Meeting Title: SWLRT Section 106 Consultation - Meeting Notes

Date: 2/06/2015 **Time:** 9:30 am **Duration:** 2.0 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
Eden Prairie: Regina Rojas
Hopkins: Nancy Anderson
Minneapolis: Brian Schaffer
St. Louis Park: Meg McMonigal
MPRB: Jennifer Ringold, Michael Schroeder, Renay Leone
KIAA: Kathy Low, Tamara Ludt
CIDNA: Craig Westgate
HC: Dave Jaeger, Kim Zlimen
SPO: Nani Jacobson, Jim Alexander, Caroline Miller, Dan Pfeiffer, Sophia Ginis, Mark Bishop, Leon Skiles, Ryan Kronzer
FTA (phone): Amy Zaref, Maya Sarna

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

	--- Agenda & Discussion
1.	Welcome & Introductions
2.	Project Update • Nani Jacobson from SPO provided a project update on the scope of the project and an updated timeline. In 2016, the Final EIS and Full Funding Grant Agreement will be completed, with construction beginning in 2017. The Southwest LRT is anticipated to begin passenger operations in 2019.
3.	Section 106 Update • Greg Mathis from MnDOT CRU explained the steps of the Section 106 process and

	referenced the handout provided to meeting attendees that explains the process in more detail. He introduced the new consulting parties Hennepin County (as of December 2014) and Cedar Isles Dean Neighborhood Association (CIDNA) (as of February 2015). • Greg acknowledged the receipt of comments from consulting parties on the November 2014 package and meeting. MnDOT CRU will consider all comments received, but in order to get through all of the material needed to consult upon, this meeting will focus on the Kenilworth Lagoon and the next meeting will focus on comments received on corridor-wide effects. More frequent meetings will be held in Q1 to get through this. The draft Section 106 agreement will be included in the Final EIS and the executed agreement will be part of the ROD. **Action: Respond to corridor-wide comments in a separate consultation meeting**
4.	Kenilworth Lagoon • Greg first showed a map of the Kenilworth Lagoon area and the historic properties potentially affected by a new crossing over the lagoon. This includes both Grand Rounds features and the Lake of the Isles Residential Historic District. • Crossing Options o Greg introduced three crossing options *(see Table 1 and KW Crossing options plans from 2/3/15 consultation package):* ▪ Metropolitan Council adopted scope: at-grade LRT crossing (Option 1) ▪ Shallow cut-and-cover LRT tunnel under the channel (Option 2) ▪ MPRB (Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board) proposal: "jacked box" LRT tunnel under the channel (Option 3) o Mark Bishop from SPO presented the engineering plans for Options 1 and 2, describing the construction sequencing for bridge removal, replacement, and tunnel construction for Option 2. o Michael Schroeder from MPRB explained the "jacked box" tunnel for Option 3. He described the construction techniques of using launching pit and receiving pit to install the jacked box. Winches would pull the box through the ground and a cutting edge on the front would help guide it into place. On the interior, soil would be excavated as it gets installed. Soil would remain intact around the box during construction and the channel would not be closed during the jacked box construction. o Nani asked if removal/replacement of the existing bridges is needed under Option 3. ▪ Michael responded that the freight bridge and trail bridge would be removed and reconstructed to align with the project's current alignment. The reconstructed bridges could also be moved over the tunnel. o Sarah Beimers from the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) asked if the SPO had considered effects on deeply buried deposits during archaeological survey work in the area (e.g. for deep bore tunnel). ▪ Greg responded that it wasn't specifically addressed at the time of survey since a tunnel was not part of conceptual engineering during the DEIS, but MnDOT CRU could look at models to see if there was potential for deeply

buried deposits. Michael also responded that MPRB didn't think there were any concerns with deeply buried deposits from discussions with their cultural resources staff, but haven't surveyed it.

- Bridge Design Concepts *(see Table 3 and bridge design concepts plans from 2/3/15 consultation package)*
    - Greg introduced revised bridge design concepts that are based on input received at the November 24, 2014 meeting. All three original concepts (Arched Pier, Thin Deck and Steel Pier) are included in Table 3 as presented in November 2014 (4 span, 3 pier concepts), new 5 span, 4 pier concepts, and one 7 span, 6 pier Steel Pier concept.
    - Ryan Kronzer from SPO noted that all of the concepts have pier overlaps. He presented the three revised 5 span concepts: Arched Pier, Steel Pier, and Thin Deck.
    - Michael asked why the structure depth ("total bridge thickness without railing") grew between the original Steel Pier and the revised Steel Pier concepts when the span lengths shortened? It went from 3'2" to 3'10" in Table 3, Bridge Design Concepts.
        - Mark verified that that 3'2" was an error in Table 3 and will be corrected for a future version - it should be 3'10".
    - Michael asked about bridge requirements for a trail bridge vs. an LRT bridge. Was there any consideration of load bearing requirements for different bridges, or consideration given to creating separate bridges in order to let light in between structures?
        - Mark responded that the combined LRT/trail bridge was designed with regard to the alignment off of the channel, ROW clearance, and safety considerations. The trail bridge is approximately 20' wide at a minimum, and the combined LRT/trail bridge is approximately 53.5' wide. Separation of the combined bridge could be done, but further study of the impacts to ROW would be needed, and how it would affect the alignment approaching the channel. The ROW clearance is minimal.
        - Michael responded that separated bridges would let more light in under the bridge and that there could be a different structure type for LRT. For example, because of less load bearing requirements, the trail bridge could eliminate pier penetrations and have different configurations of piers in the water.
        - Mark responded that this could potentially change the continuity of the structures and that SPO would need to look at how to design a structure with fewer spans.
    - Sarah asked about the metric on Table 3 for the deck+parapet+beams and if it included railing heights.
        - SPO responded that it does not.
    - Michael asked whether a gap would be possible between the LRT and trail bridge in the combined scenario?

        - Mark responded that it is possible, but the way it is currently designed allows emergency vehicles to access both LRT and the trail from the space between the bridges.
    - Ryan introduced the one 7 span option for the Steel Pier only, which was the result of comments received during the November 2014 consultation. Michael asked what the advantage of the 7 span bridge configuration is?
        - Greg responded that it was developed in response to comments received to consider a replacement structure that was similar in design to the existing trestles, with same number of spans, but in a new, compatible material. Nani responded that it is not necessarily recommended.
        - Jennifer Ringold from MPRB commented that this is follow through from November comments.
    - Michael asked if SPO had considered a hybrid bridge with a thinner deck over the water for more clearance and thicker spans on the ends?
        - Mark responded that SPO did not consider a hybrid bridge.
    - Michael asked if there was possibility to use a different deck?
        - Mark responded that all are slab construction, which is about as thin as possible.
    - Sarah commented that there is a large variation between bridge concepts in terms of abutments, wing walls, heights, grade changes, retaining walls, etc. She requested that SPO provide a summary of these aspects to better understand the differences between the concepts.
        - Greg responded that they will connect after the meeting to make sure SPO can address all of the specifics Sarah is concerned about and can provide these materials for an upcoming consultation meeting.

      Action: Provide a summary of different technical aspects of bridge concepts to better understand differences between concepts.
    - Ryan presented a railing study that was completed in response to November 2014 consultation comments. The railing study was completed for both the Steel Pier and Thin Deck concepts. *(see railing study sketches from 2/3/15 consultation package).*
- Discussion of Effects
    - Measures to minimize or mitigate adverse effects *(see Table 2 from 2/3/15 consultation package)*
    - Greg presented Table 2: Kenilworth Lagoon/Channel Crossing Options Effects Assessment. The first part of the table addresses "temporary effects" during construction. Sarah asked about effects due to traffic on residential streets and adjacent neighborhoods. She also commented that this could fit into the row of "coordinating construction hours in accordance with local permits."
        - Mark responded that construction will be in a constrained area, but need to still determine access points, which will be confirmed as project planning advances.
    - Michael commented on the Table 2 discussion of effects bundles all of the options as having the same temporary effects. He commented that the "closing of the

channel during construction of the new crossing" would be different for each option. For example, the jacked box would be intermittent closures, but the cut-and-cover option would be a longer term closure of the channel.

- Sarah asked if staging areas would be included in the temporary effects assessment (e.g. effects from vibration, construction equipment/cranes).
  - Mark responded that construction will be within the corridor. Nani explained that the Draft EIS had some temporary acquisitions for construction staging areas, but the current plans have staging areas mostly within the ROW. These will be addressed in a construction monitoring plan, which will be a part of the Section 106 Agreement.
- Greg explained that traffic and construction impacts can be discussed at a future meeting since they are a corridor-wide discussion.
- Sarah commented that the construction in the lagoon area is unique and should be discussed on its own.
- Nani commented that Cedar Lake Parkway will be the main access point for construction and will be obtaining construction permits to do work in the area.
- Mark commented that the construction requirements are different for each option and bridge design concept.

  Action: Address construction staging plan in Kenilworth Channel/Lagoon area.
- Kathy Low from Kenwood Isles Area Association (KIAA) asked if the noise and vibration study covered both construction and built scenarios.
  - Nani responded that it is only covers the built scenario now, but a short term construction noise analysis will be in the Final EIS.
- Jennifer commented that the "minimization" measures in Table 2 should be differentiated by the different crossing options.
- Craig Westgate from Cedar Isles Dean Neighborhood Association (CIDNA) asked that SPO add seasonal construction impacts as well to the temporary effects portion of Table 2.
- Greg presented the "permanent effects" section of Table 2.
- Jennifer asked a clarifying question about the way the sentence was worded for the cut-and-cover and jacked box options as extending 42.5' into the middle section of the lagoon.
  - Greg responded that the 42.5' includes both clear space and space covered by bridges. Jennifer commented that this is misleading, since the entire 42.5' will not be covered by bridges, therefore recommends rewording sentence to state the western boundary where the freight bridge ends is 42.5'. Or have two rows: one that states freight rail only western boundary, and one that states total amount of width.
- Greg referenced the width of the Lake Street bridge as a point of comparison for crossing width. Michael disagreed that the Lake Street bridge is a fair comparison due to its difference in depth, configuration, and context.
- Craig asked if the design (at-grade LRT option) could create open air between the

	bridges since there are a lot of shadows in the current concepts. ▪ Mark responded that the width is currently set for minimum distance between bridges. SPO could potentially create open space, but would need to look into restrictions. Nani noted that the revised bridge design concepts shown today were created based on feedback from the November 2014 consultation and the revised concepts create more open space between the banks and water level (due to longer structure lengths). o Greg ended the overview discussion looking for concurrence from consulting parties that all crossing options have an adverse effect on the lagoon. Nobody spoke, but nodded in agreement. o Sarah stated that in the Section 106 process we must remember that an adverse effect to a contributing feature (KW lagoon) is also an adverse effect on the entire district itself (Grand Rounds Historic District). In the Table 2 effects assessment, it needs to be stated that the channel is a piece of the larger effect to the district, so it should also mention the Grand Rounds. o Kathy asked Sarah how the Section 106 process weighs a noise impact versus an impact to the WPA retaining walls? ▪ Sarah responded that the entire project needs to be considered. If the project is in a tunnel option (Option 2), then there is risk to losing the WPA retaining walls, and there will be visual impact from rebuilding bridges, but noise will be minimized. If the project is at grade, then the impact to the WPA retaining walls can be minimized, but the visual and noise effects may still impact the resource. In any of the options, there will be an adverse effect scenario. o Sarah asked about the long term tunnel maintenance/reconstruction plan. ▪ Mark responded that it is built for 75-year lifespan. o Brian Schaffer from the City of Minneapolis asked where the jacked box portals would be located. ▪ Michael responded that it would be east of alignment and then connect with the SPO proposed tunnel south of the Kenilworth crossing. In terms of depth, it is about 3 feet deeper than the shallow cut-and-cover option. The jacked box tunnel would be about 10 feet below the floor of the channel while a shallow cut-and-cover would be 7 feet below the waterway. The jacked box tunnel is currently following the same alignment as the SPO proposed options.
5.	Next Steps • Public involvement o Nani presented public involvement opportunities for the Section 106 process that will be integrated into other public involvement activities in 2015. • Upcoming meeting schedule o Nani proposed establishing a bi-weekly meeting schedule for Q1, beginning with two dates: February 24 and March 17. Maya Sarna from FTA noted that she may not be able to attend on March 17, so the second meeting date may get

	rescheduled. o February 24 ▪ Corridor-wide discussion of effects ▪ Section 106 Agreement overview o March 17 – to be rescheduled ▪ Discuss comments received on Kenilworth Lagoon

	ACTION ITEMS:	**PERSON RESPONSIBLE:**	**DEADLINE:**
1	Provide corridor-wide discussion in future meeting	CRU/SPO	Q1/Q2 2015
2	Provide information on technical aspects of bridge design	SPO	Q1/Q2 2015
3	Provide construction staging plan for Kenilworth Channel/Lagoon area	SPO	As part of 106 agreement development