized costs of building the line, it's more than $56 million in taxpayer dollars each year. Yet some of the costs are federally funded, and other revenue streams are being consumed by the burden. But with trillions of dollars of deficit spending, do we really want to add to the debt that future generations will pay for decades to come?

Using the Hiawatha Line as a model, let's project the costs of the Central Corridor and Southwest lines. Assuming the same level of revenue from ridership and operating costs, the Central Corridor will require more than $17 million each year in operating subsidy and more than $55 million a year for the amortized costs. The new southwest line will require more than $12 million in operating subsidy with more than $72 million in amortized costs. And don't forget about Northstar commuter rail, which has an annual operating subsidy of over $13 million, with amortized costs of over $18 million.

Once all four lines are in operation, the public will pay more than $55 million each year to just operate the lines. The actual costs, with the amortized build-out costs included, is just short of a quarter of a billion dollars each year.

This is for a mode of transportation that, in my opinion, has a negligible effect on traffic congestion and would be more economically provided by existing bus service. Even worse, we are taking money away from building or rebuilding critical highway infrastructure needs to operate this incredibly expensive mode of transportation. Standing the rest of our transportation system in favor of a more expensive, less efficient and totally inflexible light-rail system is the epitome of politics trumping common sense.

Proponents will cite the fact that light rail will create jobs. But we will build more miles and bridges. Minnesota Department of Transportation studies have proven that roads have a benefit-to-cost ratio greater than one, meaning that the economic benefit of a project outweighs the actual cost of the improvement and will pay for itself over time. Most road and bridge projects have ratios of three to one, meaning that $3 or $4 of calculated value is returned for every dollar of costs. The Hiawatha Line was projected at 0.42 in 1999, meaning that for every dollar spent, we received 42 cents in value.

When you look at the costs, building more light rail lines is nothing short of a money pit that will bankrupt our state and our nation. It is time to cut our losses and stop this madness.

David CSmek is a member of the Minnetonka City Council and a Republican candidate for the state Senate.
VIII. Corridor Cities
February 3, 2012

Brent Rusco
Bottineau Transitway Project Manager
Hennepin County
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415

Dear Mr. Rusco:

Re: BOTTINEAU SCOPING PROCESS

The City of Brooklyn Park thanks you for the continued efforts for improving transit in the Northwestern Twin Cities, including Brooklyn Park. We are supportive of continuing efforts through this scoping process for the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) for the Bottineau Transitway. Specifically:

1. The City is supportive of continuing study of alignment sub-option B (West Broadway route through Brooklyn Park). This route will be able to reach more of our residents and businesses.

2. The City is supportive of continuing study of an alignment that will allow our residents to reach downtown Minneapolis and points beyond faster than other alignment options. Through studies to date, it is our understanding that this is sub-option D1 (Theodore Wirth Park route through Golden Valley). The slower routes become less competitive with driving and, therefore, will not become an attractive option to choice riders.

3. The City is supportive of continuing study of light rail transit (LRT) as the preferred transit mode.

These transit options will further Brooklyn Park's mission as a thriving community, inspiring pride, where opportunities exist for all. We look forward to continued work with you in the upcoming months.

Sincerely,

James D. Verbrugge
City Manager

www.brooklynpark.org
RESOLUTION 2012 - 14

CITY OF CRYSTAL

RESOLUTION TRANSMITTING THE CITY OF CRYSTAL’S OFFICIAL COMMENTS ON THE BOTTINEAU TRANSITWAY SCOPING PROCESS

WHEREAS, the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority (HCRRA) and the Metropolitan Council have initiated the Bottineau Transitway Scoping Process, which is the initial stage of development of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for construction of a proposed transitway adjacent the Bottineau Boulevard corridor; and

WHEREAS, the HCRRA and the Metropolitan Council have developed the Bottineau Boulevard Scoping Booklet for public review to elicit comments from stakeholders and members of the public on the purpose and need for the project, the alternatives proposed for study in the EIS, and project impacts or benefits that should be evaluated in the EIS; and

WHEREAS, the transitway is proposed to traverse the city of Crystal within the BNSF Railroad right-of-way along the Bottineau Boulevard corridor, with a proposed station location at or near 56th Avenue North (Bass Lake Road); and

WHEREAS, the alignment of a contemplated transitway offers benefits and presents impacts, both locally and system-wide, that demand further study in an EIS; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Crystal has reviewed the Bottineau Transitway Scoping Booklet and now desires to officially confirm and transmit its formal comments for consideration in the EIS.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CRYSTAL, that the city confirms its official comments on the Bottineau Transitway Scoping Process as contained in Exhibit A to this Resolution and transmits those comments to the HCRRA and Metropolitan Council for further consideration in the EIS process.

Approved this 6th day of February, 2012.

ReNae J. Bowman, Mayor

ATTEST:

Christina Serres, City Clerk
EXHIBIT A
To City Council Resolution 2012 - 14

The Crystal City Council transmits to the HCRRA and Metropolitan Council the following official comments on the Bottineau Transitway ("Transitway") Scoping Process:

I. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT

a. Provided that the city's preferred alignment as indicated in II. below is identified ultimately as the Locally Preferred Alternative, the City Council finds that the proposed Transitway will:

i. Provide enhanced connections and an additional transit alternative to access jobs, areas of high growth, schools, housing, health care and activity centers;
ii. Respond to the region's increasing traffic congestion by providing an alternative to roadway travel as a method for managing transportation demand;
iii. Respond affirmatively to the needs of transit dependent populations;
iv. Offer time-efficient, express transit service to both urban and suburban destinations; and
v. Help satisfy the regional objective for growth, efficient development patterns and sound communities.

II. ALTERNATIVES PROPOSED FOR STUDY

a. From a local perspective, the City Council supports the alignment of the Transitway that transsects Crystal (Segment "C") within the BNSF Railroad right-of-way as the reasonable alignment through the city. This local alignment is preferred because it:

i. Minimizes crossings at roadways and signalized intersections, thereby reducing conflicts between the transitway operations and motor vehicle traffic;
ii. Offers reasonable opportunities for station siting between Wilshire Boulevard and 56th Avenue North (Bass Lake Road);
iii. Proposes to share an existing railroad right-of-way with an existing freight rail service, thus requiring no additional right-of-way aside from that which may be necessary for the station and any related parking areas; and
iv. Provides a transitway station within Crystal's most significant concentration of existing shopping and employment, 312 existing multi-
family housing units within one-quarter mile, and adjacent residential neighborhoods.

b. From a system-wide perspective, the City Council finds that the preferred alignments for further study should be A-C-D1 and B-C-D1 for the following reasons:

i. The dramatically shorter travel times, two fewer stops and seven fewer signalized intersections associated with the D1 alignment are more attractive to potential new transit users and are in the best interests of the system when compared to the D2 alignment alternative;

ii. This “express” service translates to optimized ridership numbers;

iii. The investment in a fixed transitway component of a regional transit system is sizable, and the return on that investment is better realized by offering true express transit service to a resulting increased ridership;

iv. The operating conditions of the D1 alignment are more compatible with general motor vehicle, bus, bicycle and pedestrian traffic and with neighboring businesses and residents for the long term;

v. The D1 alignment achieves the level of mobility improvements and transitway system operating and safety conditions required for a dedicated transitway investment in the Twin Cities region; and

vi. The D1 alignment maximizes the opportunity for addressing and mitigating potential impacts and optimizing the benefits of a dedicated transitway system.

c. Alternatives that include the D2 alignment should not go forward for further environmental review because:

i. Construction and funding of a fixed transitway along the D2 alignment would sacrifice the reduced overall travel times and higher overall ridership numbers offered by the D1 alignment;

ii. When compared to the D1 alignment, the D2 requires two additional station stops that results in longer dwell time and seven additional signalized intersections that increases overall travel time, likely at the expense of ridership;

iii. The D2 alignment has significant technical challenges associated with operating a transitway in a largely residential neighborhood and on arterial streets with relatively narrow existing rights-of-way, a practice unprecedented in North America;

iv. The extraordinary number of property acquisitions (i.e., nearly all properties on the west side of Penn Avenue in Minneapolis and a number
of properties in Robbinsdale) required to optimize the D2 alignment will have lasting adverse impacts on neighborhood fabric and function and residents’ sense of place;

vi. For all practical purposes, the costs of right-of-way acquisition to accommodate the D2 alignment render this alternative infeasible;

vii. Costs associated with the investment in a fixed guideway along the D2 alignment duplicates existing bus service in contrast to the express service to be provided by the D1 alignment; and

The City Council prefers that both LRT and BRT be studied further in light of the significant difference in capital costs between the two modes.

III. PROJECT IMPACTS OR BENEFITS TO BE EVALUATED

a. The City Council expects that each of the issues cited below will be subject to further examination during the EIS process for the reasons stated.

i. Noise - Transitway operations will increase the frequency of noise above the baseline within the rail alignment through Crystal, particularly at crossings (Bass Lake Road, Corvallis, and West Broadway).

ii. Vibration - Transitway operations will increase the frequency of vibrations above the baseline within the rail alignment through Crystal.

iii. Vehicular traffic - Traffic control devices must offer protection at transitway crossings without compromising the integrity and capacity of the local street and county roadway systems.

b. The City Council has identified various issues related to station location and operation specifically that will require further investigation and consideration during the station area planning phase of the transitway effort.

i. Parking - Neither park-and-ride nor kiss-and-ride lots are contemplated currently for the Crystal station. The lack of such parking or drop-off facilities suggests that the Crystal station will serve walk-up riders only, which is not a realistic expectation. The lack of such facilities will compromise pedestrian safety and pose traffic/pedestrian conflicts as riders are dropped off and picked up on adjacent roadways.
ii. Pedestrian access to station - Pedestrian access to proposed Bass Lake Road station requires safe crossing of Bottineau Blvd, Bass Lake Road and the rail line.

iii. Safety - The safety of pedestrians and non-motorized traffic must be protected.

iv. Location - The siting of the Crystal station at a location between 56th Avenue North (Bass Lake Road) and Wilshire Boulevard is dependent upon various considerations that must be taken into account, including adjacent opportunities for redevelopment, visual prominence, traffic delays at nearby roadway crossings, and noise impacts on adjacent residential properties.
February 21, 2012

The Honorable Peter McLaughlin
Chair, Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority
A-2400 Government Center
300 S. 6th St.
Minneapolis, MN 55487

Mr. Chair,

Thank you for allowing the City of Golden Valley the opportunity to review and provide comments to the Bottineau Transitway Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) Scoping Document. The City appreciates the opportunity to be a partner in the study process. The City supports alternate transportation modes and appreciates Hennepin County’s commitment to analyzing transit corridors in the northwest metro area. While the Bottineau Transitway would be an important tool in providing mass transportation to the region, the City has significant concerns surrounding the D-1 Alignment, which is shown to cross through northeast Golden Valley along the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad corridor.

The City has received feedback from several of its commissions, as well as residents of the community. In general, most of the comments pertain to concerns over the potential impacts that the D-1 Alignment would have to natural areas in the city, as well as potential impacts to surrounding properties. Further, it appears that the proposed D-2 Alignment, which would travel through North Minneapolis, would serve a larger population and provide a greater opportunity for economic development.

If the County chooses to continue study of the D-1 Alignment, the City of Golden Valley requests that the following comments and concerns be addressed:

Natural Resources

The D-1 Alignment is proposed to be located within and adjacent to Theodore Wirth Regional Park as well as the Mary Hills Nature Area and Glenview Terrace Park. These areas are invaluable and unique natural and recreational amenities to the City as well as the northwestern Twin Cities region. The Comprehensive Plan for the City establishes clear goals that provide protection of these natural areas. The City requests that it be involved in all decisions that impact the parks. The City is interested in the comparison between the carbon footprint associated with building a transit facility in a natural area versus the carbon footprint that
would be associated increased transit usage as a result of the Bottineau Transitway.

Any impacts to the floodway or floodplain must be mitigated in accordance with the laws and policies of the regulating agencies. The City recognizes that mitigation within the existing railroad corridor will be challenging, and it encourages the County to work closely with the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission (BCWMC) and its member cities to identify potential flood storage areas outside of the railroad rights-of-way.

Wetland impacts will need to be mitigated in accordance with the laws and policies of the regulating agencies. The City of Golden Valley is the local government unit responsible for administration of the Wetland Conservation Act. The County is encouraged to work with its local partners to identify potential mitigation solutions outside the railroad right-of-way, if needed.

The Transitway project will need permits or approvals from all agencies regulating stormwater, including but not limited to the City, BCWMC, and Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. At a minimum, best management practices addressing erosion and sediment control will need to be implemented during construction. It is possible that rate control and stormwater treatment that reduces pollutants and runoff will be required, especially with the development of a transit station, park and ride facility, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), or other impervious surface.

The natural areas located within the D-1 Alignment are home to vast array of wildlife. Care should be taken to avoid impacts to the habitat and travel ways of all wildlife, including endangered, threatened, or special concern species. The City Council requests more specific information about the location of fencing along the D-1 Alignment, as well as what type of fencing would be used. Movement of wildlife through the natural areas may be impeded by certain types of fencing. If fencing along the route is a requirement, the City Council would like to know if there are ways in which to waive from the requirement.

As the proposed project has the potential to impact areas within large parks and natural areas, and areas adjacent to Bassett Creek, the corridor would need to be studied for the presence of historic and cultural resources. The historical significance of the Theodore Wirth Park Chalet should also be considered in this study. The City requests to be contacted if archaeological discovery is made.

**Station Location**

If the D-1 Alignment, consisting of either Light Rail Transit (LRT) or BRT through Golden Valley is selected to be evaluated in the DEIS, one station location must be chosen. The potential station locations for the D1 are Golden Valley Road near Wirth Parkway and Plymouth Avenue near Wirth Parkway. Both are located
in the City of Golden Valley and would require the acquisition of property owned by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board.

Prior DEIS information indicates that the Golden Valley Road station would serve mostly Golden Valley residents and businesses and the Plymouth Avenue station would serve mostly Minneapolis residents, businesses, and Wirth Park facilities. Businesses served in Golden Valley include regional destinations (Courage Center, Minneapolis Clinic of Neurology, Regency Hospital of Minneapolis, Wirth Park) and local destinations (Church of St. Margaret Mary, Unity Christ Church, The Family Partnership).

While a station located at Plymouth Avenue would likely have less effect on Golden Valley neighborhoods and community resources, the Golden Valley Road station would provide more direct access for Golden Valley residents and businesses. In addition, the Golden Valley Road location is on an existing bus line with potential feeder bus connections, and has planned regional trail connections.

The City would like more detailed information about how buses would be incorporated into the station areas, including the amount and frequency of feeder buses serving the stations, and information about how bus drop-off and pick-up would function at the stations.

As proposed in prior DEIS plans, parking options at either station location are limited or non-existent. The location of both proposed stations within natural areas seems to preclude possible parking options. The City would like more detailed information about how parking would be studied to function at the station locations, as well as potential costs that are associated with parkland acquisition for parking. The City would like to know how many parking spaces would be necessary at each location and whether or not parking ramps are being considered for the sites. If there were to be insufficient onsite parking at station locations, and transit riders park on the surrounding streets, an access and traffic management plan should be considered as part of the project.

As the City understands it, there are no plans for a park and ride facility at either station location. Current land use and zoning controls that are currently in place at the proposed station location sites do not allow parking that is not associated with park uses. To allow for parking to be constructed, changes to land use and zoning controls would need to be made by the City Council. The City requests that funding be made available to allow for planning studies, which include consideration for parking options, if the County moves forward with study of the D-1 Alignment. Surrounding landowners have expressed concerns about their existing parking conditions so the integration of public and private parking improvements could be an opportunity for further study.

The trip generation from the proposed station or a future park and ride facility may result in the need to modify, enhance, or expand the nearby transportation system, which includes roads, trails and sidewalk facilities. It is expected that the
County would partner with the appropriate road authority to address and mitigate any traffic concerns.

Sidewalks currently serve both station locations. The existing sidewalk system will require upgrades and/or expansion to meet accessibility design requirements and the needs of the community. It is expected that this would be accomplished as part of the site access evaluation and implementation. The City of Golden Valley owns and maintains concrete sidewalks on both sides of Golden Valley Road (CSAH 66) at the intersection of the proposed Transitway. In addition, Three Rivers Park District has identified the Golden Valley Road corridor for the proposed Bassett Creek Regional Trail which would connect French Regional Park and the Medicine Lake Regional Trail to Wirth Regional Park and the trails along the Grand Rounds National Scenic Byway. This network of trails and sidewalks would also require year-round maintenance -- especially for accessibility purposes - for LRT or BRT to succeed in this multi-modal transportation area.

The City owns and maintains an asphalt trail near the BNSF Railway in the Mary Hills Nature Area. This trail provides an important north-south connection from Golden Valley Road north into Robbinsdale via Sochacki Park. It is anticipated that a new Transitway may impact this trail and the City requests that it be actively involved with any reconstruction or realignment of this trail.

The costs to reconstruct Golden Valley Road and the existing multi-modal facilities discussed above, in addition to any facilities deemed necessary to fully meet the anticipated needs, must be considered in evaluation of the potential station location.

**Property Impacts**

It is unclear how the Bottineau Transitway would impact surrounding properties. There is information that addresses property value impacts for properties located adjacent to transit station locations. However, there is no comparable data that demonstrates impacts to properties along the Transitway with no convenient access to a station. Data should be provided that shows how the Transitway would impact single family residential properties along the corridor.

The potential noise and vibration impacts from the Transitway and the freight track are a significant concern. While current and possible future freight rail traffic also create noise, it is different from constant and consistent noise associated with a regional transit system. BRT and LRT may yield different noise and vibration levels in surrounding neighborhoods. These effects should be studied in greater detail. The City would also like to have more information about the presence of potential sound walls and other barriers that may cause visual obstructions to surrounding properties.
With high frequency transit service, the potential Transitway and transit station will have a visual impact on surrounding properties. Most notably will be the addition of lights and lighting that does not exist with the current freight rail. The effects of lighting should be studied and the screening of adjacent neighborhoods and park areas should be considered as part of this project.

**Community Resources**

The proposed Transitway and transit stations would likely require an increase in community resources such as police, fire, public works maintenance, and traffic management. Since the proposed transit system is managed by the Metropolitan Council, it is anticipated that Metro Transit Police will be the primary law enforcement agency at the station.

The City of Golden Valley owns watermain, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer facilities in the area of the proposed route. Some of these facilities cross under the existing BNSF Railway. Record drawings and other information are available in the City’s engineering office to assist in the planning and design of the project. The City requests that it be consulted on all design and construction considerations and field decisions involving City-owned utilities.

The City of Minneapolis owns a 48-inch watermain which passes under the BNSF Railway north of Golden Valley Road and Metropolitan Council Environmental Services owns a large sanitary sewer interceptor which parallels the BNSF railway in Wirth Park. The City requests that it be consulted along with the custodial agency on all design and construction considerations and field decisions involving these utilities.

The County’s project consultant estimated that as many as fifteen Xcel Energy transmission line towers may need to be relocated as a result of the proposed Transitway. The City’s Right-of-Way Management Ordinance currently requires that any proposed reconstruction, relocation, or replacement of overhead utility lines over 300 feet be buried underground. This code requirement may apply to this situation.

Many areas of Golden Valley have substandard soils which are unsuitable for construction without proper correction or engineering. A good portion of the Transitway corridor through Golden Valley is located within floodplain, lowland, or wetland areas. In addition, there are areas in Golden Valley that were found to be filled with construction debris or hazardous materials in the past. The City requests that a careful and detailed analysis of the soils be included as part of the project.
The City of Golden Valley respectfully requests that these concerns be addressed in a sufficient manner, and that they become part of public record associated with the Bottineau Transitway Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As stated before, the City recognizes the regional significance of transit in the northwest metro area, but remains concerned over the significant impacts that the D-1 Alignment would have on Golden Valley. Thank you for working with the City to address these concerns.

Respectfully,

Shepard Harris, Mayor

Mike Freiberg, Council Member

Paula Pentel, Council Member

DeDe Scanlon, Council Member

Joanie Clausen, Council Member
RESOLUTION NO. 12-016
CITY OF MAPLE GROVE
RESOLUTION FORWARDING COMMENTS AND FINDINGS REGARDING THE PROPOSED BOTTINEAU TRANSITWAY SCOPING STUDY

WHEREAS, the Bottineau Transitway is proposed to extend from the Northwest Suburbs, including Maple Grove, to downtown Minneapolis on a dedicated right-of-way as either a light rail transit line (LRT) or a bus rapid transit line (BRT) in order to satisfy the long term regional mobility and accessibility needs for businesses and the traveling public and,

WHEREAS, the Bottineau Transitway is currently in the federal environmental review process and as part of that process a number of alignments are considered as part of the Scoping Study and,

WHEREAS, the Scoping Study helps refine the number of alignments forwarded on for further review and,

WHEREAS, the Cities along the corridor are able to comment and give feedback regarding what alignments should be reviewed further as well as any other comments regarding the project and,

WHEREAS, LRT alignments A-C-D1 and A-C-D2 originate in the Gravel Mining Area of Maple Grove and are currently proposed to follow the alignment of a future extension of Arbor Lakes Parkway and,

WHEREAS, the City of Maple Grove currently operates Maple Grove Transit service with express routes to downtown Minneapolis utilizing a federally funded transit station and,

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Maple Grove makes the following:

FINDINGS

A. The City of Maple Grove and development in the Gravel Mining Area would be impacted by the construction of a LRT system in the city that would connect the City of Maple Grove to downtown Minneapolis and the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport with a dedicated transit line.
B. The City of Maple Grove’s existing Maple Grove Transit operation has the potential to be affected by such a system and issues related to the continuation of the federally funded transit center would need to be resolved.

C. The location of such an LRT system in the city has the potential to impact the right-of-way of a future extension of Arbor Lakes Parkway.

DECISION

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Maple Grove and based upon the information received and the above Findings:

1. The City of Maple Grove supports forwarding on for review the Alignment A-C-D1, A-C-D2, B-C-D1, B-C-D2 as they can help meet the needs and purpose outlined in the Scoping Study.

2. If the alignment of the transitway is located in the right-of-way of a future Arbor Lakes Parkway, the line should be located on the north side of the street and not be center running.

3. If a Bottineau Transitway route alignment located in Maple Grove, either upon initial start-up of transit operations or after start-up of operations to maximum not to exceed 30 years, renders the Maple Grove Transit Station located at 12350 Main Street North to be obsolete of its current designated transit use, Hennepin County will bear the cost to decommission the facility. Furthermore, while the City of Maple Grove will retain ownership of the parcel, it will not be responsible to pay back any pro rata share of Federal, State or Metropolitan Council grants to purchase land and to construct the Maple Grove Transit Station due to failure to maintain capital asset for designated purpose for 50 years as pursuant to the following documents:

   a) Transportation Advisory Board Solicitation document for federal funding grants dated July 19, 1999,
   b) CMAQ Grant Funding Application submitted by the City of Maple Grove for the Maple Grove Transit Hub dated September 20, 1999,
   c) Project Memorandum for the Maple Grove Transit Station SP 189-595-01; CMA 2703(143) approved by the Minnesota Department of Transportation on October 10, 2002,
   d) Regional Transit Capital agreement No. SG-02-72 between the City of Maple Grove and the Metropolitan Council fully executed on October 21, 2002 and subsequent amendments one and two,
   e) Purchase Agreement (document #6400/00283/315376.9) between Opus Northwest, L.L.C., and the City of Maple Grove for the 4.28 acre Transit Station parcel fully executed on October 24, 2002,and
f) Regional Transit Capital agreement No. SG-04-032 between the City of Maple Grove and the Metropolitan Council fully executed on May 13, 2004.

3. The City’s affirmation of support for this project does not in any way obligate current or future City of Maple Grove funds to be used for the construction and/or operation of the Bottineau Transitway.

Motion to approve the foregoing findings, conclusions, and decision was made by Leith and seconded by Johnson, upon a vote being duly taken thereon, the following voted in favor thereof: Acting Mayor Jaeger, Councilmembers Leith, Johnson

and the following were against: None

and the following were absent: Mayor Steffenson, Councilmember Sargent

whereupon, the resolution was declared duly passed and adopted the 21st day of February, 2012.

STATE OF MINNESOTA )
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN ) SS.
CITY OF MAPLE GROVE )

I, the undersigned, being the duly qualified and acting Clerk of the City of Maple Grove, Hennepin County, Minnesota, a Minnesota municipal corporation, hereby certify that the above and foregoing Resolution No. 12-016 is a true and correct copy of the Resolution as adopted by the City Council on the 21st day of February, 2012.

Al Madsen, City Clerk
City of Minneapolis Bottineau DEIS Scoping Comments
Approved by City Council 2/15/2012

The following comments on the scope of issues and alternatives to be studied in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement reflect the extreme difficulty that the City of Minneapolis has in supporting either of the alignment alternatives through Minneapolis: D1, which bypasses the neighborhoods in North Minneapolis, and D2, which, while promising some economic development, divides, and in other ways negatively impacts the neighborhoods in North Minneapolis.

1. Alignment Alternatives Issues

The City of Minneapolis has significant concerns with the impacts of the D2 alignment alternative. The D2c alignment alternative through North Minneapolis along West Broadway and Penn Avenue North has significant negative impacts on the communities in North Minneapolis. Like most North Minneapolis streets, it has a narrow right-of-way width (66 feet on Penn Avenue N and 75 feet on West Broadway Avenue) and requires right-of-way acquisition along a 1+ mile stretch of Penn Avenue North, including all of the single-family homes on the west side of the street, in order to fit the LRT and maintain two-way traffic. The remaining parcels on the west side of Penn Avenue would be substantially smaller, and it is not known whether they could be redeveloped. In addition, West Broadway Avenue would be reduced from 4 traffic lanes to 2 traffic lanes, and the existing off-peak on-street parking would be removed. There has been significant study of subalternatives for the D2 alignment on Penn and Oliver avenues (D2a and D2b); these subalternatives also had significant negative impacts. City staff, with the assistance of the Bottineau project team, have not been able to identify other alternative alignment options through North Minneapolis for LRT or dedicated busway modes that do not have similar significant negative impacts due to the physical constraints of existing neighborhoods with narrow street rights-of-way throughout North Minneapolis.

The City of Minneapolis also has significant concerns with the D1 alignment alternative. One of the factors contributing to the need for the Bottineau Transitway project is to improve transit access for the high proportion of people who depend on transit in the study area. As stated in the DEIS Scoping Booklet, 14% of households in the project area do not own a vehicle, compared with only 8% regionwide, but that in some areas of North Minneapolis, the number of zero-car households exceeds 50%. The D1 alignment alternative, however, largely bypasses these transit-dependent communities in North Minneapolis and does not extend the transportation and economic development benefits provided by the transitway directly to these communities.

One significant reason to choose one alignment over another is the positive economic development impacts which can result from transit investment, and specifically rail construction. The City of Minneapolis believes that little development would result from the D1 alignment, and that minimal development would result from the D2 alignment. North Minneapolis could certainly benefit from the positive economic development effects of transit investment, however, and so the City believes that the region should pursue other
arterial transitway improvements (fixed rail modern streetcar on Broadway or rapid bus on Penn Avenue, Emerson/Fremont Avenues, etc), as well as transit-oriented development initiatives, in North Minneapolis.

The City of Minneapolis believes the D1 vs. D2 alignment decision must be presented in the context of potential improvements to the transit network as a whole, rather than solely in the context of the opportunities presented by the Bottineau Transitway project. Unlike the impacts of the D2 alignment alternative, the City of Minneapolis believes that the issues of concern associated with the D1 alignment could be avoided through improvements to the broader transit network, including specifically one or more arterial transitway projects (streetcar or rapid bus) connecting North Minneapolis to the regional transitway system via premium transit service along arterial streets, potentially including West Broadway Avenue, Penn Avenue and Emerson/Fremont Avenues. These types of transitway improvements generally operate in mixed traffic and are more compatible with the existing neighborhoods and narrow street rights-of-way in North Minneapolis. Metro Transit is currently studying these types of premium transit improvements through the Arterial Transitway Corridors Study; however, there has been no commitment to fund and implement these improvements.

Existing city plans support the development of an arterial transitway network, in addition to supporting the development of a regional transitway network, including Bottineau. The City’s comprehensive plan, The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth directs growth and redevelopment into a pattern of corridors and nodes along transit corridors (see the activity centers, commercial corridors, community corridors, neighborhood commercial nodes, and transit station areas in Attachment A), and the city’s Access Minneapolis Citywide Transportation Action Plan supports these growth policies by recommending a Primary Transit Network (PTN) along those corridors that is a permanent network of all-day transit service, either bus or rail, that is reliable, frequent, maintains reasonable speeds, and has vehicles and passenger facilities that have the same amenities and quality of service as rail transit (see Attachment B). To further coordinate economic development and transit service in these corridors, the City undertook the Minneapolis Streetcar Feasibility Study to identify the PTN corridors with the greatest potential for streetcar to both increase transit ridership and catalyze economic development. Fourteen corridors were evaluated, including West Broadway Avenue, Penn Avenue, and Emerson/Fremont Avenue, and West Broadway was recommended for the long-term network of seven streetcar corridors citywide (see Attachment C).

In addition to these City priorities, Metro Transit is also currently studying rapid bus improvements (also termed “arterial BRT”) through the Arterial Transitway Corridors Study on many of these same corridors including West Broadway Avenue and is considering future study on Emerson/Fremont avenues (see Attachment D). The City strongly supports the future study of rapid bus improvements on Emerson/Fremont avenues and Penn Avenue N.

These arterial transitway improvements are needed now, regardless of a Bottineau Transitway improvement, because they improve the quality of transit service of existing high-ridership bus routes that are planned to remain in place with the Bottineau Transitway improvement. While they will improve transit connections between North Minneapolis and
the Bottineau Transitway, they do not duplicate the transit service to be provided in the future by the Bottineau Transitway. Therefore, the City of Minneapolis strongly supports implementing these arterial transitway improvements in North Minneapolis independently from the Bottineau Transitway project.

**Recommendation:** The City of Minneapolis recommends that the DEIS include an analysis of the distribution of the project's benefits relative to the transit-dependent, minority and low-income communities in the corridor for the D1 alignment alternative. The City also recommends that, separate from the Bottineau Transitway project, the Twin Cities region pursue arterial transitway improvements (streetcar or rapid bus) and transit-oriented development initiatives on one or more arterial streets in North Minneapolis, potentially including West Broadway Avenue, Penn Avenue North, and Emerson/Fremont Avenue N.

2. **D1 Reverse-Commute Feeder Bus Network**

One of the factors contributing to the need for the Bottineau Transitway project, as stated in the DEIS Scoping Booklet, is to improve transit access in the reverse-commute direction between Minneapolis and the inner northwest suburbs to schools and jobs in Maple Grove and Brooklyn Park. Because the D1 alignment alternative largely bypasses North Minneapolis, as stated in comment #2, it is extremely important that the feeder bus network be modified to provide convenient transit connections to the D1-C stations from North and Northeast Minneapolis neighborhoods in the reverse commute direction. Currently, the majority of bus service in North Minneapolis, particularly in neighborhoods north of Lowry Avenue, terminates at the Brooklyn Center Transit Center, which does not connect with the D1-C stations, and there is poor transit connectivity between the D1 alignment and Northeast Minneapolis with only one infrequent bus route on Lowry Avenue crossing the river. In the inbound direction, the existing bus network provides reasonable connections to the LRT system in downtown and the D1 alignment on Highway 55.

**Recommendation:** The City of Minneapolis recommends that the DEIS include an evaluation of reverse-commute feeder bus connection options from North and Northeast Minneapolis to the D1 alignment and identify improvements to the feeder bus network to the D1 alignment connecting residents in North and Northeast Minneapolis with jobs and schools in the northwest suburbs.

3. **D1 Station Locations in Theodore Wirth Park**

The two D1 alignment station location options in Theodore Wirth Park just west of the North Minneapolis neighborhoods are at Golden Valley Road and Plymouth Avenue. There are benefits to both of these station locations. The Golden Valley Road station has more roadway connections through both Minneapolis and Golden Valley, and these roadways are designed to carry heavy vehicles; it therefore, offers more opportunities for feeder bus connections, which is particularly important for neighborhoods north of West Broadway Avenue. The Plymouth Avenue station provides direct access to the main entrance of Theodore Wirth Park, a regional park, and has more housing units within a ½ mile radius of
the station than the Golden Valley Road station; however, it has fewer opportunities for feeder bus connections. The proximity and use of these two stations is similar to the 46th St and 50th Street/Minnchasha Park stations on the Hiawatha LRT.

Recommendation: The City of Minneapolis recommends that the DEIS include an evaluation of the benefits and costs of including stations at both Golden Valley Rd and Plymouth Avenue along the D1 alignment.

4. D1/D2 Highway 55 Pedestrian Environment

Both the D1 and D2 alignment alternatives run on Highway 55 into downtown Minneapolis. Highway 55 is a wide, multi-lane roadway with residential neighborhoods on either side. There are currently pedestrian crossings every 1/16 to 1/8 mile along Highway 55 through either signalized intersections or uncontrolled pedestrian crossings connecting the discontinuous streets to the north and south. The introduction of a transitway and potential redevelopment spurred by the transitway will increase the number of pedestrians crossing this busy roadway to access stations or other neighborhood destinations. It is important that pedestrian crossing opportunities be conveniently located and safely designed to accommodate this increased pedestrian activity. In addition, the initial D1/D2 alignment concepts on Highway 55 included geometric changes to add turning lanes, resulting in a wider roadway for pedestrians to cross and narrowing space behind the curb for sidewalks and tree boulevards, which could be contrary to the goal of creating a transit-oriented, pedestrian-oriented environment around the stations.

Recommendation: The City of Minneapolis recommends that the DEIS evaluate the impacts of the transitway and associated roadway design on pedestrian safety along Highway 55 and identify safe and convenient pedestrian infrastructure improvements.

5. BRT Interchange/Target Field Station

The Bottineau Optimized BRT alternative developed at the end of the Alternatives Analysis study and shown in the inset map on page 7 of the Scoping Booklet runs on 5th Street, similar to the LRT alternatives, but does not stop at The Interchange/Target Field, different from the LRT alternatives. The BRT alternative has stations approximately ¼ mile west of The Interchange at Border Avenue and approximately ½ mile east of The Interchange at Hennepin Avenue and 4th Street. These station locations will require transit riders to walk several blocks to access Northstar Commuter Rail and Target Field; this is particularly an issue on Twins game days when LRT ridership is very high to Target Field.

Recommendation: The City of Minneapolis recommends that the DEIS evaluate alternative Target Field station location options and/or pedestrian access improvements for the BRT alternative that provide more convenient access to Target Field and the Interchange than the proposed Border Avenue station.
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Attachment B: Primary Transit Network

Source: Access Minneapolis Citywide Transportation Action Plan, 2009 (with current Bottineau alignment alternatives)
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Attachment C: Minneapolis Long-Term Streetcar Network
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Source: Minneapolis Streetcar Feasibility Study, 2007 (with current Bottineau alignment alternatives)
Attachment D: Potential Rapid Bus Corridors

Source: Metro Transit Arterial Transitway Corridors Study, currently underway
CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS
CERTIFICATION

STATE OF MINNESOTA )
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN ) SS
CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS )

I, Casey Joe Carl, City Clerk of the City of Minneapolis, in the County of Hennepin, State of Minnesota, certify that I have examined the attached copy of a Transportation & Public Works Committee Report, concerning the Bottineau Transitway Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), adopted February 15, 2012, approved by the Mayor February 15, 2012, and to be officially published February 18, 2012, and have carefully compared the same with the original on file in this office, and that the attached copy is a true, correct and complete copy of the original.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have signed and affixed the city seal on February 17, 2012.

City Clerk

[Signature]
T&PW - Your Committee, having under consideration the Bottineau Transitway Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process, which was referred back to the Transportation and Public Works Committee by the City Council on February 10, 2012, now recommends:

a) Accepting the invitation that the City of Minneapolis become a participating agency for the Bottineau Transitway Draft Environmental Impact Statement process; and

b) Approval and submittal of comments, dated February 14, 2012, on the scope of issues to be studied in the Bottineau Transitway Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNCIL MEMBER</th>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>NOT VOTING</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
<th>VOTE TO OVERRIDE</th>
<th>VOTE TO SUSTAIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reich</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstede</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuels</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillgren</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECORD OF COUNCIL VOTE (X INDICATES VOTE)
February 17, 2012

Brent Rusco
Bottineau Transitway Project Manager
Hennepin County
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415

Dear Mr. Rusco:

Thank you for inviting comment during the scoping phase of the proposed Bottineau Transitway and for providing a presentation of the project to the Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board (MPRB) of Commissioners on February 1, 2012. As you are aware, the MPRB owns, maintains and operates nearly 7,000 acres of parkland and water in and near the City of Minneapolis. The MPRB’s mission is as follows:

The MPRB shall permanently preserve, protect, maintain, improve, and enhance its natural resources, parkland, and recreational opportunities for current and future generations.

The MPRB exists to provide places and recreation opportunities for all people to gather, celebrate, contemplate, and engage in activities that promote health, well-being, community, and the environment.

It is within the context of our mission that the MPRB makes the comments contained in this letter. There are three overall messages the MPRB wishes to express regarding the Bottineau Transitway:

- The MPRB supports the Bottineau Transitway and a light rail transit plan for it.
- The MPRB believes that for numerous significant reasons, the D2 Alignment using Pean Avenue is the best and only legitimate option for the locally-preferred alternative.
- The MPRB unanimously opposes the D1 Alignment adjacent to Theodore Wirth Regional Park for reasons articulated in this letter.

In review of the proposed routes, the MPRB believes that the D2 Alignment presents the greatest opportunities for urban revival, economic development, strong ridership, and transportation equity in North Minneapolis and therefore is the only legitimate option. In addition, the MPRB believes that the D1 Alignment presents great potential for significant impacts to current and potential natural resources, parkland, and recreation opportunities it is entrusted to protect.
The MPRB offers the following additional comments to the scoping process:

1) Theodore Wirth Regional Park and Wirth Memorial Parkway Regional Trail are part of the MPRB's Grand Rounds. The Grand Rounds is considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The D1 and D2 Alignments will need to be assessed to ensure significant historic characteristics of the Grand Rounds are preserved.

2) Theodore Wirth Regional Park is part of the Metropolitan Regional Park system. The proposed station at either Golden Valley Road or Plymouth Avenue requires land currently owned by the MPRB. As such, loss of park acreage due to the D1 Alignment or potential stations at Golden Valley Road or Plymouth Avenue will require a thorough review of original property deeds and current Metropolitan Council policies related to disposition of regional parklands. If it is determined that the Bottineau Transitway project is required to replace MPRB land that is taken for the project, the MPRB will require that the replacement land be free and clear of environmental concerns and suitable for park use.

3) The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board's Ordinance PB-5 outlines bus transportation restrictions on MPRB parkways. It states:

"While the board may, under exceptional circumstances, be prompted for good and sufficient reasons to grant the restricted use of certain sections of the parkways and boulevard system for bus transportation, it should be understood that such permits will be considered temporary, and that it is the board's fullest expectation and earnest request that other suitable routes over city streets and highways be provided and suitably improved, and that any such temporary permit for use of the roads under the jurisdiction of the board will always be promptly withdrawn when the board deems its continuance inadvisable or the cause of its issuance removed."

Therefore, it is critical that the projected ridership does not assume that bus routes on MPRB parkways are added to increase ridership at proposed stations for the D1 or D2 Alignment.

4) Currently, a path exists along the eastern edge of Theodore Wirth Regional Park. This is an important route for the community through the park. It is the MPRB's intent to restore and retain a trail in this area. It is critical that this be included in design development, if the D1 Alignment is selected.

5) A portion of the D1 Alignment parallels the eastern boundary of Theodore Wirth Regional Park. The increased frequency of LRT or BRT travel in addition to current rail services along this segment is expected to increase the barrier between the community and Theodore Wirth Regional Park, create a significant barrier for wildlife near Bassett Creek, and permanently and significantly alter the passive recreation opportunities on the eastern side of the park. Therefore, if the D1 Alignment continues to move forward, it is critical that this impact to parkland, wildlife, and recreation be identified and addressed in future corridor consideration, environmental assessments, and design development.
6) Currently, the Highway 55 underpass along the D1 Alignment is used by pedestrians, bikers, and skiers. As a critical segment of the Luce Line Regional Trail and the winter cross-country ski trails, it is essential that this area continue to be passable by cyclists, pedestrians, and cross-country skiers. Additionally, the available space needs to accommodate ski trail grooming equipment.

7) The D1 Alignment would have significant floodway and floodplain impacts. The master planning for Theodore Wirth Regional Park that is currently in progress is addressing multiple recreation, habitat restoration and ecosystem protection goals and interests. Due to these goals and interests, it is not expected that the park will be able to accommodate floodway or floodplain mitigation for the transit project.

8) The median of Highway 55 is the site of a previous Arbor Day event. It was planted with disease resistant elms by the MPRB. Mitigation for removal of any trees along this corridor will be expected by the MPRB.

9) If the D1 Alignment is selected for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the MRPB recommends inclusion of Golden Valley Road and Plymouth Avenue station in the analysis. While it is understood that only one would be built if the alignment is chosen, it is critical that both are fully evaluated.

Again, thank you for inviting comment on the Bottineau Transitway. As this project moves forward, we look forward to Hennepin County’s proactive coordination with the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board of Commissioners and staff.

Sincerely,

John Erwin, MPRB Board President

Cc: MPRB Commissioners
    Jayne Miller, Superintendent
Member Rogan moved and Member Blonigan seconded a motion that the following resolution be read and adopted this 14th day of February 2012.

RESOLUTION NO. 7143

A RESOLUTION IDENTIFYING ISSUES FOR FURTHER STUDY IN THE BOTTINEAU TRANSITWAY ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

WHEREAS, the City of Robbinsdale has participated in the alternatives analysis process for the Bottineau Transitway planning; and

WHEREAS, the City of Robbinsdale has solicited comments from the Planning Commission, the Parks and Recreation Commission and affected property owners including direct mailing announcements and has hosted three open houses with very high attendance; and

WHEREAS, the Bottineau Transitway includes three segments in Robbinsdale known as C, D-1 and D-2 which have general and specific concerns regarding the impact on adjacent and nearby residential properties and neighborhoods;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Robbinsdale supports Light Rail Transit for the Bottineau Transitway and supports the C-D1 Alternative;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Robbinsdale submits the following comments that it believes require further study in the environmental analysis process for the two segments under study in Robbinsdale:

I. Purpose and Need for the Project.
The Transitway will:
- Provide enhanced connection and an additional transit alternative to access jobs, areas of high growth, schools, housing, healthcare and activity centers;
- Significantly enhance the transit options for Robbinsdale and neighboring city’s residents;
- Respond to the region’s (and Robbindale’s) increasing traffic congestion by providing an alternative to roadway travel as a method of managing transportation demand;
- Offer Robbinsdale residents time-efficient, express transit service to both urban and suburban destinations; and
- Provide enhanced economic development opportunities for downtown Robbinsdale.
II. Alternatives Proposed for Study.

C - D1 Alternative

From a local perspective, the City Council supports the alignment described as Segments C and D1 within the BNSF Railroad right-of-way. Study of C - D1 alternative should include:

- The main items that must be studied in detail are noise, vibration, vehicular traffic and parking, including the following:
  - Traffic delays/congestion caused at crossings with preemption particularly at County Road 9/42nd Ave. N. with a variety of bus (school, metro mobility, etc.) traffic required to stop at crossing in addition to stops for transit traffic crossings and methods to mitigate these impacts;
  - Noise and vibration impacts and loss of privacy to adjacent residential properties and possible methods to mitigate these impacts;
  - Specific study is required on loss of privacy, noise and vibration impacts in locations where the LRT tracks are elevated (such as north of County Road 9) and homes are near the railroad right-of-way;
  - Specific study is required of the impact (specifically noise and vibration) on several residential dwelling units that will be as close as 35 feet from the presumed relocation of the freight railroad tracks and the addition of two light rail tracks and several dwellings including one high density residential building (Windsor Court Apartments) which will be 25 feet from the closest set of light rail tracks and what mitigation efforts are needed;
  - Study of these impacts is especially necessary because the very close proximity of the above mentioned homes to the relocated freight and new light-rail tracks and the impact has not been experienced elsewhere in the metro area on the Hiawatha light rail system;
  - Study of the impact of Park and Ride demand at and near the Hubbard Marketplace transit station is needed. This parking will have a significant impact on traffic and could have an impact on available surface parking essential to the nearby compact downtown which already depends on shared parking;
  - Study of the crossing at 39 ½ Ave. N. for mitigation of noise caused by signal controls and impacts on the neighborhood and traffic if the crossing is not closed;
- Impact on drainage in the post developed Burlington Northern Railroad right-of-way;
- Impact of increased noise and vibration due to Burlington Northern Railroad track being moved closer to properties on the west side of the railroad right-of-way;
- Wetland mitigation and flood plain compensating storage requirements will be required for the construction of the light rail lines in the flood plain;
- Impacts to the natural/quiet character of the park as a result of the movement, noise and vibration;
D2 Alternative

The D2 alignment creates significant additional impacts on the City of Robbinsdale. In addition to the items discussed in C - D1 Alternative, study of the D2 alternative should include:

- Impacts caused by noise, vibration, vehicular traffic and parking in the areas south of 36th Avenue;
- Impacts of increased noise, vibration and traffic resulting from a new Light rail crossing at France and Oakdale Avenues North;
- Impacts on North Memorial;
- Impacts on the neighborhood south of 36th Avenue that will become fragmented and isolated as a result of the closure of local street crossings in Robbinsdale and the new LRT Line;
- The difficulty of emergency access through "bottlenecks" resulting from local street closings;
- Dislocation/relocation of affected property owners/tenants. The 34th Ave. alignment directly affects at least 13 dwelling units and significantly affects more than twice that number;
- Movement, noise, vibration and visual impact to adjacent properties including several dwelling units that will be only 45 feet from the center of the tracks;
- Impacts to aging foundations of homes built in the 1920's by vibration caused by the light rail lines only 45 feet away and by the construction of the rail lines;
- Safety at controlled crossings particularly for pedestrians and safety for individuals that may not cross at controlled crossings;
- Impacts and disruption to neighboring residential and commercial properties during the construction process;
- Costs associated with acquisition of right of way, mitigation, and construction; and
- Impacts on vehicle traffic on Bottineau Boulevard, West Broadway, and Victory Memorial Parkway.

The question was on the adoption of the resolution and upon a vote being taken thereon, the following voted in favor thereof: Blonigan, Rogan, Selman, Backen, Mayor Holtz

and the following voted against the same: None

WHEREUPON SAID RESOLUTION WAS DECLARED DULY PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 14TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2012.

Michael A. Holtz, Mayor

ATTEST

Tom Marshall, City Clerk
(SEAL)

Res 7143
IX. Organizations
February 17, 2012

To: Brent Rusco
    Bottineau Transitway Study Manager

From: Larry Hiscock
    Director/Lead Organizer

Re: DEIS Scoping Comment

The Harrison Neighborhood Association voted to submit public comment requesting that the DEIS take into consideration the impact on job creation, affordable housing, creation of community amenity, promoting the sense of place, and does not displace the existing community.

The following are specific concerns that should be included in the DEIS Scoping:

1. **Promotion of Long-term Employment Opportunities**: Harrison and North Minneapolis experience substantial racial disparities regarding unemployment. The overall unemployment rate for Harrison is 20.5% for Hispanic residents it is 25% and for African Americans it is 32.5%. The analysis done should take into consideration job centers, workforce characteristics, and needed employment linkages to address entrenched racial and economic disparities in North Minneapolis.

2. **Build Wealth and Value without Displacing Low and Moderate Income Households**: Much of the rental housing in Harrison is single-family homes. These homes have been affordable to low-income and moderate-income families needing multiple rooms and yard space. What impact will the line have on the land values and loss of affordable rental opportunities of existing Harrison families?

3. **Pedestrian Connectivity**: Olson Highway is four lanes with turn lanes. Adding a LRT line may add additional barriers limiting pedestrian access, further segment communities, may create safety concerns, and may create traffic patterns unsupportive redevelopment/revitalization for the surrounding community. The DEIS should consider the impact of the transit line on traffic pedestrian/automobile/bicycle to ensure transit oriented development.

4. **Importance of a full Environmental Justice Analysis to Support Racial and Economic Equity**: Attached are two planning maps from 1935. One in an original form and the other is an overlay of current neighborhoods and highway.

503 Irving Avenue North, Minneapolis, MN 55405 ☏ 612-374-4849, ☏ 612-374-9777
www.hnampls.org
placement. It is vital this DEIS looks at the long-term cumulative impacts (positive and negative) that the Bottineau LRT Line will have on the historic populations of North Minneapolis. This should include the impacts on health, housing, educational, employment, business opportunities and access to needed services.

Below are the Guiding Principles that the Harrison Neighborhood Association uses to evaluate public and private investments in the community. We request that the DEIS addresses the principles below.

**Guiding Principles for Redevelopment**

*Overarching Guiding Principle: We, the people of Harrison, view redevelopment as an opportunity to improve the lives of the people who currently live and work in the Harrison Neighborhood. We will not support redevelopment which does not benefit the existing community. Sixty-six percent of us are people of color; sixty-three percent of our children live in poverty; and nearly a quarter of us speak a language other than English at home.*

**RESIDENTIAL/HOUSING**

Redevelopment shall:
- Preserve and improve existing housing in the BCV area while safeguarding against displacement and gentrification.
- Create a wide variety of new housing options—both single family and multi-family, both ownership and rental—at a mix of affordability levels to meet the housing needs of future, but especially current, residents.

**ECONOMIC**

- Provide long- and short-term living wage jobs for area residents.
- Create work opportunities and resources for existing businesses in Harrison, with an emphasis on those that are minority and female owned.
- Establish links between educational/job training resources and neighborhood residents, including youth, to enhance employment opportunities.
- Set minority and female construction participation goals above City minimums; provide for the necessary outreach to attain these goals.

**ENVIRONMENT**

- Improve the air, water and land quality within the Bassett Creek Valley. This is to be achieved through permitting, monitoring and regulating all industrial pollution in the BCV, this is also to be achieved through incorporating green space into each industrial site in a way that reduces run-off pollution and litter.
- Increase public access to new and existing green spaces within the BCV and adjacent areas by creating north and south open space corridors.
- Protect the ecological integrity of the creek and surrounding wildlife habitat by restoring Bassett’s Creek to a more natural and meandering route.

503 Irving Avenue North, Minneapolis, MN 55405 or 612-374-4849, f 612-374-9777
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• Use green building materials made with safe building materials.

QUALITY OF LIFE/COMMUNITY
• Address the basic retail and service needs of the people who live and work in and around the Harrison neighborhood
• Support HNA in creating a "sense of place" in the Basset Creek Valley and within the larger neighborhood that reaches across culture and economic classes.
• Create designs that are pedestrian friendly and fully accessible, that inhibits crime and improve the sense of safety.
• Improve linkages to other parts of the city and surrounding areas.
Institutionalized Racism: History
Minneapolis and Harrison
Comments submitted in response to the Bottineau Transitway Scoping Booklet
January 2012 Minneapolis, MN

To: Brent Rusco
Bottineau Transitway Project Manager
Hennepin County
701 Fourth Ave. S., Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55406

From: David Greene
ISAIAH
2720 E. 22nd St.
Minneapolis, MN 55406
612-333-1260
612-747-1982
greene@obbligato.org

February 17, 2012

ISAIAH is a coalition of 100 churches in the Twin Cities and St. Cloud regions. We advocate for racial and economic justice in our communities through several avenues, including public policy and public infrastructure investment.

These are our comments in response to the Bottineau Transitway Scoping booklet, specifically on the project purpose, environmental justice impacts and potential alignments.

Project Purpose

The Bottineau Transitway must have serving the needs of environmental justice communities as a core purpose. This should be clearly stated in the official project purpose to ensure that the project does not primarily provide benefits to communities outside North Minneapolis and primarily negatively impact North Minneapolis.

Environmental Justice

Because of the history of disinvestment and marginalization of North Minneapolis communities, Environmental Justice must be a central focus of any study of the Bottineau Transitway. The study must focus on cumulative impacts as well as the immediate impacts of the project on North Minneapolis neighborhoods.

While we will call out some particular points of interest, we do not intend this list to fully encompass all Environmental Justice criteria the Environmental Impact Statement should include.
Any alignment for the project must provide access to regional opportunities and amenities for residents of Environmental Justice Communities. The EIS should include studies of how proposed stations will serve these communities. The EIS should include a study of how the project will provide access to opportunity for Environmental Justice communities. This study should indicate job center locations, current travel patterns for residents and how they will be served by the project. Our comments on alignment issues below also cover additional environmental justice issues.

Across the country, 1/4 mile is the standard for considering pedestrian access to stations. Access studies should use the 1/4 mile standard for determining which areas will have pedestrian access to stations.

A possible additional Plymouth Ave. station on the D1 alignment should be included in the EIS and evaluated for economic development and access impacts.

Alignment Options

Of the two proposed alignments suggested by the Policy Advisory Committee, D1 and D2-c, one (D2-c) destroys houses and businesses along Penn Ave. N., an important artery in North Minneapolis. Multiple community meetings and surveys indicate that North Minneapolis residents strongly object to the D2-c alignment. This is no choice at all, leaving the study with only one viable alignment alternative. Such a study is inherently incomplete.

While the scoping booklet mentions the D2-a, D2-b and D2-c options, it does not mention the D2-d and D2-w options though Hennepin county presented them as possibilities at several community meetings. We are concerned that potentially viable options were taken off the table in favor of an option that no one in the community supports. None of the options other than D2-c appears on current publications and we have been unable to find documents explaining why the county dropped the other D2 options.

The EIS should include further investigation of one or more of the other D2 alignment options - D2-a, D2-b, D2-d and D2-w. These are options that generally follow the Penn Ave. route but have a much lower negative impact on the neighborhood. In particular the study should compare these options against the PAC recommendations, including studies of environmental justice, access and economic development benefits and impacts.

If one or more of these other D2 options is truly not viable, further documents should clearly explain why. We believe that at least one other D2 option should be viable compared to D2-c as tearing down houses and buildings has significant costs and environmental justice issues.

A study of the D2 options should pay particular attention to impacts on pedestrian mobility. The study should determine whether pedestrian crossings of Penn. Ave. should be restricted and how. The study should
carefully evaluate pedestrian connectivity of the impacted neighborhoods and try to maintain good connectivity.

We believe the D1 alignment could have serious access issues for North Minneapolis residents. It runs on the west fringes of North Minneapolis and below grade. The EIS should clearly indicate how residents will access the transitway in the D1 scenario. We understand that local bus service can be realigned and/or a streetcar on West Broadway could provide better access. The EIS should acknowledge these options and indicate the minimal frequencies of operation and routing needed to provide equal access to the Bottineau Transitway for Environmental Justice communities.

In addition, the D1 alignment removes nearly all possible direct economic benefits of the line for North Minneapolis. The EIS should include studies of economic development scenarios for the D1 and various D2 alignments to determine whether benefits of the project accrue equally to Environmental Justice Communities. Economic benefits include access to jobs outside of the North Minneapolis community, economic development within North Minneapolis and the ability of people outside North Minneapolis to access North Minneapolis businesses and amenities.
Commissioner Johnson:

I just read the detailed article in the Osseo Maple Grove Press, "Connecting the Northwest Suburbs". I understand that the County is seeking public comment on the proposed project, The Bottineau Transitway. I understand the need to connect the northwest suburbs to the rest of the metro, as well as to keep up with regional population increases and encourage economic development. I also know the importance of getting feedback from your constituents.

**Was a public hearing meeting considered for the Maple Grove community?**

Maple Grove is the second largest retail community in the state of Minnesota following only Mall of America. There is also an Arbor Lakes Business Association that I am sure would be interested in learning more about the project, as well as the tenants at The Shoppes at Arbor Lakes. In addition, the City of Maple Grove has integrated a variety of housing options located near the Maple Grove option that you are proposing to end the Bottineau Trail.

**Why are public comments only being received through February 17th?**

I recently attended the State of the City for the communities of Maple Grove, Osseo, Brooklyn Park and Brooklyn Center and heard nothing about this. I think that Maple Grove residents would be interested in learning more about the project and let you know if you have "got it right". Evening meetings located in Minneapolis and other suburban locations are not convenient for Maple Grove residents, of which many commute.

I challenge you and the Board to consider getting public comment from all areas that will be served and affected by the proposed Bottineau Trail.

Thank you,

Wendy T. Thompson, CMD  
General Manager  
The Shoppes at Arbor Lakes

12450 Elm Creek Boulevard N.  
Maple Grove, MN 55369  
Direct: 763.489.9930  
Fax: 763.424.9456

www.shoppesatarborlakes.com
From: Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us [mailto:Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us]
Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2012 2:44 PM
To: Karen Lee Rosar
Cc: 'Heinle, DJ'; Beth Bartz; Joseph.Gladke@co.hennepin.mn.us
Subject: Re: Bottineau LRT Scoping Comments

Karen,

Thanks very much for your scoping input for the Bottineau Transitway Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

From: "Karen Lee Rosar" <karen.rosar@comcast.net>
To: <brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>, <bottineau@co.hennepin.mn.us>
Cc: "Heinle, DJ" <DJ.Heinle@cmarch.com>
Date: 01/22/2012 03:12 PM
Subject: Bottineau LRT Scoping Comments

Greetings Brent

I wanted to write to you at this important juncture to reaffirm the North Loop Neighborhood Association's (NLNA) support for the Bottineau LRT as originally submitted to you, in the letter of support attached, on November 19 2009.

Additionally, I want to let you know that I personally support the Bottineau LRT. I believe LRT is superior to Bus Rapid Transit. LRT has the ability to expand significantly within its own corridor. BRT does not have this ability. Further, the Bottineau LRT would uniquely and efficiently be additive to a Metro LRT system. There is significant opportunity for Transit Oriented Development in the Bottineau corridor and I believe local businesses and municipalities are adopting this efficient use of land and transportation dollars.

Thank you,

Karen Lee Rosar
612-220-5390
karen.rosar@comcast.net
November 19, 2009

Mr. Brent Rusco  
Hennepin County Department of Transit and Community Works  
417 5th St N, Suite 320  
Minneapolis, MN 55401-1362

RE: Bottineau Transitway Light Rail Transit Resolution of Support

Dear Brent:

Thank you for presenting to the North Loop yesterday evening.

The North Loop Neighborhood Association (NLNA) supports the ongoing study and analysis of Bottineau Transitway Light Rail Transit (LRT). The NLNA P & Z Committee will continue to monitor and provide input on the study through:

- Bottineau study Committee representatives (ARCC, CAC, PAC).
- Contact of study staff with questions/comments.
- Future outreach efforts.
- Available study information from email distribution list.
- Visiting Bottineau Transitway website.

The NLNA supports Bottineau Transitway LRT utilizing the Minneapolis Transit Hub to interlink with the Hiawatha LRT, Central Corridor LRT, Southwest Transitway LRT and the Northstar Commuter Rail. The NLNA sees this link to the Northwest metropolitan area as essential in building a modern metropolitan transportation system that moves people efficiently, safely, and in a clean environmental manner.
Mr. Brent Rusco  
Hennepin County Department of Transit and Community Works  
November 19, 2009  
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Brent, please let me know if I can answer any questions.

Sincerely,

David R. Frank  
North Loop Neighborhood Association

cc: Phil Essington  
    Erin Fitzgerald  
    Karen Rosar  
    John Slack
February 16, 2012

Mr. Brent Rusco, Bottineau Transitway Project Manager
Hennepin County
701 Fourth Avenue S.
Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415

RE: Scope of Issues for Bottineau Corridor DEIS

Dear Mr. Rusco,

Thank you for providing an opportunity to offer comments and suggestions regarding the scope of the upcoming Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) that will be prepared for the Bottineau Transitway Corridor.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT

1) Better transportation alternatives are desperately needed for the current and future residents of north Minneapolis and the northwest suburban communities. A disproportionate number of lower-income families, newer immigrant communities, and people of color live in these communities and need dependable and affordable travel options so they can get to school and work.

2) Much of the future population growth in the Twin Cities Metropolitan region is expected to occur in the neighborhoods that could be served by the Bottineau transitway.

3) The Twin Cities region is on a path to construct a fixed-route transitway system that allows residents to travel throughout much of the metro area without having to rely completely on a private automobile. The Bottineau transitway is an integral piece of the system and will allow more people to get to more places conveniently and affordably.
Alternatives Proposed for Study

4) The “A” and “B” northern alignments hold great potential for ridership and employment connectivity. Both alignments should be evaluated.

5) Another alternative to consider should be the possibility of constructing both northern alignments for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

6) An alternative should also be considered based on a Minimum Operating Service analysis, for example, terminating at the 63rd or 71st Ave. station. The full build-out of the Bottineau corridor could take place in two phases, first the minimum operating service described above and the second phase coming on-line after more significant development occurs at the Target site in Brooklyn Park and/or the Arbor Lakes site in Maple Grove.

7) Both the D1 and D2 alignments should be given further consideration as both could result in significant ridership and impact to the community.

8) The D2-A alignment with 1-way pairs allowing LRT along Penn Avenue should also be given further consideration since it has different impacts on the existing residents and property owners of the community. The D2-B and D2-C alternatives also are worthy of further study in an effort to minimize the undesirable impact to local residents while achieving an alignment with great potential for the residents.

9) The potential travel sheds should be identified along with the locations where park-and-ride and TOD development opportunities may be possible.

10) Further study of a route through Minneapolis that would run along West Broadway to Washington Avenue might be worthy of consideration. Broadway being the main business corridor through North Minneapolis, a route may be able to better leverage future development opportunities and increase potential ridership, without some of the impacts that the current D2 alignment might create.

11) Both light-rail transit and bus-rapid transit should be given full consideration. To the extent possible, the DEIS should consider assessing the best Bottineau Corridor mode and alignment given recent studies of arterial bus rapid transit and streetcars in portions of the study area.
PROJECT IMPACTS AND BENEFITS TO BE EVALUATED

12) The short- and long-term impacts to the community need to be given full consideration. Short-term might include: construction disruption and temporary relocation of businesses while long-term impacts might include: acquisition of property, noise, and vibration.

13) The physical and quality-of-life benefits to the community must be fully considered. A fixed-route transitway holds great potential to transform the physical environment over time. Local zoning and planning provisions should be evaluated to determine the anticipated real estate potential as well as to evaluate the safeguards in place to ensure that current residents and stakeholders benefit from these physical improvements.

14) Negative outcomes from the alignments must also be fully considered. The potential for forced displacement and gentrification is real. The threat must be fully understood in order to safeguard against undesirable outcomes.

15) Lessons learned from the planning and construction of the Central Corridor LRT illustrate the utter necessity to embrace local residents, businesses and property owners not merely as stakeholders but as partners in the project. The Bottineau transitway must NOT happen 'to' the community but instead must happen 'with' the community.

16) A public investment of this size and scope can bring many employment and profit-making opportunities to lower-income households who desperately need a path to break out from poverty. The role of people of color and lower-income residents in the development, construction and operation of the system must be given sincere consideration.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

17) Further work on the project should be cognizant of potential changes to the FTA New Starts program.
18) Construction of LRT or BRT along the Bottineau Corridor moves the Twin Cities region one step closer to having a 21st century transportation network that provides residents and workers greater opportunity travel to destinations throughout the region without having to rely on the private automobile.

19) The necessity for safe and convenient access to any future stations by pedestrians and bicyclists must be recognized and explored in the DEIS.

20) Analysis in the DEIS should use the latest demographic projections for the region. The Metropolitan Council will have new projections for population growth regionwide and at the city level this summer.

Thank you for providing opportunities to offer input and guidance so that our transportation investments are shaped by the people who will use them.

Sincerely,

Bill Neuendorf
Director of Policy and Advocacy
Dear Joe Gladke,

I am writing to you to voice the sentiment of the West Broadway Business and Area Coalition-WBC around the Bottineau Area Transitway alignment. We understand there are potential issues and opportunities that surround the business community with both the D1 and D2 alignments. When considering alignment and future planning it is in the best interest of our community for the City, County and Metropolitan Council to acknowledge the following:

We demand best practices learned from Hiawatha, Central and Southwest Transit Lines to be applied to any line that comes through North Minneapolis. Along the Central Corridor line several businesses have cited poor transit planning, communications, and outreach as the cause of their businesses failing. We know there are several businesses mitigation strategies and best practices that have been used in other cities and are currently being developed in our own Metro Area; these strategies must be implemented early on in North Minneapolis. Additionally, if D2 is selected, we want to assure small businesses survive and thrive through construction and rail stops be designed for the best accessibility to existing businesses.

The West Broadway Community has been engaged in two recent planning processes W. Broadway Alive! and the Penn/Broadway Transit Oriented Development study. If D1 is selected and W. Broadway is bypassed, our request is that County, City, and Metropolitan Council continue to follow through on the plans outlined through these community engagement processes and additional resources are leveraged for the W. Broadway corridor. This includes fulfilling the TOD development vision for the Penn/Broadway node including BRT, arterial transitway, and/or streetcar. We want to assure equitable investment for the W. Broadway business community.

Please contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Jackie Cherryhomes
Board Chair- West Broadway Business and Area Coalition
JackieCherryhomes@fctyler.com
612-961-5614
X. Other Stakeholders
February 16, 2012

Joseph Gladke, P.E.
Manager of Engineering and Transit Planning
Hennepin County
417 N. 5th Street, Suite 320
Minneapolis, MN 55401

Mr. Gladke,

Hennepin County’s proposal to operate a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system immediately adjacent to BNSF trackage on the Monticello Subdivision has been reviewed by the Operations and Engineering Departments. After reviewing the proposal, BNSF will not support the BRT option.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Douglas D. Perry
Bottineau Transitway Community Advisory Committee (CAC)  
Scoping Input to the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)  
and Advise, Review and Communicate Committee (ARCC)

Introduction

This paper provides scoping input for the Bottineau Transitway Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) from the Bottineau Transitway Community Advisory Committee (CAC).

CAC members appreciate their roles in:
- Representing communities, businesses and institutions in the Bottineau Corridor study area. Providing a conduit for integrating the values and perspectives of citizens, communities, businesses, and institutions into the study process.
- Providing a multi-faceted communications link between the communities or organizations represented and the study process.
- Communicating with ARCC members, the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC), and the project management team (PMT)
- Preview of study materials planned for release to public stakeholders.

Scoping Input

The following scoping input is based on CAC participation in the Bottineau Transitway Alternatives Analysis Study process and the Draft EIS scoping process to date. This input is the result of discussions at the February 9, 2012 CAC meeting.

1. LRT Mode Preference.
   - The CAC has a strong preference for LRT for the Bottineau Transitway. LRT is seen as the best transit mode to serve the long range needs of the corridor.

2. Transitway Alignment Preferences
   - Alignment B is favored over Alignment A. Alignment A should be considered for future expansion potential. Alignment A has the benefits of Maple Grove Transit service and uncertainty regarding future development of the gravel mining area. Alignment B has near term emerging needs.
   - Alignment D1 is favored over Alignment D2. Trade offs are recognized but alignment D1 is considered preferable from a system wide perspective.

3. Challenges, impacts and benefits which need to be addressed in the Draft EIS>
   - Noise and vibrations for close-by properties
   - Grade crossing bells and signals
   - Visual effects of tracks, overhead wires and support poles which power LRT vehicles (catenary system) and stations.
• Possible need for visual screening mitigation
  Number of homes adjacent to the rail corridor, especially properties in Crystal and Robbinsdale close to rail corridor.
• Impacts on residential and commercial property values
• Market assessment of transit-oriented development (TOD) potential.
  Assessment of mixed use development balance, parking needs, planning and zoning requirements, and financing in relation to future land use planning efforts is needed.
• Assess potential for transit passengers to park in neighborhoods close to transit stations ("park and ride").
• Assess impacts of increased pedestrian traffic in neighborhoods close to transit stations.
• Assess impacts of operating subsidies on the public as the transit system is expanded.
• Assess safety around the tracks and at grade crossings.
• Assess benefits of increased transit usage in corridor could have in helping relieve congestion on County Road 81, improving travel time of the road for freight shipments and auto users.
• Assess benefits of police presence on light rail creating atmosphere of safety for passengers.
• Improved transit will serve growth in the corridor and support the year 2030 regional development planning framework.
• Improved transit will make transit more accessible and provide higher utility for people. Opportunities become more "reachable" for corridor residents.
• Improved transit will improve mobility for people with disabilities.
• Improved transit will make travel to activity centers more affordable for families.
• Improved transit will make travel more accessible for seniors.
• Improved transit will create options for travel to the urban core, where parking is expensive.
• Improved transit in the Bottineau Corridor is part of building out a regional system of transit service.
• Emphasize the Target Campus expansion in Brooklyn Park: 3,900 jobs to be accommodated.
• Emphasize the Bottineau Transitway's role in supporting regional growth.
• Emphasize the potential for student use of the transitway. Emphasize the potential for expansion of the two colleges in the corridor.
• Assess the potential for multi-modal facilities/connections in the corridor.
From: "Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us" <Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
To: "Karlsson, Mary" <Mary.Karlsson@metc.state.mn.us>
Cc: &apos;Ron Biss&apos; &apos;ronbiss@hotmail.com&apos;, Beth Bartz &lt;bartz@srfconsulting.com&gt;, "Joseph.Gladke@co.hennepin.mn.us" &lt;Joseph.Gladke@co.hennepin.mn.us&gt;
Sent: Thu, Feb 16, 2012 23:45:01 GMT+00:00
Subject: Re: Bottineau -- Metropolitan Council Transit Accessibility Advisory Committee Comments

Mary,

Thanks very much for sending these comments on behalf of TAAC. These comments are being included as part of the scoping input for the Draft EIS.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

From: "Karlsson, Mary" <Mary.Karlsson@metc.state.mn.us>
To: "Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us" <Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
Cc: "Ron Biss" &lt;ronbiss@hotmail.com&gt;
Date: 02/16/2012 04:23 PM
Subject: Bottineau -- Metropolitan Council Transit Accessibility Advisory Committee Comments

Brent,

Per Chair Biss's direction and based on the summary of the 2/1 TAAC meeting, I am submitting the following comments for Bottineau Scoping on the TAAC's behalf:

- The BRT alternative does not appear to provide direct service to neighborhoods in North Minneapolis
- Carefully consider the inclusion of park-and-rides at stations, they may not be needed in neighborhoods with high numbers of zero car households
- Carefully consider economic development potential in the selection of the locally preferred alternative
- The TAAC requests that a TAAC member be named to one of the project advisory committees to advise on accessibility for people with disabilities, if the Bottineau project proceeds into preliminary engineering
- If the BRT alternative advances, carefully consider whether wheelchairs need to be secured on a BRT vehicle, and if so, how to secure wheelchairs effectively and very efficiently to minimize transit travel time
- If commuter bus service is assumed in the Baseline alternative (e.g., similar to Northstar Link), consider how to provide paratransit service that complements the commuter bus service so this kind of connecting transit service is available to people of all ages and abilities
- The TAAC requests a meeting with Hennepin County Public Works ADA Title II specialist, if one exists and the Bottineau project moves forward into preliminary engineering

Mary Karlsson, PE (MN)
Senior Transportation Planner

Metropolitan Council
ph: 651.602.1819
f: 651.602.1739
mary.karlsson@metc.state.mn.us
MILLE LACS BAND OF OJIBWE

Executive Branch of Tribal Government
January 27, 2012

Brent Rusco, Project Manager
Bottineau Transitway Project, Hennepin County
417 North 5th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55401

Re: Section 106 Tribal Reviews and Consultation NHPA: Federal Transit Administration/Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority and Metropolitan Council: Bottineau Transitway Project; Minneapolis, Golden Valley, Robbinsdale, Crystal, Brooklyn Park, and Maple Grove, MN.

Dear Mr. Brent,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the above project. It has been reviewed pursuant to the responsibilities given the Tribal Historic Preservation Office by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the Procedures of the Advisory Council of Historic Preservation (36CFR800).

Based on available information we cannot comment on this project without maps detailing the route of the Bottineau Transitway in Minneapolis, Golden Valley, Robbinsdale, Crystal, Brooklyn Park, and Maple Grove, MN.

Please contact Natalie Weyaus at 320-532-4181 extension 7450 if you have any questions regarding our review of this project.

Respectfully,

Natalie Weyaus
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer

Cc: Mary Ann Heidemann, MN SHPO Review and Compliance
XI. Resource Agencies
February 14, 2012

Mr. Brent Rusco  
Bottineau Transitway Project Manager  
Hennepin County  
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400  
Minneapolis, MN 55415

Re: Bottineau Transitway Project Scoping for Draft EIS  
BCWMC #2012-5

Dear Mr. Rusco:

Thank you for providing the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission (BCWMC) with the opportunity to review the Bottineau Transitway Project Scoping Booklet and to provide comments on the scoping for the Draft EIS. We also appreciated the invitation to attend the January 19, 2012 interagency scoping meeting. Although we did not attend the meeting, over the past few months BCWMC staff met with project representatives on three occasions to discuss the project and concerns that the BCWMC may have regarding the project.

On behalf of the BCWMC, we have reviewed the Scoping Booklet and offer the following comments on the areas potentially impacted by the project that are within the BCWMC jurisdiction.

General/Background

Portions of two of the proposed alignment alternatives are located in the jurisdiction of the BCWMC:

- Nearly all of Alternative D1, from about Russell Ave. N. in Minneapolis to the intersection of Alternative D1 and D2 near the Robbinsdale/Crystal border. Stormwater runoff from this portion of the route will discharge directly to Bassett Creek, or to Grimes Pond, North Rice Pond and South Rice Pond (which eventually drain to Bassett Creek).
- A portion of Alternative D2, between about 17th Ave. N. in Minneapolis and the Robbinsdale/Minneapolis border. Stormwater runoff from this portion of the route will discharge directly to Bassett Creek.

Floodplain Issues

The Alternative D1 route follows the Burlington-Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad corridor. A portion of this route in Golden Valley (and Wirth Park in particular) is located along the Main Stem of Bassett Creek and South Rice Lake. In Robbinsdale the route is located along Grimes Pond, North Rice Lake and South Rice Lake. The BCWMC’s 100-year floodplain elevation for Bassett Creek along the D1 route ranges from elevation 826.0 ft. (NGVD29) at the upstream end of TH 55 to 832.0 ft. (NGVD29) at the

Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

7800 Golden Valley Road | Golden Valley, MN 55427 | www.bassettcreekwmo.org | Established 1968

Crystal | Golden Valley | Medicine Lake | Minneapolis | Minnetonka | New Hope | Plymouth | Robbinsdale | St. Louis Park
downstream side of Basset Creek Drive. In addition, the BCWMCs 100-year floodplain elevation for Grimes Pond/North Rice Lake is 838.0 ft (NGVD29) and for South Rice Lake is 831.5 ft (NGVD29).

During our meetings with project representatives, we discussed the potential of this project to result in filling in the Basset Creek floodplain, generally within Wirth Park, and in Grimes Pond/North Rice Pond. As discussed, the BCWMC will not allow filling within the BCWMC-established floodplain without mitigation. Proposals to fill within the floodplain must obtain BCWMC approval and provide compensating storage (1:1 basis) and/or channel modifications so that the flood level is not increased at any point along the creek due to fill. Floodplain management policies are listed in Section 5.2.2.2 of the BCWMC’s 2004 Watershed Management Plan. Please also see the BCWMC’s submittal and design requirements for projects (“Requirements for Improvements and Development Proposals,” 2008). These documents can be found on the BCWMC website: www.bassettcreekwmo.org.

Runoff and Rate Control

The BCWMC regulates stormwater runoff discharges and volumes to minimize flood problems, flood damages, and future costs of stormwater management systems. The Bottineau Transitway project has the potential to significantly increase the amount of impervious surface in the Basset Creek watershed. Alternative D1 in particular, would increase the impervious surface in close proximity to the creek itself. This will result in increased runoff rates if not controlled. Best management practices must be implemented to ensure flood profiles are not increased along Basset Creek.

Water Quality

The BCWMC and its member cities have committed significant resources to the improvement of the quality of stormwater runoff reaching the Mississippi River, by reducing nonpoint source pollution carried as stormwater runoff. The BCWMC strongly encourages the County to implement best management practices to treat transitway runoff to ensure that the project does not increase pollutant-loading to adjacent water bodies. The BCWMC’s water quality policies are listed in Section 4.2 of the Watershed Management Plan.

The BCWMC expects the Bottineau Transitway project design to include stormwater treatment and erosion control measures that will reduce the amount of phosphorus and sediment carried by stormwater runoff to Basset Creek. The BCWMC also expects the county to consider measures to minimize the amount of increased impervious surfaces resulting from the project.

Additional pollutants of concern to the BCWMC include chloride from road salting, fuel, oils, metals and construction runoff which could enter storm drains and downstream water resources. Adequate permanent and temporary construction BMPs must be implemented as part of the project.

Please also see the BCWMC’s submittal and design requirements for projects (“Requirements for Improvements and Development Proposals,” 2008). These documents can be found on the BCWMC website: www.bassettcreekwmo.org.

Maintenance

Maintenance of stormwater management (water quality and flood control) features is critical to ensure proper operation. The EA should describe the maintenance measures the county proposes to undertake to
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ensure the effectiveness of stormwater management features. The EA should also identify the parties responsible for inspections, the parties responsible for maintenance, and the inspection and maintenance schedules. The BCWMC is concerned that if these operation and maintenance responsibilities are not clearly laid out, the responsibility will fall on the member cities or BCWMC to perform the duties.

Erosion Control

A BCWMC goal is to prevent erosion and sedimentation to the greatest extent possible to protect the BCWMC's water resources from increased sediment loading and associated water quality problems. Temporary and permanent best management practices must be implemented to control construction and post-development runoff on the site and erosion. Erosion and sediment control policies are listed in Section 6.2 of the Watershed Management Plan. Please also see the BCWMC's submittal and design requirements for projects (“Requirements for Improvements and Development Proposals,” 2008). These documents can be found on the BCWMC website: www.bassettcreekwmo.org.

Wetland Management

The BCWMC wetland goal is to achieve no net loss of wetlands in the Bassett Creek watershed in conformance to the Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) and associated rules (Minnesota rules 8420). Minneapolis and Golden Valley are the local governmental units (LGUs) responsible for administering the WCA in their cities; BCWMC is the LGU for Robbinsdale. Potential wetland impacts were discussed during our meetings with project representatives. Wetland management policies are listed in Section 8.0 of the Watershed Management Plan. Please also see the BCWMC's submittal and design requirements for projects (“Requirements for Improvements and Development Proposals,” 2008). These documents can be found on the BCWMC website: www.bassettcreekwmo.org.

The BCWMC recognizes the challenges of meeting the corridor’s transportation needs, and providing transit alternatives in particular. The BCWMC appreciates the opportunity to provide these comments early in the process and looks forward to working with you to restore and protect the health of the BCWMC’s water resources. Again, thank you for the opportunity to review the Bottineau Transiway Project Scoping Booklet. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions at 952-832-2813 or kchandle@barr.com.

Sincerely,

Karen L. Chandler

Karen L. Chandler, P.E.
Barr Engineering Co.
Engineers for the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

c: BCWMC Commissioners
   Jeannine Clancy, City of Golden Valley
   Lois Eberhart, City of Minneapolis
   Richard McCoy, City of Robbinsdale
   Rachael Crabbe, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
From: "Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us" <Brent.Rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us>
To: "Andrew_Horton@fws.gov" <Andrew_Horton@fws.gov>
Cc: "Lisa_Treichel@io.s.doj.gov" <Lisa_Treichel@io.s.doj.gov>, "Nick_Rowse@fws.gov" <Nick_Rowse@fws.gov>, "Stephanie_Nash@fws.gov" <Stephanie_Nash@fws.gov>, "Tony_Sullins@fws.gov" <Tony_Sullins@fws.gov>, Beth Bartz <bbartz@sfcconsulting.com>, "Joseph.Gladke@co.hennepin.mn.us" <Joseph.Gladke@co.hennepin.mn.us>
Sent: Thu, Feb 16, 2012 23:42:13 GMT+00:00
Subject: Re: Bottineau Transitway

Mr. Horton,

Thanks very much for your scoping input on the Bottineau Transitway. We look forward to continued coordination on the important issues you identified in your email.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

From: Andrew_Horton@fws.gov
To: brent.rusco@co.hennepin.mn.us
Cc: Stephanie_Nash@fws.gov, Lisa_Treichel@io.s.doj.gov, Tony_Sullins@fws.gov, Nick_Rowse@fws.gov
Date: 02/10/2012 03:28 PM
Subject: Bottineau Transitway

Mr. Rusco,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Tier 2 Scoping Document for the Bottineau Transitway. Higgins eye pearl mussel (Lampsilis higginsii) is the only endangered species listed under the Endangered Species Act for Hennepin County, MN. This species is found in the Mississippi River, outside of the action area for this project. There are no federal lands of concern for areas near the proposed light rail line.

Wetlands are a Trust Resource identified by the Service. The proposed D1 alignment has the potential for wetland impacts along Theodore Wirth Park. The Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) would like to see a detailed discussion of anticipated wetland impacts and mitigation to such impacts to be included in the alternatives analysis for the Draft EIS. Moving the Golden Valley Station from Golden Valley Road to Plymouth Avenue also has the potential for wetland impacts. At this time we encourage Hennepin County to look closely at all possible alignment alternatives and rail station locations to avoid or reduce wetland impacts to the greatest extent practicable.

There are no known eagle nests within the action area, however, data in the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage database might not be current for Hennepin County. We do have records of bald eagles frequenting Theodore Wirth Park (near
Segment D1) and there may be nests in the area. If Segment D1 continues as a viable option, eagle nest surveys should be incorporated in the EIS for any forested areas planned for development. Surveys can consist of visual observation of the forest canopy within a 1/2 mile surrounding buffer of the proposed project area and are most easily done when foliage is absent (fall, winter, or early spring). If possible, these surveys should be performed for a few years prior to construction. Bald eagles often build new nests in early spring and we recommend that a nest survey also be completed in mid-March preceding any construction occurring between March and August. If eagle nests are discovered, construction timetables should be designed to do much of the work outside the eagle nesting season or outside a 660 foot buffer from the nest. The Fish and Wildlife Services has generated the National Bald Eagle Management Guidelines (http://www.fws.gov/midwest/eagle/guidelines/guidelines.html), which are intended to help landowners minimize disturbance to bald eagles, thereby benefiting bald eagles and protecting landowners. The Fish and Wildlife Services strongly encourages adherence to these guidelines.

Please keep these recommendations in mind when considering the preferred alternative for this project. As this project progresses into the Draft EIS stage, there may be a need for greater coordination with the Service to mitigate for any impacts to wetlands or bald eagles. Thank you for your cooperation in meeting our joint responsibilities under NEPA and the Endangered Species Act. If you have any further questions, please contact me at (612) 725-3548 x2208.

Sincerely,
Andrew Horton

Andrew Horton
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Twin Cities ES Field Office
4101 American Blvd East
Bloomington, MN 55425-1665
(612) 725-3548 ext. 2208
February 13, 2012

Mr. Brent Rusco
Bottineau Transitway Project Manager
Hennepin County
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415

Re: Bottineau Transitway Scoping Booklet

Dear Mr. Rusco:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Scoping Booklet for the Bottineau Transitway Project (Project) located in Hennepin County, Minnesota. The Project consists of bus and light rail transit improvements in the northwest area of Hennepin County. Regarding matters for which the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) has regulatory responsibility and other interests, the MPCA staff has the following comments for your consideration.

- If the project will disturb a total of one acre or more of land, a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System/State Disposal System (NPDES/SDS) Construction Stormwater Permit (CSW Permit) is required from the MPCA. The owner and operator (usually the general contractor) are jointly responsible for obtaining and complying with the conditions of the CSW Permit. A detailed Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), containing stormwater management requirements both during and post construction, as well as erosion control and sediment control requirements during construction, must be prepared prior to submitting a CSW Permit application. CSW Permit coverage is required prior to commencing land disturbing activities (i.e., clearing, grading, filling, or excavating) relating to the project. For an overview of this permit and program, please refer to the following factsheet: [http://www.pca.state.mn.us/publications/wq-strm2-05.pdf](http://www.pca.state.mn.us/publications/wq-strm2-05.pdf). Questions regarding CSW Permit requirements should be directed to Roberta Getman at 507-206-2529.

- We recommend you check the current listing of impaired waters on the MPCA Inventory of Impaired Waters located on the MPCA website at [http://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/tmdl/tmdl-303dlist.html](http://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/tmdl/tmdl-303dlist.html). We recommend you utilize the MPCA Special Waters and Impaired Waters Search mapping tool to identify special or impaired waters located near proposed projects. The mapping tool is located on the MPCA website at [http://pca-gis02.pca.state.mn.us/website/stormwater/csw/viewer.htm](http://pca-gis02.pca.state.mn.us/website/stormwater/csw/viewer.htm). Certain impairments will dictate additional increased stormwater treatment both during construction and require additional increased permanent treatment post construction. These requirements will be included in any NPDES/SDS Construction Stormwater Permit. The project proposer should determine that compliance with these increased stormwater water quality treatments can be achieved on the project site or elsewhere. Information regarding the MPCA's Construction Stormwater Program can be found on the MPCA's Web site at [http://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/stormwater/stormwater-c.html](http://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/stormwater/stormwater-c.html).

In addition, any project that will result in over 50 acres of disturbed area and has a discharge point within one mile of a special or impaired water is required to submit their Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the MPCA for a review at least 30 days prior to the commencement of land disturbing activities. If the SWPPP is found to be out of compliance with the terms and conditions of the General Permit, further delay may occur. The MPCA encourages the project proposer to meet with staff at preliminary points to avoid this situation. Questions regarding SWPPPs should be directed to Todd Smith at 651-757-2732.
Please be aware that if a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Section 404 Individual Permit is required for any project related wetland impacts, an MPCA Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 401 Water Quality Certification or waiver must also be obtained as part of the permitting process. The Section 401 Water Quality Certification ensures that the activity will comply with the state water quality standards. Any conditions required within the MPCA 401 Certificate are then incorporated into the Corps 404 Permit. You can find additional information about the MPCA’s 401 Certification process at www.pca.state.mn.us/water/401.html. For further information about the 401 Water Quality Certification process, please contact Kevin Molloy at 651-757-2577 or Judy Mader at 651-757-2544.

It is not uncommon for public utility projects to encounter contamination, especially petroleum-contaminated soil from storage tanks or spills. Efforts should be made prior to construction to determine if and where any petroleum or other contamination is likely to be encountered during the project. Utilization of the MPCA’s database and mapping tool, What’s in My Neighborhood? can be helpful in evaluating the project area or areas for potential contamination. This mapping tool can be found at http://www.pca.state.mn.us/wimn/index.cfm. It is the responsibility of the project sponsor to complete the project safely through any areas of contamination and to properly manage any contaminated soil that is excavated during the project. The factsheet, Managing Petroleum Contaminated Soil at Public Works Projects, is available to assist with this process, including how to identify potential sources of contamination. The factsheet can be found at http://www.pca.state.mn.us/publications/c-pnp5-01.pdf. If contamination is found, it must be reported immediately to the State Duty Officer at 651-649-5451 or 800-412-0798.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this project. Please be aware that this letter does not constitute approval by the MPCA of any or all elements of the Project for the purpose of pending or future permit action(s) by the MPCA. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the Project proposer to secure any required permits and to comply with any requisite permit conditions. If you have any questions concerning our review of this Scoping Booklet please contact me at 651-757-2508.

Sincerely,

Karen Kromar
Planner Principal
Environmental Review Unit
Resource Management and Assistance Division

cc: Craig Affeldt, MPCA, St. Paul
    Doug Wetzstein, MPCA, St. Paul
    Roberta Getman, MPCA, Rochester
    Todd Smith, MPCA, St. Paul
    Kevin Molloy, MPCA, St. Paul
    Judy Mader, MPCA, St. Paul
Thanks very much for your email. This information is helpful and we'll be in touch soon regarding the Bottineau project and potential implications on the Shingle Creek Watershed.

Brent Rusco
Senior Professional Engineer
Hennepin County
Housing, Community Works & Transit
Engineering and Transit Planning
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1843
Direct: 612.543.0579

I am the Engineer for the Shingle Creek Watershed Management Commission and am writing to provide you with comments in advance of tomorrow's open house. We won't be attending but I want you to be aware that we are currently undergoing a rule revision that will probably affect your project by the time you get around to submitting to the Commission for a project review. Here are the points that may affect your project:

1. The volume management standard will probably change from retaining a 0.5" storm off of impervious surface to 1.0" storm.
2. The project threshold may change from 5 ac to something less but your project is probably well in excess of the existing size threshold.
3. We are considering a soil management standard that will require a top soil and compost mix in turf areas to a depth of 12".
4. There are wetlands along the corridor and the Commission is the LGU for Crystal and Brooklyn Park.

If you'd like to discuss this please call either Diane Spector or me at 763-479-4200.

Thanks,
Ed Matthiesen
Verbal Comments

- Scoping Open House #1: Theodore Wirth Chalet, January 23, 2012
- Scoping Open House #2: Brooklyn Park City Hall, January 24, 2012
- Scoping Open House #3: Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center, January 25, 2012
- Scoping Open House #4: Robbinsdale City Hall, January 31, 2012
BOTTINEAU TRANSITWAY

SCOPING OPEN HOUSE #1

CERTIFIED

* * * * *

PUBLIC COMMENTS

MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 2012

THEODORE WIRTH CHALET

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

4:30 P.M.

* * * * *

Taken before Cheryl M. Lippman, RPR

www.nwcourtreporters.com

nwcr@nwcourtreporters.com

1-800-628-7551
LEE SCHIESTL: My name is Lee Schiestl, S-C-H-I-E-S-T-L, and I live at 2500 Kewannee Way, Golden Valley, next to the existing BNSF railroad tracks, which now has one train a day each way five days a week, which is already quite a noise level for our residence and several more closer to the track than I am, so I'm against running traffic from North Minneapolis, Maple Grove, and funnel it all down through our neighborhood, when North Minneapolis and Maple Grove already have bus service going down to the central city. And if anything had to change, I would be for running the bus instead of rail and run it down West Broadway, which has a lot of room and a lot of nonexistent businesses, and the roadway is already in, which I understand they could do at half the price over light rail.

BRENT GISSELEN: Brent Gisslen, G-I-S-S-L-E-N, address is 3400 Beard Avenue North, Robbinsdale, and then I think that the main routes should never be a BRT with buses, they should only be for the trains, and the buses should feed either end of the train route and some points along the center. That's pretty much it.
GEORGE PUZAK: My name is George Puzak, last name spelled P, as in parks, U-Z, as in zebra, A-K. My address is 1780 Girard Avenue South, Minneapolis, 55403. I think our decision makers should choose Route D2 in North Minneapolis, and maintain all the proposed stations in North Minneapolis.

Additionally, I think Route D1 and the rail trench should be converted to a non-motorized greenway similar to the Kenilworth Trail, the Cedar Lake Trail, the Midtown Greenway. This off-road non-motorized transport corridor would be a great amenity for the northwest part of Minneapolis and its suburban neighbors. Again, please choose Route D2 for light rail transit in North Minneapolis.

At the northwest -- well, let's see, at the north of the line, at the northern end of the Bottineau line, I'm ambivalent about which route is taken, but I've heard that Route B is more politically doable. Some sort of transit should connect the Maple Grove Arbor Lakes Shopping Center with this Bottineau LRT line. Thank you.

RAYMOND DUFFY: Raymond Duffy. I'm at 2916 17th Avenue North, Minneapolis. The purpose of
my coming to see what's going on here'-- and I've
been to several other regional transit meetings
prior, is to ensure that the light rail transit
is accessible to people at the Courage Center,
because -- and why I state this explicitly is
because when the Minneapolis city clerk board was
redoing the parkway -- the paving crew parkway, I
should say, they weren't allowing for the sloped
curves for handicapped people, and with light
rail transit -- well, first off, they did go
ahead, and they did slope 'em so people with
wheelchairs, it was accessible, and I live in the
area, even though I'm a few blocks one way -- or
to the east, I notice a lot more people in
wheelchairs are using the beautiful Theodore
Wirth Park because they can get to it, and you
think the same would apply for light rail transit
'cause there's a lot of people in that area that
are handicapped, and it's probably a federally
funded project, no doubt, that I think it would
be good to address the American Citizens with
Disability Act at the same time and bring their
concerns. I'm sure there's probably somebody
from the Courage Center here or will be speaking,
but I'm just a resident of my community, and I'll
say all of my community, handicapped, black, white, it doesn't really matter, so I just wanted to state that.

ELIZABETH LINDHOLM: Elizabeth Lindholm, L-I-N-D-H-O-L-M, 2511 Byrd, B-Y-R-D, Avenue North in Golden Valley, and our comments are mainly that our concern about the vibration of the line. The current line is used, I think, twice a day at 9 and 5 p.m., something about that -- like that, so we definitely feel the impact of the existing grade line in our home, and we would be horrified if this line was coming through every, you know, say, 20 minutes, to be able to feel that vibration would significantly impact our quality of living.

The other factor is that we don't agree with the selection of any line going through Theodore Wirth because it is such an important and valuable resource in this -- as an urban park setting. It's very serene for being this close to a metropolitan area, and it's so beautifully designed with so many different activities. I question the use of this line for commuter purposes simply because there's an existing freight line there. Those are my comments.
Oh, we did have one other concern around disruption of our commute patterns if Golden Valley Road was to be closed at any point during the construction, so that we would -- it would have an impact to our getting onto Highway 100 for work and school purposes.

JASON LAUSCHE: Hi, my name is Jason Lausche, L-A-U-S-C-H-E, and I live up at 3554 Knox Avenue North. I'm a huge proponent of the D2 plan. I think some of the reasons that I have for believing that is that in that neighborhood going through North Minneapolis property, you're going to run into a lot of folks who simply don't have their own transportation, no cars, no way to get around, and they would be able to service those -- those people a lot better with the D2 plan going directly through North -- North Minneapolis there; and then, also, I guess, the impact of North Memorial, of course, whether it's the patients that need to go to and from, or all of the employees. In the D1 plan, I'm very concerned that we not only disenfranchise all the people in North Minneapolis who really could utilize that service and are really in dire need of it, but also the entire concept of servicing
North Memorial Hospital is gone from that plan what -- whatsoever, and then, I mean, I would just believe that, you know, when you're dealing with public transit, and especially light rail systems, I think you really need to service the density of a population. To not do so, my concern is that it continues to -- to encourage sprawl and further sprawl from the inner city, so I guess that's all I have to say. Thanks.

WILLIS CROONQUIST: Okay. My name is Willis Croonquist, spelled C-R-O-O-N-Q-U-I-S-T, I'm a 28-year resident of Golden Valley, and our family strongly supports this project. Preferably, we would like to see light rail transit continue as the other one has years ago. We -- we had a cousin, who, years ago, owned a restaurant; in fact, he still owns it down by Hiawatha in -- in South Minneapolis, he was very disappointed when light rail was going past his restaurant, and because I supported light rail, we'd have some tremendous arguments. Now, today, there's a station half a block from his restaurant, and his restaurant -- restaurant has tripled with business because of light rail. I saw him some time ago over Christmas, we get together, I said
what do you think of light rail now, and he said it was the best thing that ever happened to me. And if you remember a number of years ago, we had a state senator, a very prominent Minnesota state senator who vigorously opposed light rail in those days, and he called that train a train to nowhere, and, boy, was he wrong. So I hope you continue to work on this, and as a resident of Golden Valley, we strongly urge the Hennepin County Rail Authority, and whoever's backing this, to continue the fine work they're doing, and let's have some progressive politicians who think about the future of our -- our grandkids, and do something positive for change for Minnesota and Minnesota communities. Thank you.

BRENT GISSLEN: Brent Gisslen, B-R-E-N-T, Gisslen, G-I-S-S-L-E-N, and 3400 Beard. Anyways, my concern is I want to point out that on the -- the D2 option where the rail line goes over or under the Theodore Wirth Parkway, that bridge has already been repaired for a 20-year commitment, and -- and it would cost a fortune to go over it, and there's been a lot of talk about switching the parkway so it goes over 81 instead of under 81, the park desires that option, but they don't
want to pay the cost of the bridge, and you're
going be spending a lot of money on a bridge,
and, actually, it's cheaper for you to go at
grade level and buy the parkway a cheaper bridge
instead of a freeway bridge. A possible --
another possible option is try and re --
reinitiate the old traffic circle, that's a
suggestion.

DAVID RHUDE: David Rhude, R-H-U-D-E,
Minneapolis. Build it.

MONICA WADE: I'm Monica Wade, M-O-N-I-C-A,
W-A-D-E, 3423 Grimes Avenue North, Robbinsdale,
Minnesota, 55422. So my concerns are, I'm, like,
five houses away from 34th Avenue where it's
possible it's gonna go down. Concerns on noise
and vibration, and also if there's gonna be a
wall on the -- it looks like on some of the
plans, the wall stops between Grimes and Halifax,
and that means I could see it out my kitchen
window, that's a concern. I think that's
probably about it.

RICHARD HUNTLEY: Richard Huntley, 2925 Kyle
Avenue North. Doesn't seem like the Golden
Valley route really is gonna access enough people
because it misses North Memorial where you get
patients and workers there without cars, and also you bypass all of Minneapolis stops for people who don't have cars, so they're not gonna drive over to Golden Valley station.

NANCY HUNTLEY: Since there's no parking there anyway.

RICHARD HUNTLEY: But I understand there's gonna be no parking provided there, you know, they'll have to walk. I understand there might be a bus to go over there, but I doubt they're gonna take the -- take the bus over there. I guess that would really be some of my concerns there.

NANCY HUNTLEY: I'm Nancy Huntley. Golden Valley line will go through a nature center, and what will happen to the wildlife and the general park atmosphere if you have a train going through every seven minutes during peak time, every 15 minutes during the day?

RICHARD HUNTLEY: It doesn't seem cost-effective either to move the other rail line over so to get that rail in there.

NANCY HUNTLEY: I think that's it.

RICHARD HUNTLEY: Thanks.

KELLY MADSSEN: This is Kelly Madsen at 3316
France Avenue North, Robbinsdale, and I'm opposed to the light rail going down 34th down to -- to -- is it 81? I'd rather have 'em just reuse Burlington Northern Santa Fe's railroad. I think that if they're gonna be redoing that anyways, I'd rather see 'em do that rather than tear up homes and go through neighborhoods, and I guess that's the only comment I have. Thanks.

KATRINA MADSEN: Katrina Madsen, K-A-T-R-I-N-A, and M-A-D-S-E-N, and I'm 11. I live on France, and there's a wooded area that it would be a lot better for because there's already a track, and maybe it would work a little bit better.

MARY ADAMS: Mary Adams, 2815 Kyle Avenue North, Golden Valley. Purpose and need for project, use the buses and existing systems and improve those so we do not pay more in taxes and hurt the environment. All right. Let's see, these are my thoughts on why I do not like the project going through Golden Valley. It will not be used by residents in Golden Valley, it will bring in more undesirable people to the area, it will create a lot of parking issues, which means they're gonna have to make parking and take away
more of the environment and surrounding area and residential property. The -- my property value will probably go down, my taxes will probably go up. It's gonna bring in more buses, because the buses have to bring in the people to use it, and so it's going to have a huge impact on noise, the environment, the trails, and existing bike trails, and the animals in the vicinity next to the train tracks. It's gonna have a huge impact on crime 'cause our crime rate will increase as you bring in more population of people into the neighborhood that do not live there, and -- and I will move if this is coming into Golden Valley.

And my suggestion is, if you can think of the analogy when we started busing children to other districts, the best result would have been to build better schools right where they live so they could have all the wonderful benefits of a brand-new school with teachers. Well, the same thing is true here, put the transportation in the backyards of the people who need it so they can walk out the door and get on it and not need to get -- be bused, or take a taxi, or whatever they have to use to come over to get on a train that's not in their neighborhood. That's it.
RICHARD ADAIR: Hi, this is Richard Adair, 200 Upton Avenue South, Minneapolis, A-D-A-I-R. I would be equally distant -- this is in the brim of my neighborhood between the Southwest Transitway and the Bottineau Boulevard Transitway. Would be -- to plan for the future, it should be a train rather than a bus. I have two quick comments. Number one is, if you have it -- you don't need two van wait stations, if you have one on the Southwest Transitway, you don't need one on the Bottineau Transitway, or vice versa. In my opinion, they're really close, and people can walk between those two. The second one is, time of transit is essential. This metro area's gonna continue to grow, and it should be able to -- people from the suburbs should be able to get downtown for the longer rides in the shortest possible period of time. For that reason, I prefer the D1 route over the D2 route, and the other way of saying it is that people who live in North Minneapolis can get downtown on the bus pretty easily, the southern part of North Minneapolis, and the people who are gonna be using this, it would be worth their while getting over to one of the stations in the
D1 route because the only people who are gonna use it from so close to downtown are those that are going to the U, or to St. Paul, or to the Mall of America, and it's gonna be worth their while to take a feeder bus to one of the others, to the -- to the station on the D1 route. Thank you for listening.

JASON STURGIS: Jason Sturgis, S-T-U-R-G-I-S, 2500 Dresden Lane, and I would not be in favor of the D1, as it's my backyard, I live on the trail behind the -- the -- the freight line runs there now, it's fairly loud; but having said that, I have got -- I don't know all the impact studies, and things of that nature. At face value right now, I would not be in favor of this in my backyard. It's a beautiful trail area there, Merry (ph) Hills, that freight train once or twice a day is disturbing enough. I can't imagine, you know, constant -- or not constant, but regular rail service. That's it for now. Thank you.

GILLIAN ROSENQUIST: I'm Gillian, G-I-L-L-I-A-N, Rosenquist, R-O-S-E-N-Q-U-I-S-T, I live at 2321 Kyle Avenue North in Golden Valley, 55422, and I appreciate that the residents of the
eastern part of Golden Valley are being included in this conversation and discussion, and I appreciate the fact that our new mayor, Shep Harris, made sure that we were, because we really intimately know the traffic patterns and the needs of this neighborhood. One of the needs that we really have is for some kind of safe and useful bike corridor, and we think that that would be a real wonderful thing to tie into this -- this system. Light rail and alternate transit, such as biking, I think, can go hand in hand, especially when you have -- when you're talking about the Route 1 proposal through the park system into Theodore Wirth.

ROSEMARY FROEHL: My name is Rosemary Froehle, the last name is spelled F, as in Frank, R-O-E-H-L-E. I live at 1007 Sheridan Avenue North, Minneapolis, 55411, I've been a resident there for over 40 years. My main concern is I've been attending many of the neighborhood meetings around this transit issue, and at our last meeting here in the near North Side, we had voted on the option going down Oliver Avenue, and the information we'd been given at that time was that that was the least destructive as far as the
number of homes that would be taken, and it would not affect some of the businesses right on Penn, Estes Funeral Home, North Point, the Urban League building, and so that was the primary -- or the number one choice for the residents in the neighborhood. As I come here tonight, I don't see that being reflected anywhere, and I understand that there was a decision made by an advisory committee that voted to go down the Penn Avenue route rather than hitting -- than doing the Oliver alternative, and I'm just concerned about the effect on the businesses in the area, and also the fact that there's a lot of mistrust in the neighborhood and feeling like the neighborhood isn't being listened to, and especially with the understanding that this was the least destructive of homes, and also was gonna be a less expensive alternative than going down Penn. I understand the complexity of -- of these decisions, but also I'm concerned about the apparent, sort of divergence of looking at a number of issues and listening to the neighborhood, or the lack thereof.

Oh, I am opposed to the alternative of going through the railway bed through North -- through
North Regional -- North -- through Wirth Park.
I'm a user of the park, and my children and
grandchildren use this park, and I believe it's a
natural resource which needs to be thoroughly
protected. I am in favor of light rail coming
through North Minneapolis, but would prefer to
see it on the Oliver alternative rather than down
Penn. That's it.

PAUL KRAWCZYK: My name is Paul Krawczyk,
K-R-A-W-C-Z-Y-K. We live at 1223 Washburn Avenue
North, essentially where the Plymouth Bridge and
Theodore Wirth Parkway intersect, or Plymouth and
Washburn is the intersection. We're very close
to the prospective route that would run along
Theodore Wirth Parkway versus Penn. We do Met
Transit often from our home at this point, but do
not feel that the location of the tracks running
currently with the railroad tracks -- I don't
know what you call that section that -- what is
it, the prospective track here? Oh, well, the
track that's gonna run down the current railroad
track and not Penn, I don't feel like it would
benefit the neighborhood nearly as much as the
Penn route would, I think the Penn route would
certainly benefit the masses. I think that the
Theodore Wirth route would simply bypass North
Minneapolis and avoid the mass -- need for mass
transit from the -- North Minneapolis. All down
Penn and Broadway, I think that that would be a
much better option for the city and for the
train. I guess that's it.

PAT JORDAN: I'm Pat Jordan, I've lived, for
the last 26 years, at 3830 Bassett Creek Drive.
Bassett Creek runs through the -- my -- the end
of my property, and when -- my son is 41, when he
was around 13, 14 years old, he found an
arrowhead in the creek. in the creek in our
backyard, and he had it looked at by some museums
and some archeologists, and it was dated about
700 years old, it is now in a museum that's
dedicated to the Mississippi River, and I'm not
sure what city and state that's in, but it's a --
it's a very beautiful area that we live in and
has a lot of nature and a lot of things that
people might miss. Thank you.

(Scoping Open House #1 public comments
concluded at approximately 6:45 p.m.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>started</td>
<td>tonight</td>
<td>Wade 9:11</td>
<td>14:4</td>
<td>2916 3:24</td>
<td>2925 9:22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state 4:5</td>
<td>track 2:7</td>
<td>wait 13:9</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nw">www.nw</a>...</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:3 8:4, 4</td>
<td>11:13</td>
<td>walk 10:9</td>
<td>W-A-D-E</td>
<td>9:12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:17</td>
<td>17:20, 21</td>
<td>12:22</td>
<td>years 7:15</td>
<td>7:16 8:3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:1, 7</td>
<td>17:22</td>
<td>13:13</td>
<td>7:16 8:3</td>
<td>3423 9:12</td>
<td>15:19</td>
<td>8:17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>station</td>
<td>tracks 2:4</td>
<td>wall 9:17</td>
<td>15:19</td>
<td>3554 6:8</td>
<td>18:8, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:22 10:4</td>
<td>12:9</td>
<td>9:18</td>
<td>18:15</td>
<td>3830 18:8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:6</td>
<td>17:17, 18</td>
<td>want 8:18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stations 3:6</td>
<td>traffic 2:8</td>
<td>9:1</td>
<td>4:30 1:13</td>
<td>10 15:19</td>
<td>15:18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:9, 25</td>
<td>9:7 15:5</td>
<td>wanted 5:2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stenotypy</td>
<td>trail 3:10</td>
<td>Washburn 17:10, 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:11</td>
<td>3:11</td>
<td>way 2:2, 4</td>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>10 45 19:17</td>
<td>15:18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stops 9:18</td>
<td>trails 12:7</td>
<td>week 2:5</td>
<td>15:19</td>
<td>3554 6:8</td>
<td>18:18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:2</td>
<td>12:8</td>
<td>weren't 4:8</td>
<td>18:15</td>
<td>3830 18:8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>train 2:4</td>
<td>West 2:13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:13 8:9</td>
<td>2:23 8:6</td>
<td>We're 17:13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studies</td>
<td>8:6 10:17</td>
<td>whatsoever 7:2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:14</td>
<td>12:9, 24</td>
<td>wheelcha... 2:12, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgis</td>
<td>13:7</td>
<td>4:12, 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:8, 8</td>
<td>14:18</td>
<td>white 5:2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suburban</td>
<td>18:6</td>
<td>whoever's 8:10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:14</td>
<td>trains 2:22</td>
<td>wildlife 10:16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thereof</td>
<td>Transcri... 19:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:23</td>
<td>19:8</td>
<td>Willis 7:10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thing 8:2</td>
<td>thing 8:2</td>
<td>window 7:10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>12:8</td>
<td>17:32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:14</td>
<td>3:21 4:2</td>
<td>8:20</td>
<td>20-year</td>
<td>8:21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:13</td>
<td>7:4, 14</td>
<td>15:16</td>
<td>23 1:10</td>
<td>23rd 19:4</td>
<td>2321 14:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:4</td>
<td>15:21</td>
<td>versus 13:12</td>
<td>2511 5:5</td>
<td>26 18:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:17</td>
<td>17:16</td>
<td>versus 17:15</td>
<td>27th 19:17</td>
<td>28-year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surround...</td>
<td>18:3</td>
<td>vibration 5:7, 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:1</td>
<td>7:21</td>
<td>9:16</td>
<td>7:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>switching</td>
<td>Transitiw... 1:3, 13:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:23</td>
<td>3:13</td>
<td>vice 13:12</td>
<td>7:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system</td>
<td>13:6, 10</td>
<td>vicinity 12:8</td>
<td>7:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:10, 14</td>
<td>13:11</td>
<td>vigorous 8:5</td>
<td>7:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systems 7:5</td>
<td>transport 3:12</td>
<td>virtue 19:8</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:17</td>
<td>transport... 6:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-C-H-I...</td>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>voted 15:22</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>tremendo... 12:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-T-U-R...</td>
<td>7:21</td>
<td>16:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:9</td>
<td>trench 3:9</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>tripled 7:23</td>
<td>tonight 13:13</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take 10:11</td>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>13:13</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:11</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>16:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:25</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:23</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>16:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:5</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taken 1:19</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:14</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:15</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:16</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:17</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:18</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:19</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:20</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:21</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:22</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:23</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:24</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:25</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:26</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:27</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:28</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:29</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:30</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:31</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:32</td>
<td>19:13</td>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>2815 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MR. HANSON: Thomas Alfred Hanson, 6741 83rd Place North, Brooklyn Park, Minnesota. I believe the best option is for -- coming to the northwest suburbs is the B, the Brooklyn Park option, where there's a lot of jobs and industry compared to retail in Maple Grove.

I also think that the LRT is the only way to go, which you'll notice on this reporting and also my comments, that it's greener, it's less maintenance, and I think that it would be the future to connect the northern metro with the southern metro, what they so call now the Blue Line.

I would also prefer going through Golden Valley to keep the speed up and using buses to bring to the trunk line so people could get to the train so that it would go to place of work or the mall or school or airport.

And I think you really don't need a lot of stops in North Minneapolis just because the bus already provides a well service within five miles of the metropolitan core to bring people to and from the city, but on just the outside edges, they could always bring it to the train to keep the train at full capacity, that goes all the way out
into North Minneapolis, Brooklyn Center, Plymouth, Maple Grove, Rogers, Champlin. It could all come to the park and rides or stations to help move the train at full capacity.

I think that would help get their numbers instead of having the buses run into Brooklyn Park and go downtown and also the train going downtown. Make the train the main trunk and the buses feed it. Thank you very much.

MR. FANDRICH: James Fandrich. The information that we're, you know, receiving tonight doesn't include any of the cost per ridership or the subsidy, particularly the subsidy per ridership. And, you know, that's something that, you know, I'm pretty interested in because I'm not a rider, I'm retired, but I am going to subsidize people that do the ridership.

I'd like to hear more of that information because particularly the flexibility of the bus service or rapid transit I think outweighs what the LRT can provide in cost and flexibility of meeting the ridership requirements, so, you know, that's my comment.

One tongue-in-cheek comment is that the extension of the LRT is simply going to bring --
make it more -- will make it easier for thugs to
get to the Mall of America. Like I say,
tongue-in-cheek comment.

But I am -- I'm particularly interested in
trying to evaluate the cost that it's going to be
to me, a retired person, who doesn't use the
system, and where I see and view the bus service
as a more flexible method of transportation.
Those are my comments. Thank you.

MS. TILTON: Melody Tilton. As someone
that's looking to buy a house in the area in the
next year or two, this is really important to me,
because it's either buy a house along the proposed
light rail line or buy a house in Minneapolis and
St. Paul where I know there's going to be a light
rail. That's really important.

But for the options; I like Option C and
Alignment D2 and Alignment B. I think keeping it
in Brooklyn Park where there isn't development yet
along the Target corporate office, someone here
was telling me that they're going to be planning
on putting in some hotels and some more
entertainment options around that area. I think
that if it doesn't pick up by the time that it's
there for the employees of the Target Corporation,
that it would really encourage growth and Brooklyn Park would really benefit from that.

And I think if they went with the bus route, the high-speed buses, that if they did a hydrogen option instead of a gasoline or a diesel, that it would be a lot more affordable by the time that the project's completed than gasoline, and I think that it would have more longevity. And I think that's it. I guess that's it. Thanks.

MS. RICHARDS: Marietta Richards, 7408 Douglas Drive, Brooklyn Park. Well, they're talking about rail and bus. Okay. You'd want to make the most direct point with the rail, I would think, and take your points where you want to pick the rail up with the bus. You know what I mean? You'd just go straight up Brooklyn Boulevard -- or, I mean, Bottineau Boulevard to the end and then have your buses pick them up in other areas, you know, because they can -- they can turn, where your rail line, you want to do it as cheaply as possible, because it's not going to be cheap to put all that rail in.

That's my idea. Just go straight up Bottineau Boulevard and then catch your buses to the offshoots. That would seem to be about the
cheapest way to go.

MS. GUSTAFSON: Beverly Gustafson, 5300 62nd Avenue North, Brooklyn Center 55429. My comment is that I want to make sure that at the stations, that there's plenty of parking available. That's my main concern is that there's going to be drop-off and pickup stations but no parking spaces available. Okay. That's it.

(The Scoping Open House #2 came to a close at approximately 8:00 p.m.)

*   *   *   *   *
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STATE OF WISCONSIN
   COUNTY OF ST. CROIX

Be it known that I took the Scoping Open House #2
on the 24th day of January, 2012, at Brooklyn Park,
Minnesota;

that I was then and there a Notary Public in
and for the County of St. Croix, State of Wisconsin,
and that by virtue thereof I was authorized to
administer an oath;

that the proceedings were recorded in stenotypy by
myself and reduced to print by means of Computer-Assisted
Transcription under my direction, and that the transcript is
a true record of the proceedings to the best of my ability;

that I am not related to any of the parties
hereto nor interested in the outcome of the action.

Dated this 3rd day of February, 2012.

Lynn Gondreau, RPR. Notary Public
St. Croix County, Wisconsin
My commission expires 2/19/2012
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Wesley C. Moses
1900 Vincent Avenue North, Apartment 8
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55411.
I do agree with the -- we need light -- the system, light rail system, but I disagree with them coming down Oliver Avenue because it's taking out houses, residential on both sides, two blocks, both sides, when they could easily come down 55 and maybe go down Penn or really they can down Broadway. Broadway is -- is a really better street. It's wider and everything. They did the same with University in St. Paul, so, and they didn't take no residential out. So this is what they got proposed here, is taking some of the residential. This is ridiculous. So that's it.

Basically, I want them to come down Broadway. I do represent my church and mostly everybody, members and pastors do agree that the rail system should come down Broadway, and shouldn't come through no residential. Shouldn't come -- nobody should lose their place to live, you know.

We have plenty of space business wise
to come down Broadway and it will enhance
the business, for one. They're trying to
enhance Broadway anyway. This would enhance
Broadway. If you do it the other way,
you're taking out people's houses, and
that's not feasible.

Faith Tabernacle Gospel Fellowship
International is the church I was referring
to. That's about it.

The thing is, those that are planning
this do not live in the area and they're
doing more detriment to the north side by
coming through the residential area as
opposed to coming down the business side.
They do not live in this area, so it really
has no impact on them as much as does those
of us who live, eat, worship, play, and
everything there. So, yeah.

Rita Frenzel
1004 Queen Avenue North
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55411.
I wanted to make a comment about the
route, specifically the D1 and D2 routes
that are being proposed for the LRT line. I
want to say that the D2 route, that
either -- any one of the D2 options would be
acceptable to me. D2, Option C, would be
the most preferable. But I want to be very
clear and state very strongly that I
vehemently oppose the D1 option. And the
reason is that it will effectively isolate
North Minneapolis again. It will bypass
North Minneapolis. It will become
essentially a commuter rail between downtown
and the northwestern suburbs, and -- and
once again North Minneapolis will be
experiencing perhaps the negative impacts of
an LRT line that's close, but not really
close enough to be useful.

The D1 option would bypass North
Memorial Hospital, which is an important
piece of the community. People need to be
able to get to it. People that don't have
car transportation need to be able to get to
the hospital. The LRT line would help to do
that. If you go with the D1 route, that
bypasses the whole north side and including
North Memorial Hospital. You -- you don't
provide anything. So -- so essentially the
DL route doesn't help North Minneapolis. It helps the northwestern suburbs. It doesn't help North Minneapolis, at all.

And I would argue that there is no area in the greater -- in the Metropolitan area that needs help more than North Minneapolis.

The other concern I have about the DL route is that it has to have a significant environmental impact, and that's not good. We need wetlands for flood water retention, for groundwater filtration, groundwater recharging. We need those kind of areas, and to -- to put an LRT line through it and to do the kind of environmental upset that would happen with that just -- I just don't see any good in that. I do think, though, that a greenway along that route would be very -- very positive, would really add something to the community and add something to the area. It would make some good connections. I don't -- don't like the idea of an LRT route there, though. That's the only comments I have.
Diane Loeffler
1004 Queen Avenue North
Minneapolis, Minnesota 5411.
I would concur with her comments.

April and Richard Estes
2210 Plymouth Avenue North
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55411.
I think it's a really a bad idea
because it is going to be taking property
from people who have had property for a long
time. And specifically our chapel, Estes
Funeral Chapel has been in the community for
54 years. We are needed in this community.
We help this community. My husband has been
here, he has helped everyone, and I think it
will be a shame for them to come down
Plymouth and take our chapel. Plus, they
will be taking all of our land. Plus, I
don't think it's safe as far as kids are
concerned.

People have lived on that block.
They're going to lose their homes and
everything. And I think it's really a
disgrace, because there's other lands here,
too. And the other thing is the emotional part. I feel, how would they, meaning the Hennepin County, whoever, the City, whoever, how would they like for their mother or their father's funeral home to be going out and a big light rail going down, bells ringing, minister preaching? It's very emotional for me. And this big thing coming down, people can't get across the tracks. You got to go one way or whatever. And I think that's terrible. I wouldn't want my mom buried and a funeral going on, minister preaching, you can't hear when he's speaking. You can't hear the songs or anything like that. And I think that's -- that is disrespect for the people in our community, since we bury people in our community.

And I also think it would be terrible for them to come down and take North Point. We have just built North Point. That's where our people, the African American people go there for health care. Poor people go there for health care. So how do they expect for them to get their health
care? I think it's ridiculous.

I think they can find other places to
get people down to the Target Center. My
personal feeling is all of this is just to
get people to the Target Center. And I feel
how many African American — I'm speaking
because I'm African American. How many
African Americans do you see down at the
Target Center working? How many is at the
ball game? And I feel that's the purpose of
it.

I also feel that there's cars.

Everyone around here has a car. There's
buses and there's other places that it could
go. I think it should go in Theodore Wirth
Park. There's a rail over there. But, oh,
no, that wouldn't be the right thing to do
because they've done a lot of work on the
park over there and it looks very nice, so
why would they want a light rail going down
between the park? So that's my comments.

I've attended every meeting, and that's
my personal feeling, and we all feel it.
Not only me, our community. They're being
disrespected. I wouldn't even -- we
wouldn't even be able to bring a body out the door. And we need to be on a corner where people know where we are. And we've been in this community 54 years helping people who are not able -- does not have resources to bury their people. And my husband is right here, been doing it for 54 years. And our family is highly respected in this neighborhood.

But I think they are, whoever is in charge of this light rail and all, I think they're disrespecting our community. That's what I have to say.

Estes Funeral Chapel is a small business. Once the streets are torn down and everything is blocked off, how are we supposed to pay off our bills? How are we supposed to bury people without money? And the vibration will tear down our building. We can't afford to buy a new building. They're not going to pay us what we are worth.

The -- our competition, who is Washburn McReavy, they're not going around their funeral chapels. They're the people
who have all of the money. They got money
and they're not tearing nothing up around
them, but they come over here to the only
black funeral chapel in Minneapolis of 54
years and move us all out where we can't --
we can't -- we can't even get money to
rebuild or anything like that. So they
will -- will -- the vibration will just
knock our building down. We're not going to
even have enough room to bring a body out of
the door because they're going to try to
take everything that we have. And you -- I
wonder if their mama was there, again, if
their mother was there being funeralized and
all this mess come through there, and I
resent them doing that. And like I said, we
are a small business. And we have struggled
to be there 54 years to help the people in
North Minneapolis. And now they're trying
to tear us down and that's disrespectful for
my husband and Estes Funeral Chapel being
here 54 years in this community. So I hope
they listen to what I say.
Erika Shatz
1807 Queen Avenue North
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55411.

I've lived in the community for ten years, and for five years I have not owned a car. So the first thing that I want to say is the buses are fantastic. The only thing that I'm unhappy about with the buses is that I used to be able to take a bus from my home directly to the UM, to the university, and that has been canceled with cutbacks. And I can walk down to the funeral home, but I can't get it right from my house. So, you know, it's good to have public transportation to education.

I have, like, some erratic comments, and then I have some together comments, so I'm going to keep going off my various notes.

So the work proposal, I'm very disappointed that it doesn't have more stops. I think there can be a stop at Plymouth -- I mean, I think it shows a stop at Plymouth, but there should be a stop at Broadway. There should be a way -- a stop
up near North Memorial Hospital for people
to have a way to come and go from the
hospital.

I guess if we are definitely going to
go to adding another lane somewhere, I'm in
favor of using the existing space.

Overall, I think that I've experienced
some of this process in a dis -- in a
disrespectful way, and I'd like to give some
examples. But, first, I'd like to
appreciate -- and I think a lot of outsiders
have good intentions, but good intentions
don't automatically mean good outcomes. And
people might want to help economically
depressed North, but to come in and be
disrespectful, hoping to build a city of
great mutual respect for each other, you
know, will not be successful. I -- I think
that outsiders are bringing this idea of
this is going to be really good for economic
development, especially coming down Penn.
And I don't hear insiders saying this is
what our community -- this is the answer to
our economic development.

The issues around the economic
development in this area have to do with human relations, have to do with mutual respect, have to do with entrenched poverty and racism, and it's really not centrally about stops of a transportation system.

So some of the disrespect, and I feel really emotional about the first one, is what had been a proposal is no longer one of the most likely outcomes to re -- to take partial removal of dozens of people's homes. I have never heard of such a proposal for any residential area, other than North Minneapolis. And I cannot imagine it being proposed to any people of any neighborhood. I am just astounded and I think it's horrendous. I think it's -- I think I'm embarrassed of my city and my state to take people's property and say we're not even going to buy your property. We're just going to take your front door, we're just going to take your parking spots, and the people that pick you up and drop you off at night. It's -- it is just so painful to be treated that way and talked about that way.
Some other examples I think include taking North Point, which is a fairly new facility. It started as a pilot program to increase health access, you know. And then ten years later, let some middle class people from outside do a new project over here, trying to be helpful and take away something that we just built up. I use North myself. I like to be able to walk to my health care clinic.

Then I think as far as the Estes Funeral Home, I've only -- this is as an outsider. I have never been to a funeral at the home, and my family is not from here, so I don't have a legacy, a history with the home. But when I think about, it's just obvious the longevity of the funeral home and the places where I've been to my -- family funerals back East, and to lose those buildings where you, you know, face the transitions of life, I just think, wow, isn't that kind of a meaningful place to people to lose all those memories.

And another example of what I feel is disrespect is the very poor efforts to get
community people to come out to these
meetings. I have email, and I received an
email asking me -- for example, offering me
an invitation to come to this meeting	onight and to download this packet. Well,
not only do my elder neighbors not have
e-mail and not have computers, but who even
wants to print all this (indicating)? I
mean, and then I thought, well, I'll just
print it for everybody, and I thought why
should I spend $50 of ink printing this? I
don't know why people haven't gone door to
door up and down Penn asking the residents,
you better come to a meeting and hear about
what's going to happen.

The packet I'm referring to is the
Scoping Booklet of the Bottineau Transitway,
the Draft EIS, by Hennepin County.

Now, I called and I asked, can you
please give me ten copies and we'll spread
them out to the neighbors? And -- and they
were provided, which I appreciate very much.

The people whose homes will have
vibrations and noise should be involved.
It's their property that the foundation is
going to settle more than it would naturally settle.

I -- I just think that, you know, putting a notice in the newspaper is not sufficient, especially when it's not a high computer using neighborhood and it's not a high literacy neighborhood. I mean, what do we do when the tornado happened? We had notices on every street about where to go for services. And it was all over the radio, it was all over KMOJ Radio. You know, they should have been announcing this stuff. Okay.

So here, what else do I want to say? The -- I have concerns about the impact of the rail coming down Penn. Now, some people are for it, and I'm not totally against it, but, again, to approach it with the disrespect that's happening is not going to have good outcomes for the community. Dividing neighborhoods is not good for a community, and that's what the rail is going to do. Increase noise and vibrations,

taking people's homes.

And they -- the incredible sense of
danger that I have for children. You know, it's not like it's elevated. It's -- it's right in the street. I'm very offended, or let me just say it feels slippery that the 15-minute video that I was asked to watch coming in, that is an overview, never shows the rail going down a residential street. All of the pictures in the video are of wide open and industrial areas and major streets with parks on both sides. They're not showing what it's going to look like on our street. I mean, has anybody even envisioned it?

We can't take people's parking and access to a front street. Like if -- if the homes are left on Penn, and they're partial takes so they don't have street access, they can't be dropped off and picked up, they can't park. They have to do all of life out the alley. Alleys are dangerous, alleys are not paved. You can slip in alleys. If you're in a wheelchair, you can't get up and down alleys. I mean, nobody wants to live their life out of an alley, and nobody else would be asked to.
I know I'm really being long-winded here, probably because you're sitting next to me. I'm getting on my soap box, so (indicating).

All right. So if this is a 50- to a hundred-year vision, which I think that's what the transportation issues we're trying to address here, I don't think these are particularly visionary plans. I think they're visionary for what we wish our city's like today, but I don't think it's going to be anything special and appropriate 50 or a hundred years from now.

You know, we've got to have room for people to walk and for bikes. You know, if the earth manages to survive, there's going to be a lot of people on unmotorized vehicles. We got to have room for bike lanes. What about covered bikeways? What about a monorail that goes up in the sky? How cool would that be? And that's a visionary 50- to a hundred years from now is space travel.

What would teenagers propose? This is all about their lives. It's not about --
I'm sorry, but Mrs. Estes, this -- by the
time this is even built, my elder's
generation will be passed and I'll be elder.
This is all about what do young people want.
You know, kids are very creative. I'd like
to see a bunch of kids brainstorm the
transportation issues.

So I think that vision -- I think the
vision is strong communities, strong city,
sense of involvement, everybody respecting
each other. And I think if we don't use
respect on the path to where we're going,
that we're not going to have respect when we
get to the end. Thank you.

I wanted to add that I wonder how the
number of stops on Penn, if the rail was to
come down Penn, are determined, because
the -- they're so -- they're spaced so far
apart that an older person would not be --
an older person in my neighborhood that
might walk to the Golden Valley stop would
not walk to the Plymouth or Broadway stop.
So then is the question, will it serve North
Minneapolis at all or is it just really for
the suburbs? That's it.
Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

Roosevelt Turner
1800 Queen Avenue North
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55411.

I personally do not see the need for any type of rail, period. First of all, I do not think a rail will take the place of buses. Buses go to Anoka and pick up passengers if you are going shopping or to your job, or whatever. They let you off much closer than this train is going to.

And I look at some of the printouts. There's two stops and people have to walk blocks and blocks and blocks in subzero weather and senior citizens cannot be out walking in subzero weather. And I just -- I just don't think it's a good idea. I don't see a need for light rail. This is not New York, Chicago, or California. So I think it's a waste of taxpayer money.

And I -- you talk about knocking people's homes out. I live -- my back door is Penn Avenue. And if you take -- I'm a
retired senior citizen. If you own your home, they're not going to give you what your home is worth. You got to go out retired senior citizen on a fixed income and buy another home. I don't think that's very good, at all. I just think -- can't do that. How can you do that?

If your house is worth $200,000, are they going to give you 200,000 for your house when they tear it down? I don't think so. You got to go out and make another loan for a home? I don't think so. That's not -- I just don't think that's feasible. That's all I have to say. I do not think it's feasible for the north side residents. This isn't -- the north side are catching buses. Most people have cars.

They're not -- people are not going to stand out in the cold in the winter. I wouldn't walk five blocks to get the train myself. Not in the summer I wouldn't do that at my age. Think about doing it in sub below zero weather, no, no. I don't think it's -- uh-uh. I just -- I don't think it's for the north side residents. I am totally
against this, 100 percent. With that, I end my comments.

Ronald R. McConico
2114 Queen Avenue North
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55411.

My first comment I want to make is that I believe we need to protect Penn as a thoroughfare. It is the only street that connects south to north. Lyndale stops, Emerson stops. It's the only street that allows traffic to go from south to north. And by disrupting that, you're going to disrupt the pattern flow of the neighborhood.

I've been thinking about people that live up in the 40s -- you know, 30s and 40s. The other thing is I think that by running down Oliver, you'll disrupt a lot of homes in the short term, but you'll still protect Penn as a thoroughfare, and then Oliver can become a commercial district.

I also think that serious consideration needs to be given to BRT, bus rapid transit, and to think on how you can do that and
still travel at the same speeds as light rail with it being half the cost to produce and two-thirds of the cost to run. If we think a little bit more out of the box on how we can get it still to run as quickly as a light rail, I think that's an important, important issue.

By coming through North Minneapolis, yes, we're going to disrupt homes, but we're also going to bring business and commerce to North Minneapolis, where if we run up on the parkway, North Minneapolis is -- is something that gets avoided. So for the long term and for the future of North Minneapolis, I think this is a good idea, but I also think we need to protect Penn Avenue as a thoroughfare. Okay.

Esther Adams
1701 Queen Avenue North
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55411.

My concern is access to the west side of Penn Avenue at street -- okay, say 14th, 16th, 17th, those three street intervals to the left. How are we going to get to our
properties to the left -- the left -- yeah, to the left of that light rail, because they're -- they're saying that they have stations that are going to be at Plymouth and Golden Valley Road. But what happens to us trying to get to the left, even to the right really, with the rail going down the middle of that street? How do we get access to our streets?

It's different than it is over south because that's running across the back of property and then they still -- you know, you have that rail come down, like, at 30 -- 34th Street and 38th Street. It's off Hiawatha. Are we going to get an arm that's going to come down to let us in where we need to get in to go into our streets, or am I going to have to go from Plymouth Avenue all the way over to -- because these are one-way streets north and south. All of these are one-way streets. One way -- Queen is one-way north. Russell is south. Sheridan is north. Thomas is south. So am I going to have to go all the way over to -- russell is one-way -- Sheridan from Plymouth
to go up to 17th to get to my house? Or --
or am I going to have to go to Golden Valley
Road, that way, to come to the one-way
street coming south to get to my house?
That's my question.

And that's probably going to be a
question for a lot of other people, too, you
know, with that train coming up and down.
That was my main one.

Is there going to be a barrier once
they get rid of the houses on Penn that's
going to go all the way or are there going
to be breaks in the barrier? How is that
going to work?

And -- and this plan, have they decided
just only to take one side of the street,
which is the west side, and leave the east
side? Or are they going to take both sides?
That's it.

Will I get a personal answer to my
questions?

One more. How does that affect the
property value of the houses once they put
this in? Yeah. How does it affect the
property value?
Then another question is, will you
treat the -- how are you going to deal with
the renters as well as the -- the
homeowners, because when the tornado came
through, the homeowners took their checks
and the renters were just left out, no place
to go, no help, no assistance, or anything
like that. Is this going to happen again in
our neighborhood? Okay.

(Whereupon, the Foregoing Proceedings
were concluded at approximately 7:30 p.m.)
STATE OF MINNESOTA

COUNTY OF WASHINGTON

Be it known that I took the Foregoing Proceedings on the 25th day of January, 2012, at Minneapolis, Minnesota;

that I was then and there a Notary Public in and for the County of Washington, State of Minnesota;

that the Foregoing Proceedings was recorded in stenotype by myself and reduced to print by means of Computer-Assisted Transcription under my direction,

and that the Foregoing Proceedings is a true record of the Comments given to the best of my ability;

that I am not related to any parties hereto nor interested in the outcome of the action.

Dated this 1st day of February, 2012.

[Signature]

Lynn M. Ettl, RPR, CCR
Washington County, Minnesota
My Commission Expires 1-31-2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Northw. Court Reports</th>
<th>1-800-628-7315</th>
<th>1-800-628-7315</th>
<th>1-800-628-7315</th>
<th>1-800-628-7315</th>
<th>1-800-628-7315</th>
<th>1-800-628-7315</th>
<th>1-800-628-7315</th>
<th>1-800-628-7315</th>
<th>1-800-628-7315</th>
<th>1-800-628-7315</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1111.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table contains various legal references and numbers, likely extracted from legal documents or court reports. The content appears to be a mix of dates, numbers, and text, possibly related to court proceedings or case summaries.
SCOPING OPEN HOUSE #4

BOTTINEAU TRANSITWAY

CERTIFIED

SCOPING OPEN HOUSE #4
HELD ON THE 31ST DAY OF JANUARY, 2012
AT THE ROBBINSDALE CITY HALL
4100 LAKEVIEW AVENUE NORTH
ROBBINSDALE, MINNESOTA
6:00 P.M.

Taken before Lynn M. Ettr, RPR, CRR

www.nwcourtreporters.com
nwcr@nwcourtreporters.com
1-800-628-7551
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INDEX OF COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. Martha M. Hoffman ................................. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2. Earl J. Nevala ................................ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3. J.S. Futcher ................................. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4. Deb Berger .................................... 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5. Mary Kay Harris .............................. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6. Dale Price ..................................... 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7. Jeannette Hiel ............................... 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8. Amelia Hummel ................................ 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9. Dawn Henning .................................. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10. Diane Steen-H. ......................... 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11. David Kiser ................................. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12. Carol Larson ................................. 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Martha Hoffman
4545 Beard Avenue North
Robbinsdale, Minnesota 55422.

My comment is, do it tomorrow. It's about time. I would like to voice my support for Alignment B out to TNC, the Target North Campus. I -- they're moving 3,000 employees in -- starting 2012 to Target North Campus, and a lot of us live north and would love to have that option.

My other thing is there is no bus service between Parkway and Bottineau Boulevard, 81. That whole west -- or east side of 81, that community is without bus service. So we desperately need bus service to whatever this light rail will be. So do it. It's 2012, people need transportation. That's my comments.

Earl Nevala
3336 France Avenue North
Robbinsdale, Minnesota 55422.

What about what we were told last year during the discussions of improvements to France Avenue south of Oakdale, the widening...
and the realignment of the intersection?
Did all of this have to do with the rail
line? And was a choice already made to run
down Oakdale Avenue? I say keep it on 81,
not on the residential streets.
Safety is an issue. Hiawatha Line has
caused eight deaths in the short time it's
been running, and I think safety is a big
issue here. I say keep it off the
residential streets. Keep it on the rail
line or keep it on 81. I don't want it
running down the streets in a residential
neighborhood. That's it.

J.S. Futcher
4132 Regent Avenue North
Robbinsdale, Minnesota 55422.
To me, it makes more sense to use the
existing Burlington Northern Santa Fe
Railroad tracks, but I understand from
tonight's presentation that the railroad, or
somebody, isn't going to let -- let this be
used. So, therefore, the light rail transit
is going to come right down along the same
line as the railroad tracks. And, to me,
this is sort of a waste of resources when
they already have some -- a good railroad
track going right through the area. As I
said, I would prefer to see the railroad
tracks used.

Deb Berger

3408 France Avenue North

Robbinsdale, Minnesota 55422.

I'm not against a light rail system. I
think it's in the wrong spot. I think down
81 to 41st or 42nd would be much more
beneficial. There's more open property
there for parking. It would bring
businesses to downtown Robbinsdale. I just
think that the way that they're going is
disrupting too many elderly people in that
area that have lived there for too long.
All this is going to benefit is the
hospital. Anything else?

And also about putting all that money
into your homes over the years, because you
can't afford to move. Where are people
going to go? Hennepin County is going to
lose more revenue by doing this with all the
taxes.

Mary Kay Harris
3538 Grimes Avenue North
Robbinsdale, Minnesota 55422.

I was starting to write it. I agree that public transit needs to be improved in North Minneapolis and Robbinsdale. For 26 years I took the bus to work downtown. Now for the past 18 months, I have had to drive because the bus routes to Robbinsdale along Broadway have been decreased. That's the frequency of the buses.

But it's my belief that the light rail project is regressive and not progressive. At one time Minneapolis had an exemplary trolley car system, in the '30s, '40s, and '50s. And that was taken down, eliminated, because of -- and I don't have to go into a lot of detail. But it's a fact that it was a plan between the rubber companies for tires, auto manufacturers, and so on. So at one time, we had the best mass transit system in the -- in the whole United States, and that was dismantled.

So now something is being put into
place that causes a great deal of
destruction. For example, the route going
through St. Paul along University Avenue is
causing huge hardships for the business
owners there. And the Metropolitan Council
even had to put $1.2 million out to help
promote those businesses so they wouldn't go
under.

Or the idea of having this train go
through Robbinsdale on a trajectory where
the imaginary 34th Avenue will be taking out
all kinds of trees and houses. At one time
the infrastructure was in place, but that
was demolished. And now they're trying to
put something in place that doesn't belong
there now. Okay. That's one point that I
want to make.

The other thing is, when they talk
about senior citizens, I don't think that
senior citizens are going to use light rail.
I don't think that is a mode of
transportation that will be suited to senior
citizens because they'll have to walk quite
a distance to get there. So I think that's
a specious argument, that this is something
that will be used or appeal to senior
citizens.

As I say, I agree that we need an
improved mass transit, and I think that it
would be a good idea to buy a fleet of small
electric buses and vans and run those in --
in North Minneapolis and Robbinsdale, I mean
even out to Arbor Lakes. It looks as if
there's going to be a lot of destruction
going out that way, too. So that's what I
want to say.

There again, the incredible disruption
that that's going to cause along Broadway,
all of those businesses. To be truly
progressive, this should have been done back
in the '60s. Now the time is past for this
project.

And the last thing I want to say is
that these trains are very large, even
though they're called light transit. I work
downtown. I see them on 5th Street. This
is a very large conveyance, and I can't
imagine it going down, like, Penn Avenue or
going down 34th Avenue in Robbinsdale.
These things are huge. They're not meant to
be on a small corridor.

I think, if anything, it should go on a large corridor, maybe on Highway 55. It's also known as Van White. So that's what I want to say. Thank you so much for this. I just think that -- I think that we're way behind the curve with this. The damage has been done already with urban sprawl and the destruction of the environment. And this should have been done years and years ago, and now it's too late.

Dale Price
3336 Halifax Avenue North
Robbinsdale, Minnesota 55422.
As a resident of 3336 Halifax, this will be impacted by D2, the Robbinsdale directive for the LRT.

Having talked with Golden Valley council members, the Mayor of Robbinsdale, and consultants on behalf of light rail, their intent is to do the least amount of disruptive intersections and removal of homes. Yet the D2 option leaves you nothing but options of putting in a bridge,
restructuring traffic patterns, going over multiple intersections. And then the process in going down to North Memorial Hospital.

I would suggest that we have a current hub at 41st for our bus transit. We have a block, half-block section that's available to be depot style disembarkment for LRT coming in from the north side.

It makes a little more sense to me to get off the track at level grade; when they exit the track to a transit hub, to do so at a level grade location where no homes are purchased, no bridges are built, and the easy access to Bottineau Drive, which is a component to take it to the north side of Minneapolis. I would hope that they would consider looking at that, rather than the D2 location. I guess that's it.

Jeannette Hiel

3359 Grimes Avenue North
Robbinsdale, Minnesota 55422.

I am a senior citizen and I'm a little scared, worried about my house. And I -- I
don't think it's a good idea. I see that it's for future -- you know, future traffic, cars, getting them off the road and all this stuff. And I just -- I talked to Rick, the guy here in Robbinsdale who is on -- the roads, and he said that it wasn't anything that was going to happen overnight. And that -- and then I talked to somebody here, and he said 2018 or 2020. So I thought, well, you know, I probably won't be here, but I just don't -- there are other options than coming down -- you know, building a bridge over Indiana Avenue North down 34th side street there, taking houses on both sides of the street. I mean -- and it's just -- it's disruptive and it's not right. It's just not -- you know, this is my own opinion. It just -- it's upsetting. It's just not -- but I don't know, you know, how it's going to end.

I understand the mayor here in Robbinsdale isn't for this idea. And there's a better -- there's a couple better options, which they might go for. We don't really know what they're going to be doing.
You know, it isn't decided yet. And even
the time element isn't decided yet. Okay.
That's all I have to say.

Amelia Hummel
4368 France Avenue North
Robbinsdale, Minnesota 55422.
My name is Amy Hummel, and I live in
Robbinsdale between Crystal Lake and
Lake Drive. I'm DFL co-chair for
Robbinsdale and I have lived in Robbinsdale
since 2000, and I used to live in St. Paul
Midway. I was an honors degree in economics
and attended the Johns Hopkins University
School of Advanced International Studies,
and worked for the World Bank. I also lived
in Washington, D.C., while they were
building the subway metro system.

It's a well-known principle, I guess,
of urban development and urban studies that
any transit system increases land rent and
this has a dramatic impact on the -- the
transit systems' increased land rent and
have a kind of a star-spoked development
pattern that they impose upon urban areas,
and that they facilitate urban growth and
the integration of populations in a
well-served transportation area.

I am 100 percent in favor of bus rapid
transit or light rail transit or anything
else they can build to integrate the first
ring suburb with the rest of the metro area
and make it accessible to everyone.

But I don't want one cent of my tax
dollar going to this system unless I can
ride on it. I want there to be dense and
frequent affordable bus feeder routes to all
stations. And I think they need an extra
station in Robbinsdale between Bass Lake
Drive and the southern station so that I can
ride it, too.

I went and testified in favor of the
recently established, and then discontinued,
metro transit bus route R-19. And I have
never been so disappointed in how -- public
policy makers and my neighbors as I was
going to those public hearings and hearing
that people didn't care about elderly
residents or the handicapped or people who
simply wanted to ride the bus. The main
beneficiaries of mass transit are the people still driving their cars, because bus -- the streets are not crammed with other car riders, especially during rush hour. But a good transit system promotes economic development and employment and property values.

As a single woman living in Washington, D.C., I knew, as we all knew, the safest places to live were right on a bus line. So I would like to see this knowledge incorporated in this planning.

I personally would prefer the bus rapid transit because it costs less to build and maintain. Also, when you have an incident, whether it's caused by weather or equipment or a car driver or a pedestrian or whatever, when you have an incident on a train track, the trains can't go around it. But bus rapid transit offers that extra degree of reliability and I think the safety, as the buses are not -- bus transportation would not be impaired.

Also, I want there to be money left over for those bus feeder routes, even
though I understand it comes out of separate
tax revenue areas. And the light rail
transit for sure and possibly the bus rapid
transit would have some federal funding that
would mandate that there would be bus
routes. I want them to be as many as
possible, rather than as few as we can get
away with. And I want there to be money
left to fund it.

I'm almost 65 and I would like to
support a cause that would actually benefit
me, and this definitely would. We need
access not only between residences and
places of employment, but places of medical
care, like North Memorial, and basic
shopping. And the train doesn't have to go
there, but the feeder buses should. If you
have a bus accessible at a
pedestrian-friendly town, it has to have bus
transit.

Dawn Henning,
3415 Halifax Avenue North
Robbinsdale, Minnesota 55422.
I'm just concerned about the -- the
houses. Like, we just moved in in October, we had no idea this was going on. We weren't told about it. But anyway, the houses in the area, even when we drive down, like, the alleys, you can see foundation cracks from -- there's kind of a hill right there. And I'm just really concerned about the house structures and the structures in general being compromised because of all the construction and the light rail vibrations and stuff.

I was just told that there would be a lot of vibrations because of the light rail, but there wouldn't be. He said that it would be less than even the railroad. But there's also beforehand. There's all that construction and everything. So there is going to be -- I believe that some homes will have some issues with foundations. And that's my real main concern.

Diane Steen-H.
2829 Yosemite
St. Louis Park, Minnesota 55416.
After looking at that 12-minute tape in there, I'm thinking about two of the slides,
and one was saying that the senior citizen population up in this area is going to explode by, like, 125 percent in the next decades. And so looking at these two options for the southern route, either going along Theodore Wirth or swinging east to go down Broadway, that one seems the best, the one that would go past the North Memorial complex, because of senior citizens having to get to medical care.

So I prefer for this general area here to have the eastern option used, instead of the more scenic one that's going to go along Theodore Wirth Park.

And then another slide said that close to 15 percent of the residents in this area don't have a car and so they also will benefit from this line, especially that eastern swing around, because if they don't have -- if it goes along Theodore Wirth, they're going to have to get on some feeder buses and -- or take a half-mile walk or whatever. And that's just going to add to the burden of this urban area up here. So I think when you think of the
North Minneapolis citizenry, older people, people without cars, I don't think they should go along that park. I think they should take the urbanized route along Penn and Broadway.

And that's -- also, I'm a social activist and I canvas the neighborhoods for things, rank-to-choice voting. I've done that for years. And so I really feel for the people and I don't think they should have to have an extra burden of getting to the Theodore Wirth area to get onto light rail. It should be closer to where they live. So the eastern option, Broadway and Penn is best.

David Kiser
3807 Vandemark Road
Robbinsdale, Minnesota 55422.

Well, I strongly believe it should be the D1 alignment from Robbinsdale going south, that it would allow for the best use of the line with the people from farther out getting to downtown quickly, rather than having to make multiple stops. And in my
estimation, that's the purpose of the whole
line is to move people further away to
downtown quickly. That's all I have to say.

Carol Larson
3711 Lee Avenue North
Robbinsdale, Minnesota 55422.
You can put down that I'm all for it,
the project. I'm looking forward to it.

(Whereupon, the Foregoing Proceedings
were concluded at approximately 9:05 p.m.)
STATE OF MINNESOTA  

COUNTY OF WASHINGTON

Be it known that I took the Foregoing Proceedings on the 31st day of January, 2012, at Robbinsdale, Minnesota;

that I was then and there a Notary Public in and for the County of Washington, State of Minnesota;

that the Foregoing Proceedings was recorded in stenotype by myself and reduced to print by means of Computer-Assisted Transcription under my direction, and that the Foregoing Proceedings is a true record of the Comments given to the best of my ability;

that I am not related to any parties hereto nor interested in the outcome of the action.

Dated this 1st day of February, 2012.

[Signature]
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Washington County, Minnesota
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