Engagement Strategies and Approach

September – December 2021

The METRO Blue Line Extension is looking for a route that does not use eight miles of railroad right of way as previously planned. Because of the shift away from railroad property, some of the project can remain the same, while other areas need to change.

Since August 2020, the project along with the community engagement cohort have engaged with communities through a variety of activities, including in-person and virtual community meetings, door knocking, attending community events, online and paper surveys, and interactive maps. See below for the timing and project updates shared during each round of engagement.

- **Round 1** (August 2020 through January 2021): Input on project goals, concerns, opportunities, and thoughts on potential new routes
- **Round 2** (March to June 2021): Input on new route options released as part of the Initial Route Modification Report
- **Round 3** (July to August 2021): Input on the connections that light rail would make within communities and station locations within those areas
- **Round 4** (September to December 2021): Input on updated design concepts and potential opportunities and impacts of light rail options

This document summarizes the feedback received during the fourth round of public engagement from September to December 2021, including a summary of responses and questions received from public meetings, advisory committee meetings, community cohort engagement, the online comment form, and the interactive feedback map.

From September through December 2021, project staff have engaged with the public about the project through the following:

- **7 public open houses**
  - In-person meetings (156 attendees total):
    - Crystal: Wed, September 29, 2021 from 5 – 7 p.m.
    - Robbinsdale: Wed, October 27, 2021 from 5 – 7 p.m.
    - Minneapolis:
      - Tues, November 9, 2021 from 11:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.
      - Tues, November 16, 2021 from 5 – 7 p.m.
      - Sat, December 4, 2021 from 1:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Common Themes

Below are the common themes that emerged from feedback received during this round of engagement:

- Mixed feedback on West Broadway vs. Lowry routes:
  - Prefer the Lowry Ave route – provides opportunity to develop vacant lots along Lowry Ave; feel that it’s safer; West Broadway is very narrow and would result in impacts to businesses, residents, parking, etc. to fit light rail.
  - Prefer the West Broadway route – serves transit dependent populations and Northside residents and businesses; better meets project goals; West Broadway is denser (has more community destinations and services) than Lowry.
  - Prefer neither route – both routes have too many negative impacts to Northside residents and businesses; prefer the old alignment; need more information before making a decision.

- Avoid negative impacts/disruptions to existing communities and the environment (e.g., construction, noise, pollution, traffic operations, safety, business/resident displacement, gentrification)
- Displacement and gentrification occurring along the alignment is the highest concern; need up front commitment from the project team on these issues before selecting a route
- Need to ensure personal safety getting to/from stations and while on transit
- Ensure transit is accessible (e.g., stations are in walkable, visible, high-density areas; transit information is translated; safe pedestrian and bicycle connections; ADA-accessible)
- Prefer above/below grade route to minimize impacts to existing residents/businesses, improve transit experience
- Incorporate street beautification, public art, greening/landscaping along the route and at stations
- Concerns about the cost-effectiveness of the project; shift to working from home, no longer need to go to/from downtown
Feedback from Open Houses

Station recommendations
- Feel that station at 40th Ave is not near businesses and is too close to residential homes on both sides
- Support having a stop near North Memorial
- Recommend station at southwest Lowry/Victory – North Memorial Hospital; important to have direct access to ground level Oakdale/East entrance
- Concerned about cost/upkeep with more people using the parking ramp at North Memorial station
- Need two more stops on West Broadway
- Have covered stations, heat, light, emergency call options
- Feel that there should be parking, both short and long-term, available around stations
- Prefer a stop directly serving Heritage Park neighborhood (e.g., Lyndale and N 7th St, west of I-94)
- Prefer Lyndale Station because it is accommodating to I-94 traffic and access to Upper Harbor Terminal

Minneapolis Route Options
- Mixed feedback on preferred route option
  - Prefer Lowry because LRT fits better, feels that it’s safer, and there’s potential for development
  - Prefer West Broadway because it has potential to reduce racial disparities and bring economic benefits; routing through North Loop isn’t worth the challenges
  - Prefer neither option because both bring negative impacts (e.g., displacement) to residents and small businesses, more information is needed on current/potential development projects along each route
  - Feel that Lowry should have LRT and West Broadway should have BRT
  - Connection to Northeast Minneapolis is important

- Preference for all eastbound traffic on West Broadway and all westbound on 21st Ave N
- Concerns about options 3A-a, 3b-a, and 3C-a which would make West Broadway a one-way street and causing more speeding/accidents
Supportive of using 21st St for safety reasons
Supportive of elevated line
  - Not hearing any reasons as to why LRT can’t be elevated
  - Think the elevated option along Bottineau makes more sense than Lowry

Prefer LRT is at-grade at Abbott (by ramp)
Add a crosswalk to station and sidewalk connections to residential side at North Memorial station
Concern about loss of parking

Need to ensure safety getting to/from stations and while using transit
Want to feel safe taking the train no matter what time of day it is
Need for safe pedestrian/bike crossings
At Emerson/Dupont split – need for pedestrian improvements along Emerson or alley of Dupont
Traffic calming needed – ensure design makes drivers feel like they need to slow down and makes pedestrians and bicyclists feel like they are safer than they are currently
Need more info about how accessible the route will be for bikers/how it will affect bikers

Visual appearance/landscaping
Incorporate greening to preserve small town feel and parkway appearance of Co. Rd. 81
Need boulevard trees along Co. Rd. 81 from Abbott through downtown Robbinsdale

Concern about impacts due to construction
The LRT will go right through my backyard; concerned about the noise
Will having an elevated train lessen the noise/dinging sound?
Concerns about businesses being supported during construction
Public engagement

- Appreciate the in-person meeting (vs virtual) – much easier to understand information presented
- Amount of information shown at meetings was overwhelming
- Disappointed at lack of information/answers to questions directly related to residents, displacement, and relocation

Anti-displacement

- Minimize impacts, disruption, and displacement of Northside businesses (e.g., KMOJ, NAZ, Walgreens) and residents; they need to stay in the community
- Why was anti-displacement research not done first before bringing these routes to the public?
- Need more information on relocation process and policies to prevent indirect displacement

Other feedback

- Need for more BIPOC representation at open houses and on the project team
- Supportive of this project because it will cut down on traffic congestion and greenhouse gas emission

Community Engagement Cohort Activities

Since March 2021, project staff have contracted directly with 12 community and cultural organizations to support a robust engagement process. These organizations are seeking feedback on the project by hosting activities prioritizing low-income communities, communities of color, and specific areas of the corridor.

This relationship is a continuation of an approach that began in 2014 with the Health Impact Assessment, health equity engagement during station area planning and in 2020 when the project pivoted to explore the new direction for route options and station study areas.

The current community consultant organizations were selected to reflect constituencies identified in project stakeholder analysis along with their geographic focus within designated project areas. Selected consultants work as a team with complimentary services and Areas served. The Cohort meets as a team with Communications and Engagement Project staff to coordinate their efforts with the direction of the BLRT Project Management Team.
Activities included door knocking, in-person and virtual focus group meetings, listening sessions and Facebook live events along with pop-up information tables at community events. The Cohort amplified project messaging to their networks and collected community feedback from all activities.
Cohort Community Feedback Summary:

Displacement and gentrification:
- Displacement and gentrification occurring along the alignment is the highest concern; need up front (quantified) commitment from the project team on these issues before selecting a route.
- Policy action is needed at the state and local level to address displacement and gentrification.
- Many of the people that live in the light rail corridor are immigrants and refugees who are low- to middle-income; they can’t afford to be displaced.
- Need to support young people on the Northside by generating jobs, apprenticeship opportunities, career pathways.
- Need for resources on displacement and relocation options.
- Need to incorporate lessons-learned from past transportation projects that negatively impacted BIPOC communities to inform our approach – such as Green Line and Blue Line.
- Fearful community will lose diversity of our corridor businesses and residents.
- Previous promises for improvements to Harrison neighborhood need to be addressed such as safety improvements on Olson Memorial Highway: pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bus stops.
- Need for rental assistance and affordable housing:
  - Concern about not being able to afford increased property taxes but also not qualifying for affordable housing.
  - Is Metro Transit investing in affordable housing along the corridor?
  - Need for mixed-use, multi-unit housing with variety of unit sizes.
  - Need to address the Harrison neighborhood history of displacement and rising cost of housing.
- Need to preserve affordable commercial space for small businesses.
- Lao communities have lived near Van White Blvd and Olson Memorial Highway for many years.
- Suggest having a stop near Asian businesses/services (e.g., Asian grocery stores) to build wealth and keep people in the area
- Anti-displacement initiative:
  - Will the initiative address harm done from the previous alignment?
  - Will the CURA contract/scope be available to the public?
  - Initiative should address direct and indirect impacts to residents and businesses in North Minneapolis
  - Suburbs should be included in this work

**Route options:**
- Experiencing tension amongst community about routing on West Broadway vs. Lowry; need the light rail to benefit all areas of North Minneapolis
  - Preference for routing on Lowry due to its proximity to residential areas and the limited space on West Broadway
  - Preference for routing on West Broadway due to density of businesses, housing, schools, libraries, etc. but concerned about how tight the right-of-way is; North Minneapolis has been left behind on development investments and needs light rail access/benefits more than North Loop; feel that the Lowry route would go through the community, not serve the community
- Not clear who ultimately makes the decision/votes on the final alignment
- Concerns about how light rail fit on the narrow streets in Minneapolis without impacting homes and businesses
- Need more information before making a decision on route
- Concern about at-grade design
  - Need for better traffic enforcement such as people running traffic lights and causing collisions with the trains.
  - Feel that light rail should be built above/below ground like in other major cities
  - Preference for elevated track on West Broadway
- Many transit-dependent people live along Zane Ave in Brooklyn Park and need reliable bus connections to light rail
- Concern that Washington Avenue/Lowry route development would not provide many jobs to community members
Riding transit:
- Need to educate the community on how to ride transit/train
- Concerns about an increase of the cost of riding transit increase
- Will funding be provided to residents/businesses for bus rides and parking costs?
- When will the train operate?

Construction:
- Concern with noise (e.g., during church and KMOJ radio hours) and environmental impacts with construction
- Concern about small business impacts during construction
- Need to understand the employment opportunities for BIPOC communities within the project such as construction jobs and contracts for construction

Adjacent properties:
- Need for resources and data on how light rail affects property values
- Lowry Ave has a lot of vacant land that could be developed
- Opportunity to eliminate parking minimums and parking lots

Small businesses:
- Concern about reduction of on-street parking, particularly for West Broadway businesses
- Suggest a parking ramp like at transit hubs or other creative parking solutions
- Need for resources/funding will be available for businesses impacted by construction and ways to make existing businesses stronger post-construction
- Many small businesses rent rather than own their space. Concern that landlords are holding onto their buildings without making improvements, waiting for an increase in property values to modernize them and increase the rents. Concern that landlords would kick out existing tenants and rent to outside businesses that can afford the higher rents.
- Interest in starting small businesses in the corridor
- Metro Transit should track impacts to businesses (e.g., how many close due to construction or by choice, whether light rail helps/hurts business). What were the impacts on businesses when the Green Line in St. Paul was built?
- Need for a job/workforce center near 85th Ave N in Brooklyn Park
- Are there plans for business incubation centers elsewhere (other than Brooklyn Park)?
Station location and design:
- Stations should be well lit and heated
- Stations should reflect local communities, culture, history; should enhance neighborhood aesthetically not just for their function
- Consider possibility of hosting pop-ups at stations around holidays/during certain times of year
- Easy/safe pedestrian and bike access to stations is key; improve sidewalk and bike lane connections
  - What will happen to the bike lanes, if LRT goes down Washington Ave?
- Concern that lack of parking at stations will cause riders to park in neighborhoods
- Locate stations at major intersections
- Include wayfinding to local businesses, places to get food, etc.
- Incorporate street beautification and public art
- Asian community wants to ensure there are community gathering/entertainment spaces next to the light rail; preserve the cohesion of Asian communities along the corridor
- See an opportunity for transit hubs at Emerson, Lyndale, and Washington

Accessibility:
- Language/cultural barriers, preventing elders in Lao and Hmong community from riding light rail
  - Elders rely on younger generations to drive them places. Without transportation options, elders are stuck at home. Important they have access to light rail.
- Need for better translations of project materials
- Stations should have transit info available in multiple languages
- Suggest having multi-lingual transit staff at stations to help with translation/accessibility
- Ensure equal accessibility for disabled in station design and transit operation

Safety:
- Concerned about safety on/at transit (e.g., sexual harassment, anti-Asian hate crime); especially during evening hours
- Concern that below grade stations will be hubs for crime/violence
- Ensure pedestrian and bicyclist safety when crossing streets and traveling to/from high activity areas such as parks and schools
  - Crossing 42nd/Lake Drive and Bottineau/81 is dangerous
- Need for security measures (e.g., cameras) at transit stations and on vehicles
Engagement process/communication:

- Need more info on the project schedule
- Cohort members have noticed more awareness about the project from the larger community
- Homeless populations feel excluded from the engagement on this project
- Concern that renters’ needs are not being prioritized
- Communities appreciate engagement early on in the process and ask that outreach is conducted where people naturally gather
- Ensure open lines of communication to avoid misinformation
- Concern about COVID’s impact on people’s ability to participate and focus on the project. Keep this in mind when making deadlines for submitting feedback.
- Door-knocking and social media engagement are strategies that have been working well
- Feel that small businesses need specific engagement
- Suggest mapping level of car ownership of households along light rail alignment and using this data to strategically place stations in areas with low car ownership
- Use marketing to change mindsets about transit – humanize North Minneapolis riders, showcasing diverse riders to break stereotypes
- Promote community assets (e.g., Theodore Wirth Park; cultural destinations to enjoy food, dance performances, celebrations; Farmers Market). The pink featured on project designs (indicating property impacts) overwhelmed communities engaged; need more sensitivity when presenting that info

Cohort member, Asian Media Access, hosted a vaccination pop-up event in December 2021.
Interactive Map Comments

The interactive map featured and sought feedback on potential station locations and visualizations of how light rail could fit at locations along the considered routes. As of December 15, 2021, the interactive feedback map had 148 comments. The map featured two map layers:

- Stations and visualizations
Former light rail route

Users could select a pin and drop it on either of the map layers in locations where they wanted to provide feedback. Pin categories included: concern and opportunity. Users could also reply to images posted by the project team that showed engineering drawings and visualizations of what light rail could look like along the routes. The most commonly received feedback are summarized by pin category.

This round of engagement also focused on collecting community feedback on the refined the station study areas, route options, and connecting links to Target Field station in Minneapolis. The route options in Minneapolis were divided into seven sections to help the community give us feedback on potential design solutions in specific areas:

- Sections 1-4 cover the West Broadway Route
- Sections 5-7 cover the Lowry Route

The engineering drawings showed what light rail could look like on the Lowry and West Broadway Route options and potential building impacts of these options.

No comments were posted on the Former light rail route map layer.

### Interactive Map Comments by Pin Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May Layer</th>
<th>Total Number of Comments</th>
<th>Responses to Route Options in Minneapolis</th>
<th>Concern Comments</th>
<th>Opportunity Comments</th>
<th>Responses to Visualizations</th>
<th>Robbinsdale Engineering Drawings Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route and Station Options</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Location of Minneapolis Route Options shown on the Interactive Map
### Stations and Visualizations Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Pin Type</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concern</strong></td>
<td>Mixed feedback about the Lowry Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The Lowry alignment won't serve many people. Missing the densest housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and mixed-use commercial area in North Minneapolis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The freeway is a major barrier for pedestrians getting to a station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There would be opportunity to develop the industrial section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comment Pin Type

**Feedback**

- **Mixed feedback about West Broadway route**
  - Broadway is too narrow and there would be too many impacts to homeowners.
  - LRT infrastructure would help reduce automobile congestion along this corridor.
- **Along Lyndale Ave by Hall Park**
  - Supportive of LRT running here because it would help traffic calming and improve safety for pedestrians.
  - A station location at Lyndale and 7th Street would serve Heritage Park and the surrounding neighborhood.
  - Support for an elevated crossing at 7th Street and Olson Memorial Highway.

### Opportunity

- **More easily access Elm Creek without a car.**
- **Consider moving the downtown Robbinsdale station north of 41st Ave as a center platform at grade.**
  - Improved pedestrian and bike safety.
  - Better access to downtown businesses and services.
- **Supportive of the Lowry route**
  - The road is wide and straight enough to make it less costly to construct.
  - Serves as a great location for walking distance for large number of residents.
  - Future D Line is a busy corridor and will be a great opportunity to Link BRT and LRT.
- **Overtime people will get used to the split directions at 21st Ave and West Broadway.**
- **A new bridge that enhances pedestrian and bicycle features at Lyndale Ave and 5th Street would provide a better environment to access the station.**

### Visualizations

- **Bottineau Blvd (County Road 81) at 40th Ave**
  - Mixed feedback for the elevated option.
    - Supportive because it will bring more accessibility and won't interfere with traffic.
    - Unsupportive because of cost and putting people out of business.
- **Oak Grove Parkway**
  - Supportive for the travel option and connection to current Green and Blue Lines for commuting and other actives.
- **93rd Avenue**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Pin Type</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern about bicycle access to this station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern there won’t be adequate amount of parking. Would like to see more park and ride sized lots along here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85th Avenue</td>
<td>Concern about pedestrian safety and this crossing. Would like to see a pedestrian bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Boulevard</td>
<td>Concern about the modifications and the potential impacts to surrounding properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottineau Blvd (County Road 81) near the Crystal Airport</td>
<td>Not supportive of the proposed location of LRT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottineau Blvd (County Road 81) South of Bass Lake Road</td>
<td>Supportive of this concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottineau Blvd at 48th Ave</td>
<td>Supportive of the location of LRT and the reduction of vehicle lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowry Ave at Newton Ave</td>
<td>Supportive of Lowry as it doesn’t impact the Broadway corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowry Ave at Lyndale Ave</td>
<td>Concern about the shared bike and road space, should have separate lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Ave at 29th Ave</td>
<td>Concern about only having a single lane for vehicle traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Broadway at Queen</td>
<td>Supportive of this concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Broadway at Newton Ave</td>
<td>Concern about the amount of ambulance traffic on West Broadway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Broadway at Emerson Ave</td>
<td>Consider tunnel option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern about elevated LRT ruining the character of the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comment Pin Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West Broadway at Lyndale Ave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Would like to see how the split option could preserve traffic flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndale at 18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Concerned that this alignment doesn’t reduce number of traffic lanes from what is planned (with sidewalk and bike lanes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Ave at 14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supportive of LRT running down Washington Ave because it allows people to get to work easily.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Route Options in Minneapolis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1 (Target Field Station to Lyndale Avenue/Plymouth Avenue)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Support 1A-a because it looks like it'll be the fastest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support 1B because it continues to utilize Lyndale Avenue and will bring other road improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2 (Lyndale Avenue – Plymouth Avenue to West Broadway Avenue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support for 2A-a because of the station location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support 2A-b because it would offer more direct access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 (West Broadway Avenue – Lyndale Avenue to Irving Avenue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mixed concerns about property impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4 (West Broadway Avenue – Lyndale Avenue to Irving Avenue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Concerned about impact to the commercial fabric (4A-a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support for 4A-b because it has important transit connections that serve the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5 (10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue/Washington Avenue – Target Field Station to Plymouth Avenue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Concerned about too many curves in 5A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support for a North Loop station in 5B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Concern about vehicle impact on 10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; in 5B-b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6 (Washington Avenue to Lowry Avenue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Concern that 6A-a does not have good character for a station location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Feel that the station in 6A-b should be far north to reduce distance to the Upper Harbor Terminal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7 (Lowry Avenue – Washington Avenue to Bottineau Boulevard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support 7A-a and having a station at Freemont to transfer to D Line BRT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Online Comment Form (November – December 2021)

We received 12 responses to the online comment form. Responses from the comment form are summarized below.

**Based on the new information presented in the interactive map, do you have a preferred route? Why?**

- **West Broadway**
  - It’s more accessible to people living south of N 26th Ave; having to use the freeway crossings at Plymouth or West Broadway are major barriers to access
  - Supportive of the light rail split with northbound on 21st and southbound on West Broadway

- **Lowry**
  - Provides access to more people than the West Broadway route
  - The C and D lines provide access to West Broadway and properties west of I-94; placing station east of I-94 would promote redevelopment of underutilized property

- **Other**
  - Prefer both routes; North Minneapolis as a whole deserves the economic benefits associated with light rail projects
  - Do not have a preferred route
Public Engagement Report (September – December 2021)

▪ Prefer to take the bus
▪ There is less room on West Broadway than Bottineau

There are multiple options for many of the sections shown in the image. What opportunities do you see with each option presented? What are your concerns with them?

Section 1

■ Like the location
  ▪ Makes sense to start here to transition further along the route
  ▪ Overlap with D line BRT on 7th St
  ▪ More transit running through this area would help connect North Minneapolis to downtown

■ Concern about traffic impacts caused by routing on 7th St
  ▪ Having LRT turn down 10th would bring less issues, smoother flow during peak traffic or large events

■ Concern about impact to North Loop businesses
■ There should be an elevated crossing on 7th St
■ Money should not be invested in light rail

Section 2

■ Dislike this route – only one travel lane in each direction will be very frustrating to residents and community members
■ Feel that this area would really benefit from access to transit; like that it includes the Harrison neighborhood
■ Assume a bridge would be added, which increases cost

Section 3

■ Concerns:
  ▪ About safety issues, feel that this is a dangerous area
  ▪ About light rail causing congestion, this area experiences a lot of traffic
  ▪ It will eliminate all parking on West Broadway
This area needs careful design consideration and could benefit from thoughtful community-oriented design
Station should be located between Emerson and Fremont
Northbound trains should go on 21st; southbound trains should go on West Broadway

Section 4
Concerns
- The route goes through a residential area with no stops
- That it will eliminate all parking on West Broadway
- That it’ll make traffic flow hectic; many people commuting from the city to the suburbs in this area
- That many key businesses for the Northside community are located here and would be impacted by construction

Need for warm skyway access to the hospital

Section 5
Like this route option
- Route is away from heavy traffic
- Allows for a smooth transition into the city

Feel that people along this route have a fair amount of transit access already
Feel that this route would cause significant traffic issues
Concern about impact to local businesses
Don’t like the location of the station; is a more direct alignment to the North Loop possible?

Section 6
This route has few people nearby; other areas would benefit more from public transit access; feel that this bypasses key areas of North Minneapolis
Like this routing – Washington Ave has more space
Build stations as far north on Washington as possible to give access to Upper Harbor Terminal
Consider routing on:
- N 2nd St – better access if future development happens here
- The west side of I-94 to better serve North Minneapolis
Section 7

- Concern about traffic impacts due to I-94 and Upper Harbor Terminal project
- Feel this route would be good for the Northside; will revitalize the community and allow for safe transit access to destinations like the Library, Fairview, and Upper Harbor Terminal

Do you have any comments on designs for the route and/or information shown in Robbinsdale and Crystal?

- Need stations at:
  - North Memorial – hospital should have a say in the location of the station near their campus
  - Station north of 41st Ave, not south of 40th Ave
  - Near Hy-Vee

- Feel the station should be at-grade in Robbinsdale
- Need for parking at Robbinsdale station
- Why doesn’t 63rd Ave station have express bus that goes directly downtown? People don’t want continued construction on Co. Rd. 81
- Feel that no one will be going downtown anymore
- Corridor cities should join together to form a “minority-driven, economic and business based coalition corridor” and get funding to support and grow businesses while acquiring commercial real estate along the corridor

What other feedback do you have for us?

- Invest in clear air buses
- Prefer route that doesn’t require people from North Minneapolis to cross I-94 to access the light rail
- Feel that the light rail project should be delayed
  - Minnesotans love their cars and won’t give them up
  - Pandemic has changed people’s work/life/commute needs; people’s need for transit has changed

- Against moving light rail off Co. Rd. 81 at West Broadway in Brooklyn Park; most people in this area do not want light rail here
- Need more info about:
  - Projected ridership
How the different alignments affect travel time

Show businesses/businesses owners along each route so community knows who will be impacted by this project, where help is needed, trouble areas

Advisory Committee Meeting Comments

The BLRT advisory committees, the Business Advisory Committee (BAC), Community Advisor Committee (CAC), Corridor Management Committee (CMC), and Technical Project Advisory Committee (TPAC) have provided key input throughout the new route selection process which helped shaped the direction of public engagement and informational tools available to the public. The BAC, CAC, and CMC all met monthly between September 2021 and December 2021 and the TPAC met bi-monthly, for a total of 14 meetings between all committees during this period. Additionally, advisory committee members attended and helped host other events and conversations in their communities. The themes for those meetings are summarized below.

Key questions and takeaways:

- Anti-displacement continued to be a priority for the project and the following were expressed regarding this effort during this period:
  - Advisory committee members would like to be involved in the selection of working group members
  - The working group, CURA and related entities should seek immediate/interim actions to address displacement where possible
  - The members of the working group need to represent a wide diversity of communities and opinions

- Interest in making sure the information shared at committee meetings was broadly available to the public:
  - Open houses should be broadly advertised
  - All information needs be plain language, particularly for design details and the anti-displacement initiative
  - Concern that this is an important decision and not everyone is aware of the options
  - The public needs to see potential building and access impacts to understand to have an opinion on the routes

- Desire for the evaluation of the routes to be comprehensive, reflective of community input and considerate of many data inputs
- Concerns for building impacts and safety for all communities
- Support for thorough coordination with public entities like the City of Minneapolis in order to assure the route is in coordination with other public investments and plans
Questions about design details regarding:

- Safe connections and crossings for pedestrians and cyclists
- Green infrastructure along the route
- Opportunities to involve BIPOC businesses in design
- Design needs to be creative and consider all options- nothing is off the table
- Desire to keep pursuing elevated guideway and other options where applicable

Questions about the construction phase including:

- Can the project assure that there will be training opportunities and jobs for corridor residents and communities?
- How can the project support businesses impacted by construction?