



Meeting Title: SWLRT Section 106 Consultation

Date: 11/24/2014 **Time:** 1:00 pm **Duration:** 2.5 hrs

Location: Southwest LRT Project Office , Conference Room A
6465 Wayzata Boulevard, Suite 500
St Louis Park, MN 55426

Meeting called by: Greg Mathis, MnDOT Cultural Resources Unit (CRU)

Attendees: SHPO: Sarah Beimers, Natascha Wiener
Eden Prairie: Regina Rojas
Minnetonka: Elise Durbin
Hopkins: Nancy Anderson
St. Louis Park: Meg McMonigal, Alex Boyce
Minneapolis: Brian Schaffer, Jack Byers
MPRB: Jennifer Ringold, Renay Leone
KIAA: Kathy Low, Tamara Ludt
HC: Kerry Pearce Ruch
USACE: Brad Johnson, Melissa Jenny
SPO: Nani Jacobson, Ryan Kronzer, Sophia Ginis, Daren Nyquist, Dan Pfeiffer, Sam O'Connell, Jenny Bring, Caroline Miller
On phone:
SPO: Paul Danielson, Leon Skiles
FTA: Maya Sarna, Amy Zaref
HC: Nelrae Succio

Purpose of Meeting: Meet with consulting parties to continue Section 106 consultation process

--- Agenda Topics ---	
1.	Welcome & Introductions
2.	Project Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nani Jacobson (SPO) introduced the project timeline and major milestones
3.	Overview of Section 106 Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greg Mathis (CRU) reviewed the purpose of the Section 106 Consultation process, roles of consulting parties, and where the SWLRT project is at in the 106 process.
4.	Design and APE Adjustments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greg and Ryan Kronzer (SPO) discussed the design adjustments in Minneapolis since the April 2014 consultation meeting Greg provided a summary of the revisions made to the APE in October 2014 based on the

	preliminary design plans
5.	<p>Historic Properties Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greg provided a summary of historic properties corridor wide and three properties added back into APE (Shaw House, Saveland House, Neils House)
6.	<p>Preliminary effects determinations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Properties with continued consultation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hopkins Commercial Historic District- no adverse, no questions, group agreed ○ M&StL Depot – no adverse, no questions, group agreed ○ CM&StP Depot – no adverse <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Signal bungalow proposed near depot, but view is obscured by existing vegetation on depot property ▪ Meg McMonigal St. Louis Park (SLP) commented as part of Preliminary Engineering phase that there was no driveway access to proposed signal bungalow and that the bungalow may want to be moved closer to ROW ▪ Sarah Beimers (SHPO) asked what are the dimensions of a signal bungalow? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Danielson (SPO) responded roughly 10’ x 30’ x 8’ ▪ Sarah asked does the SLP historical society use the depot space for and are their access issues with use of space? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meg responded that it’s used for storage mainly, no access issues with design for use of space. ○ Peavey Haglin Grain Elevator – no adverse, monitoring during construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Natascha Wiener (SHPO) asked what is the size of the TPSS? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greg responded slightly larger than a bungalow. ▪ Meg commented on placement of TPSS as well. What are special care requirements as an NHL? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greg responded must minimize harm. A construction protection plan if it will be effected by construction storage and staging. ○ Minikahda Club- adverse <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Greg explained that project is potentially acquiring 2,200 sq ft and constructing a retaining wall to make ADA accessible crossing near front entrance. Will continue to identify ways to avoid adverse effect. ▪ Brian Shaffer (Minneapolis) agrees with trying to avoid or minimize the adverse effect, but wants a pedestrian crossing even if adverse. ○ Lake Calhoun/Playing Fields at 32nd St- no adverse <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Greg explained that there will be continued consultation on parking and traffic as project moves forward; possible memorandum of agreement (MOA) stipulation for monitoring after construction

- Jennifer Ringold (MPRB) concurred with recommendation for continued consultation on behalf of the MPRB.
- Cedar Lake Parkway- no adverse
 - Greg noted MPRB was concerned about noise from the ped crossing warning device in its comment letter on the April 2014 consultation package. Ryan added that the Ped crossing warning device has not yet been designed.
 - Sarah asked will the freight crossing need additional safety features?
 - Ryan responded that it may want to add a device at the ped crossing, but freight crossing signals will likely to remain the same as existing conditions.
- Properties impacted by 21st Street Station: Neils, Shaw, Saveland, Kenwood Parkway Residential Historic District- no adverse
 - Discussion of multiple properties as a group since there will be similar effects for all.
 - Kathy Low (KIAA) asked how are parking, visual, traffic, and noise mitigated?
 - Greg responded that it depends. It can be addressed in different ways, but needs to consider why the property is significant and how it is effected both by the project and mitigation. The Project will continue to look at traffic.
 - Kathy asked if she can get a copy of the noise and vibration study?
 - Nani responded it will be included in the SDEIS.
 - Kathy asked how are bus routes to station changes a part of 106 process?
 - Ryan responded that Route 25 will continue current route; more work to be done on future bus service planning in area.
 - Kathy asked will traffic and noise be included in the process?
 - Nani responded, yes traffic and noise will be included in the NEPA process.
 - Jack Byers (Minneapolis) asked what is effect on historic properties? Will effects determinations be made prior to SDEIS?
 - Nani responded that preliminary effects determinations are the topic of this meeting and will be in the SDEIS.
- Site 21HE0409 – no adverse
 - Sarah asked have you done enough survey to determine boundaries?
 - Nani responded, yes, completed Ph II investigation to determine the boundaries and also have freight rail acting as a buffer between the site and the proposed alignment.
- Kenwood Pkwy, Kenwood Park, Kenwood Water Tower – no adverse, no comments

- Mac Martin House – no adverse
 - Kathy commented that she is not sure if KIAA agrees and will include in comments
- Dunwoody – no adverse, no comments
- Introduction of Channel Lagoon area and related properties
 - Greg introduced lagoon features and non-contributing elements.
 - Sarah commented on viewpoints from non-contributing bridges (Bridge No. 5 (Kenilworth Bridge) and No. 6 (Burnham Road Bridge)
 - Jennifer commented that Bridge No. 6 itself is not significant; therefore, is the view from the bridge important? Design intent was there for all bridges to be built as part of design competition. Not comfortable with bridges as non-contributing.
 - Greg commented that Bridge No. 5 is non-contributing based on its historic ownership and association. Bridge No. 6 is non-contributing based on its date of construction. Can discuss with Jennifer further after the meeting to answer questions.
 - Ryan introduced functional requirements of bridge.
 - Greg asked if all agree that the physical parameters of bridge, if constructed will be an adverse effect? Yes, all agree.
 - Sarah asked what is the timeline for SPO and FTA to make effect determinations? SHPO has been commenting as if final determinations will be made eventually by FTA.
 - Maya Sarna (FTA) responded that preliminary determinations will be included in the SDEIS. Nani explained that final determinations of effect will be made after SDEIS, but before the FEIS is published.
- Bridge Design Concepts
 - Ryan presented the Arched Pier Concept – Based on Midtown Greenway former railroad bridge over the channel between Isles and Calhoun.
 - Jack asked will aesthetic treatment be on both bridges?
 - Ryan responded yes, they have the same symmetry.
 - Kathy asked about engineering section view and what it depicted.
 - Greg responded it is a view looking at the bridge from one end, showing what it would look like at the pier.
 - Ryan presented the Thin Deck Concept - Darker concrete, a reinterpretation of the existing bridge.
 - Jack commented that the railing height looks very tall.
 - Ryan presented the Steel Pier Concept - Darker rusty steel with concrete pier caps
 - Brian Schaffer asked can these concepts be blended or are they all distinct?
 - Ryan responded both. They are initial ideas and can look at one or at elements of several. The goal is to get feedback on ideas.

- Discussion of properties affected by new Kenilworth crossing
 - Cedar Lake – no adverse, no agreement.
 - Jennifer brought up the proposed Cedar Lake trail goes from 21st Station to Cedar Lake. In order to determine impacts, she needs to know if trail will be improved or not; need to know design and continue consultation.
 - Kathy asked what are noise impacts on Cedar Lake?
 - Nani responded that Cedar Lake is not a noise sensitive resource under FTA criteria for this project. Greg explained that the impact analysis is based on FTA noise criteria.
 - Jennifer stated that we need to be sure Cedar Lake is considered in correct noise category for measuring impacts; it should be considered a passive use of park. Was it changed to another category for SDEIS?
 - Nani responded it is not considered a noise sensitive resource under FTA criteria for this project.
 - Natasha commented that districts and historic properties have settings; need to look specifically at sound and its effect on character and setting.
 - Sarah asked what is FTA noise definition of a “park”?
 - Greg responded, it depends, FTA criteria is based on how the property is used.
 - Jennifer sees two categories for measuring effect of sound on historic properties: 1) user/experiential or structural, and 2) which category it should go into FTA’s thresholds based on its historic use.
 - Sarah stated that sound is related to Section 106 – if it causes an adverse effect on setting and character.
 - Nani explained that in a noise and vibration assessment, they first look at where quiet is essential for resource.
 - Greg stated that we can revisit criteria and continue to consult on sound impacts.
 - General discussion on bridge concepts
 - Sarah stated that all elements of the Grand Rounds are linked by use.
 - Natascha noted that all bridge design concepts had same number of piers – was this intentional?
 - Ryan responded that all functional concepts used 25 ft. distances as an efficient span.
 - Brian asked can a bridge with more piers be built?
 - Ryan responded yes, but it may defeat goals of getting skiers and boaters better access underneath.
 - Jack commented that the interpretation of non-contributing bridge concept seems like recreating false history. Sees several design categories to discuss: piers, underside, deck, and fence. Nothing shows how bank meets

piers.

- Natascha asked about the abutments. What types of wingwalls/end treatments proposed?
 - Ryan responded that the goal was to have space so there could be future trails on sides of both banks.
- Natascha asked was a wooden bridge considered?
 - Nani responded that the Council doesn't support a wooden bridge due to shorter life span. NJ: Also, it would need to be creosote treated, which is less environmentally friendly.
- Natascha asked was 25 ft. span distance used for efficiency of engineering or spacing underneath for use?
 - Ryan responded for both reasons. Paul further noted that we wanted 14 ft. height to minimize the number of piers, but keep equal spacing, to help get kayakers and skiers through underneath.
- Natscha asked would it (more piers) reduce overall massing?
- Sarah asked would the caps be smaller if there were more piers?
 - Paul responded that he thinks there would be a minimal change in cap size. Nani responded that this is consistent with Wirth's vision – 25 ft spacing.
- Natascha asked could there be a problem with encountering old piers left in water? are the new piers designed to avoid these, or would the old piers need to be completely removed? Paul responded this was not considered in these concepts. The concepts did not get into that level of detail.
- Kathy asked would the bridge design concepts affect freezing of the channel?
 - Ryan said he was not sure; he can look into it.
- Jack asked will the banks stay mud/soil?
 - Ryan responded yes.
- Brian asked what should we comment on?
 - Ryan responded the bridge design concepts are just ideas, but we welcome feedback as part of your comments.
- Sarah asked what is the public participation process planned?
 - Nani responded the SDEIS will include open houses during the comment period.
- Greg explained the SDEIS is based on the April and July 2014 project scope and budget adopted by the Council. This is covered in the consultation material reviewed today, in addition to design advancement since that time.
- Nani explained that Section 106 will be incorporated into other public outreach activities throughout 2015, as applicable.

7.	<p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greg stated that comments are due by 12/12/14 • Greg stated another meeting will be scheduled in Q1 of 2015

ACTION ITEMS:	PERSON RESPONSIBLE:	DEADLINE: