

Meeting Title: SWLRT Section 106 Consultation

Date: 4/22/2015 **Time:** 11:00 am **Duration:** 1.5 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
Eden Prairie: Lori Creamer
Hopkins: Nancy Anderson
St. Louis Park: Meg McMonigal
MPRB: Michael Schroeder
KIAA: Jeannette Colby, Tamara Ludt
Hennepin County: Dave Jaeger, John Doan
CIDNA: Craig Westgate
FTA: Amy Zaref (phone)
SPO: Nani Jacobson, Ryan Kronzer, Mark Bishop, Leon Skiles, Sophia
Ginis, Dan Pfeiffer, Jenny Bring, Caroline Miller, Kelly Wilder
MnDOT: Liz Abel

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

--- Agenda & Discussion ---

--- Agenda & Discussion ---	
1.	<p>Welcome & Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nani Jacobson from SPO opened the meeting and led attendee introductions. Greg Mathis from MnDOT CRU gave an overview of the agenda.
2.	<p>Section 106 Process Overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greg Mathis from MnDOT described elements of the Section 106 process and the status of each: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The following steps have been completed - initiating the process and determining the Area of Potential Effect (APE). ○ An additional 120 architecture/history properties need to be surveyed to determine their significance; it is anticipated that this will be complete in Q2 2015. This additional survey is required due to revisions to the APE brought about by reaching

	<p>the 30% design milestone and due to project changes resulting from a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the City of Minneapolis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The next step is to publish in the SDEIS the preliminary determinations of effect presented at previous meetings. It is anticipated that the final determinations of effect will be made in Q3 2015, pending receipt of needed feedback and additional information from consultation. ○ The process to resolve adverse effects is in progress through continuing consultation and will be documented in the Section 106 agreement in development between Q2 and Q4 2015. ○ Greg asked if there were any questions, and none were asked.
3.	<p>Discuss effects to historic properties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Greg explained that the participants' packets contain all comments from the previous two meetings and that the goal of the meeting today is to consult further on comments received on two archaeological sites and the Kenilworth Channel/Lagoon Crossing ● Archaeological sites – 21HE0436 & 21HE0437 (Royalston Station) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ These sites are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under criterion D. Various alternatives were considered through the consultation process to avoid an adverse effect on these sites, but none were feasible. Therefore, the determination will be “adverse effect” because the sites will be adversely impacted. ○ Mitigation is proposed that will incorporate interpretation into the Royalston Station design based on results from Phase II investigations. In addition, a Phase III data recovery will be conducted during construction to excavate and curate artifacts. ○ In its written comments in response to the February 24, 2015 consultation, the City of Minneapolis (not in attendance today) requested consideration of potential additional alternative mitigation measures. Therefore, Greg asked consulting parties for feedback on incorporating interpretation into station design and for any additional mitigation ideas, since station design is beginning to get underway. ○ Jeannette Colby from the Kenwood Isles Area Association (KIAA) asked why these sites are significant and what they can tell us. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Liz Abel from MnDOT explained that these neighborhoods were platted in the 1870s in a curvilinear design popular with upper class professionals and business owners. Shortly thereafter – according to researchers – in the 1930s demographics shifted and the area began to decline, with new working class residents dividing homes into multiple dwellings. However, more recent archaeological excavations have found intact yards and debris more representative of middle class inhabitants (not indicative of lower or working class residence as presumed in historical documentation). Therefore, these archaeological sites are eligible for the information they can provide for a more accurate understanding of the area's social history than the previously-told story of a neighborhood in decline. ○ Sarah Beimers from SHPO said that she would like more conversation with the

City of Minneapolis to ensure that the results from mitigation efforts are accessible and beneficial to the public, in contrast to data recovery files that simply sit in SHPO's drawers.

- Greg clarified that much is known from the Phase II investigations that could form the basis for interpretation efforts, and that revisions could be made based on any new information from the Phase III data recovery.
- Craig Westgate from Cedar Isles Dean Neighborhood Association (CIDNA) asked what percentage of the remains are still buried under the road
 - Liz answered that about half of the lots are still buried under the street, including backyards where most deposits are typically located.
- Nani mentioned that the City of Minneapolis previously expressed support for the idea of the incorporation of interpretation into station design.
- Sarah added that there might be web-based options for adding additional information from the Phase III recovery, or there could be a placeholder in the station design for interpretation, to be completed once the Phase III data recovery is completed. The Section 106 agreement could contain provisions for this.
- Nani said that this discussion is timely and should be resolved soon to be incorporated into station design, which is beginning.
- Jeannette asked whether, because questions remain about what the data is showing, the information will need to be updated.
 - Liz responded that they are quite certain about the themes that would drive interpretation based on the results of the Phase II investigations.
- Sarah pointed out that some interpretive mitigation has been focused on education around why the site's specific geography is important and incorporated mention of the federal process that enabled the mitigation.

Action: Nani said SPO will follow up with the City of Minneapolis and begin planning for mitigation through interpretation incorporated into the Royalston Station Design.

- Kenilworth Channel/Lagoon Crossing
 - Greg reviewed the preliminary adverse effect determination for the crossing and identification of effects to the overall Grand Rounds Historic District (GRHD).
 - He explained that they (FTA and SPO) would like feedback on the bridge configurations, and treatments for the WPA walls and banks. To inform review of the proposed configurations, Greg defined the following terms:
 - Bridge configurations: this refers to the functional aspects of the new crossing, including the number of bridges, the arrangement of the spans, and the number of spans and piers, etc.
 - Bridge design concepts: this refers more to the aesthetics and at type of structure, such as trestles, slab spans, girder spans, etc.
 - Greg explained that various elements contribute to the historic property, such as the topography, the waterway, vegetation, the WPA walls, spaces within the

lagoon/channel and the setting, and that effects on them would be considered.

- Greg provided an overview of the consultation process to date for the new crossing:
 - Consulting parties first discussed the new crossing in April 2014, including how the bridge would engage with the banks and impact recreation, and the group provided comments including suggestions involving natural and darker material, creating more space for recreation, and modern construction techniques.
 - Based on this consultation, engineers presented three bridge design concepts in November 2014, all with four spans and three piers: arched pier, thin deck, and steel pier. Based on these concepts, consulting parties provided feedback that they would like to see more piers, avoid re-interpretation of non-contributing bridges, and a reduction in pier cap sizes and overall massing of the spans.
 - During the February 6, 2015 consulting parties meeting, revised five- and seven-pier configurations were presented. Comments were received to reduce the number of piers, minimize bridge deck expanse to allow more light on the channel, maintain vertical clearance, and minimize impacts to WPA walls and channel banks.
- Greg noted that the Metropolitan Council entered into a memorandum of understanding with the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB) in March that gives them greater engagement in the design process, including through weekly coordination meetings with SPO and MnDOT CRU.
- In response to the most recent consulting parties' feedback, and consistent with guidance from a November 4, 1912 Minneapolis Board of Park Commissioners meeting, revised configurations will be presented today.
- Ryan Kronzer and Mark Bishop from SPO presented the revised configurations: all incorporate three separate bridges, a clear span trail bridge, and increased deck thickness allowing for longer spans. Previously, freight occupied its own bridge and LRT and the trail shared another. The key change now is that there are three separate bridges, allowing for greater flexibility in the engineering and design of the trail bridge. Ryan clarified that they are requesting feedback on the configurations – size, shape, and location – more so than the aesthetics.
- Mark and Ryan oriented the group to the “Bridge Design Concepts and Configurations Considered” handout with an overview of concepts presented in November 2014 compared with the configurations presented at this meeting. They highlighted a few points illustrated in the legend:
 - Green signifies the limits of the WPA wall, and the dashed line is the shoreline. The wall is discontinuous on the south side and stops 30-40 feet short of the existing bridge on the north side.
 - The lighter grey shaded area is the limits of disturbance, where there are no specific restrictions on impacts to trees, vegetation, etc. Where it is not shaded (outside of the limits of disturbance), those elements would be left in their existing state.

- The darker grey shaded area denotes proposed new structures.
- Brown signifies proposed fill.
- Diagonal cross-hatch denotes proposed ground removal.
- Key elements of the new configurations include the following:
 - There is now 5-6 feet between each bridge, as opposed to the 8-9 feet before. Greg pointed out that the new pedestrian bridge alignment is now closer to the current trail bridge alignment.
- Mark oriented participants to the four new configurations, posted on the walls. All four new configurations have a single-span trail bridge.
 - Configuration 4A – Both the LRT and trail bridges are 100 feet long. The LRT bridge has two piers and three spans. The 134-foot long freight bridge has four piers and five spans, and the height of the abutments is minimized by bringing them into the existing banks.
 - Configuration 4B – While a 14-foot vertical clearance was considered in previous versions, the 10.4-foot minimum clearance now guiding design allows for fewer freight piers – pushing piers away from one another and increasing span length. The trail bridge is 110 feet long. Both the LRT and freight bridges are 120 feet long, have three spans and two piers, ends align with each other, but the piers of the LRT bridge are further apart (on shore). The span length for these two bridges increases to a maximum of 50 feet (freight) and 75 feet (LRT).
 - Configuration 4C – This slight modification from 4B takes a cue from the channel’s shape, with a linear south side and curved north side, so that the piers can be aligned with the southern shore.
 - Configuration 4B “skew” – This configuration is the same as 4B but skews the north end of the trail to the east to take advantage of the space offered by Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority (HCRRA) right-of-way. This allows for up to 14 feet of open space between the trail and LRT bridges, increasing the amount of light in the channel. However, it modifies the trail alignment and changes the trail user experience.
- Mark clarified with Michael Schroeder from MPRB that the minimum vertical clearance is 10.4 feet but that they try to maintain a greater clearance.
- Mark and Michael also clarified that each configuration includes provisions for a six-foot clear space on the north side of the waterway for a potential future trail.
- Jeannette noted that the “4B skew” option brings the trail even closer to homes. Mark noted that it is still within HCRRA right-of-way. Jeannette acknowledged this, but expressed concern that it would still matter to the homeowners so it may not be something KIAA would support.
- Craig asked if the space between the bridges is the same in all options and Mark confirmed that is the case, except for where “4B skew” gets wider.
- Jeannette asked whether the different piers locations in the channel would affect freezing of the water. Mark said the water would freeze just as it does currently,

and Nani clarified that they have analyzed the effects of more light as well as more vibration and found that neither should affect the water's freezing.

- Jeannette asked whether any of the configurations differ in the amount of noise generated, or in transference of noise to the surrounding area. Nani said that the shift in freight rail will be analyzed. Thus far noise from the LRT project has been identified as a moderate impact to users of the channel per FTA criteria within 40 feet on either side of the centerline. Mark clarified that there are no differences in the amount of noise generated among the configurations since they are at roughly the same location and height.
- Sarah noted that near the slide area on West River Parkway in Minneapolis, she can hear the LRT train pass over the Washington Ave. bridges, which she approximates is one-quarter mile away. Nani acknowledged the comment and explained that the project will meet certain threshold criteria and mitigate the noise as required.
- Jeannette asked what the noise mitigation will be, and if mitigation is being considered at this stage of the bridge design process. Nani explained that the engineering and environmental teams are working to determine that, and that it is most effective to treat the noise at its source (the wheels).
- Craig noted that users of the channel are all around, not just below the bridge, and Jeannette concurred that there are many sensitive receptors in addition to skiers and kayakers, and that water can carry noise.
- Mark presented a series of draft visualizations of the east and west approaches to each configuration, to illustrate the differences in view from the user's perspective, beginning with the current views. He described the views from the east:
 - 4A – No piers from the clear span trail bridge, but behind it LRT and freight piers are visible, in the water and on shore.
 - 4B – LRT bridge piers move outside the channel, and the bridge becomes thicker.
 - 4C and “4B skew” – Mark noted the pier locations and the shallower LRT span. The skewed trial bridge would have impacts to box elder trees, which are not trees such as ash that would have to be removed eventually anyway, but are not significant.
- Jeannette asked if the existing bridge is 14 feet from the water level. Mark confirmed that the existing bridge has a vertical clearance of 14 feet from the water and that previous input that resulted in a lower deck was to enable longer spans to minimize the number of piers in the channel.
- Mark then described views from the west approach:
 - 4A – The freight bridge has thicker slabs, and the five span arrangement hides abutments behind vegetation.
 - 4B – Offers a clearer view under the bridges with a vertical clearance lower than in 4A, to enable the longer span.
 - 4B skew – More light is apparent in the channel.
- Nani acknowledged that the group was being presented with a lot of information at once but encouraged them to provide initial reactions and feedback today if

possible during the meeting, as this would help the advancement of the design process. Nani also encouraged a detailed review of the materials after the meeting to provide substantive comments.

- Mark then presented plans and multiple section drawings (A-G) for each configuration:
 - Mark clarified for Craig that the wing wall for the trail bridge in Section E for all configurations is approximately 10 feet tall.
 - Jeannette asked how many feet of fill will be required on the north side, and Mark answered about 4-5 feet, but there could be some flexibility in the amount of fill under the trail.
 - Jeannette brought up concerns about noise, and Mark stated that noise levels would be kept as close to current levels as possible. (As noted above, Nani indicated that current analysis indicates that the LRT will result in a moderate noise effects per FTA criteria).
 - John Doan of Hennepin County asked if the type of materials would impact noise levels, and Mark responded that certain materials could dampen or mitigate noise.
 - Mark pointed out that questions remain about what to do with the walls and banks during and after construction, noting that the brown area at the banks on the schematic drawings is currently an unknown slope treatment. He asked parties to consider questions about whether the stone walls should be disassembled, catalogued, and replaced, or maybe new modern walls matching the bridges within the limits of disturbance would be appropriate.
- Nani asked for feedback on the engineers' presentation, and specifically about what to do with the WPA walls and the preferred number of piers.
 - Meg McMonigal of St. Louis Park noted that she prefers the cleaner look of these configurations.
 - Jeannette expressed that the current wood bridge "feels little" and that the new bridges will "feel big," so they will have a different feeling, but appreciates the engineering team's efforts at creativity. She noted her understanding of how minimizing the number of piers resulted in a lower clearance, but still has some concerns about the 10.4 foot clearance. She noted that the neighborhood association may be unwilling to support the "4B skew" option that brings the trail closer to homes.
 - Craig noted that separating the bridges into three is nice because it lets in more air and light to the channel.
 - Dave Jaeger from Hennepin County liked the design flexibility offered by three bridges and wondered if it would bring down costs.
 - Sarah asked whether the difference in total width was only 1.4 feet from the two-bridge configuration, and Mark answered yes and explained that the width of the footprint moved out about five feet and the bridge depth increased by about one foot.
 - Michael noted that SPO has been creative in that some elements of the spans and

	<p>edges could be grated to allow in more light, and overlook options could be built into the trail design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Craig noted that grates and increased spaces could also increase noise, and Mark and Greg acknowledged that concern and confirmed that this will need to be studied further as the design for the bridges advances. <p>Action: Nani asked the consulting parties to consider the bridge configuration options after the meeting and provide any additional comments to SPO.</p>
4.	<p>Additional Comments Received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nani acknowledged receipt of comments from consulting parties in response to the February 2105 consultations that included requests for additional information on traffic, parking, noise and vibration, etc. She confirmed that analyses of these items are ongoing. Results will be finalized in late summer and they will be used to make final determinations of effect, which will be presented to the group in late summer. • Nani informed the consulting parties that five station design open houses were held in April, which were attended by several hundred people. A number of people asked questions about historic properties. If consulting parties want to review the materials that were presented at the open houses, they are available on the project website.
5.	<p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments on the materials that were provided today are due on May 27, 2015. The reason for giving everyone more than 30 days to provide comments is that the 22nd falls on the Friday before Memorial Day and many people may be out of town, so this will allow people to provide comments when they get back. • Upcoming public involvement opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The next consultation meeting will likely be in June. • Develop Section 106 Agreement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The process to resolve adverse effects is underway and will continue through future consultation. As effects are resolved, the Memorandum of Agreement will be prepared. • Nani asked for any last questions, and Greg said he looked forward to receiving additional comments to assist the project in moving forward.

ACTION ITEMS:	PERSON RESPONSIBLE:	DEADLINE:
Follow up with the City of Minneapolis and begin planning for mitigation through interpretation incorporated into the Royalston Station Design.	Greg Mathis	
Consider the bridge configuration options after the meeting and provide any additional comments to SPO	Consulting parties	5/27/15