15 May 2015

Greg Mathis
Minnesota Department of Transportation
Office of Environmental Services
Cultural Resources Unit
Mailstop 620
395 John Ireland Boulevard
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155
greg.mathis@state.mn.us

RE: Kenwood Isles Area Association (KIAA) Comments on 22 April 2015 Consultation on Potential Effects of Southwest Light Rail Transit Project, SHPO #2009-0080

Dear Mr. Mathis:

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the April 22, 2015 consultant meeting and to review the revised materials provided at that meeting. The Kenwood Isles Area Association (KIAA) has the following comments on the materials:

1. KIAA does not have a preference with regard to the placement of the Kenilworth bridge piers or thickness of the span. We were informed at the meeting that each design would generate similar auditory impacts. We hope that designers will continue to be vigilant about the setting and feeling of the historic channel, including minimizing audible intrusions and sounds associated with modern rail infrastructure that may alter the park-like setting of the lagoon, a vital element of its historic character.

2. KIAA does not support Bridge Configuration 4B-Skew. Though we appreciate the creativity of the proposal, we assert that the bicycle and pedestrian trail in this design would needlessly increase the impact on private residences that abut the HCRRA property.

Thank you for continuing to work to answer KIAA's questions regarding area impacts and for the opportunity to review these materials and to participate in future consultation for the Section 106 review of the Southwest Light Rail Transit Project.

Sincerely,

Jeanette Colby
Kenwood Isles Area Association

cc: Kenwood Isles Area Association
Cedar Isles Dean Neighborhood Association
Jennifer Ringold, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
Sarah Beimers, Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office
Tamara Ludt, Preservation Design Works

Minneapolis
Park & Recreation Board

Administrative Offices
2117 West River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55411-2227

Operations Center
3800 Bryant Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55409-1000

Phone
612-230-6400
Fax
612-230-6500

www.minneapolisparks.org

May 27, 2015

Mr. Greg Mathis
Southwest Project Office
Park Place West Building, Suite 500
6465 Wayzata Boulevard
St. Louis Park, Minnesota 55426

RE: ***Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board comments on the Section 106 consultation process and potential effects related to the SWLRT bridges at the Kenilworth Channel***

Dear Mr. Mathis:

The Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board (MPRB) appreciates the opportunity to offer comments on the proposed bridges over the Kenilworth Channel related to the Southwest Light Rail Transit (SWLRT) project. Our insights are based partially on reviews offered by the Southwest Project Office (SPO) at a meeting held on April 22, 2015, but the MPRB has, through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) executed with the Metropolitan Council, gained additional insights upon which our comments are founded. The MPRB's comments focus on several areas that were prominent in the MOU, including bridge configurations, channel context, historic context, and bridge relationships.

Bridge configurations

The MPRB reviewed design concepts prepared by the SPO in November 2014 and questioned the need to maintain a 14-foot clearance under the bridges. Recognizing the impacts this clearance has on the Kenilworth Channel, MPRB staff suggested that a lesser clearance—one aligned with directives for original bridges established by Theodore Wirth, former Superintendent of Parks for the Minneapolis Board of Park Commissioners—might allow for a superior design from the perspective of the channel. Research indicated a clearance established by Wirth that, when translated to contemporary datum elevations, results in a clearance of 10.6 feet. MPRB staff supports this redirection of baseline parameters of the design for the bridges, although the greatest practicable clearance is desired.

A change to parameters for clearance provides a bridge with fewer intrusions into the channel itself. As the channel is considered the historic resource, not the bridges, the MPRB views this as a significant improvement when compared to the previous bridge proposals and to the existing trestle bridge located at the channel.

The MPRB supports design configurations that reduce direct impacts to the Kenilworth Channel, particularly related to the number of piers in the water. Concepts shared by SPO include a trail bridge that is separated from the LRT

bridge, resulting in a trail bridge that spans the channel without pier support. This direction, is particular, is strongly supported by the MPRB.

Channel context

The MPRB believes preference should be directed to the Kenilworth Channel as the primary resource when impacts are considered. It is not only a historic feature but is one that is more directly impacted by the introduction of a bridge supporting LRT through additional deck coverage. To the extent that bridges can be separated in ways that introduce more light to the channel, MPRB believes a more favorable design is achieved. Configurations explored by the SPO include a skewed trail bridge, which the MPRB believes should continue to be studied and considered until and unless it is clearly demonstrated as having a negative impact on adjacent or nearby residential properties. To date, it has not been demonstrated as having such an impact, but it is clear that even a slight skew offers the opportunity to increase the amount of natural daylight reaching the channel.

Historic context

The extant bridge is not one upon which a new design for a bridge should be based. The trestle bridge was never intended to be permanent and while a design for the bridge bearing a relationship to other bridges on the Chain of Lakes might have been anticipated in Wirth's time for the railroad bridge over the channel, such a bridge was never implemented. To use an unimplemented design for the basis for design of bridges implemented as part of the SWLRT project would present a false history for the channel crossing. Still, Wirth's writings suggest directions that resonate with history without mimicry. He suggested, "If concrete bridges are to be built then the designs should be of the simplest possible character, without any attempt at ornamentation." He further noted, "Let those concrete bridges show graceful, pleasing lines, be true in character to their construction, and let their modesty and simplicity of design be one of their strongest features." Considering these directives, the MPRB takes no exception to the concept designs proposed, and also believes the introduction of a steel structure for the trail bridge could be supported as its use of the material is honest and simplistic in both structure and form.

Bridge relationships

The introduction of the LRT bridge at the channel adds some complexity to the composition of bridges. However, the MPRB believes the LRT and freight rail bridges bear a similarity suggesting complementary design, while the trail bridge, because of its clearly different requirements for loading and deflection, could be either similar or strikingly different in materials, form, and overall design. From that perspective, the MPRB takes no exception to the concept designs.

Several features related to the bridges have not been defined and the MPRB withholds any response to those features until a design is clearly demonstrated. Features or components such as the channel walls, slope paving at bridge abutments, landscape restoration, and bridge railings need definition. In addition, the methods of controlling noise have yet to be fully explored and may impact upon the design. As noise mitigation is considered, the MPRB reserves the opportunity to introduce comments that may support or negate any statements offered in this letter.

Other features of the SWLRT project may also be of interest to the MPRB but have not been fairly demonstrated in current concepts. The tunnel portal and its visual impact needs to be defined by SPO so that the MPRB can consider the ways it influences the experience of park users on the Kenilworth Trail

and views from Cedar Lake Parkway. An expansive retaining wall on the north side of the corridor and supporting the freight rail tracks has the potential to detract from the channel. Design directions for this wall have yet to be demonstrated.

Four bridge concept designs prepared by SPO were shared with the MPRB at a meeting of the Board of Commissioners on May 20, 2015. The intent was not to deliberate the merits of any particular design or ask the commissioners to define a preference, but rather to allow for early insights for bridge directions. The commissioners noted no particular exceptions to the design directions presented as a part of the meeting, nor did they indicate a preference for any of the concepts.

The MPRB looks forward to refinements of the bridge design concepts. Please let me know if you have any questions related to the content of this letter.

Sincerely,

Michael Schroeder
Assistant Superintendent for Planning
Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board

Minnesota
Historical Society

STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

May 28, 2015

Mr. Greg Mathis
MnDOT Cultural Resources Unit
395 John Ireland Boulevard, Mail Stop 620
St. Paul, MN 55155-1899

RE: Southwest Light Rail Transit Project
Multiple Communities, Hennepin County
SHPO Number: 2009-0080

Dear Mr. Mathis:

We are continuing consultation on the above project which is being reviewed pursuant to the responsibilities given the State Historic Preservation Officer by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and implementing federal regulations at 36 CFR 800, and to the responsibilities given the Minnesota Historical Society by the Minnesota Historic Sites Act and the Minnesota Field Archaeology Act.

Our office participated in a Section 106 consultation meeting for this project on April 22, 2015. At this meeting your agency presented and submitted the new bridge configurations for the proposed crossing structures over Kenilworth Lagoon/Channel – to supplement the Bridge Design Concepts presented in February 2015 - for review and comment by our office and participating consulting parties. In addition, we also briefly discussed proposed mitigation for the adverse effects to archaeological sites 21HE0436 and 21HE0437 but, due to the fact that there were no representatives present from the City of Minneapolis, it was decided to defer additional consultation regarding resolution of adverse effects to these sites to a later meeting.

We have been continuing consultation under the premise that your agency has determined that there is a potential adverse effect to the Grand Rounds Historic District which will be caused by the proposed construction of new crossing structures over the Kenilworth Lagoon/Channel, a contributing element in the historic district. It is our understanding that final effect determinations will be made by the Federal Transit Administration later this calendar year, but that we will continue to consult regarding the design of these crossing structures in an effort to minimize adverse effects.

We offer the following comments and recommendations, taking into account information presented at the consultation meeting on April 22 and our subsequent review of the documents submitted, including:

- *Bridge Design Concepts and Configurations Considered* (Table), Draft 4/22/2015
- Plan views, section views, profile views, and sketches of the revised crossing configurations 4A, 4B, 4C, and 4B-Skew (Plans), Draft April 2015

It is our understanding that the additional configurations build upon the original proposal for two crossing structures at this location (one with combined pedestrian/bicycle trail and light rail and the second with freight rail) and propose a split of the combined trail/light rail structure thus creating two separate crossing structures for the trail and light rail thus bringing the total number of structures at this location to three. While we understand the benefit of this proposal as it relates to minimizing potential impacts to park users at the waterway level, primarily by creating less of a tunnel-like structure above, it is our opinion that the added physical presence of this new infrastructure on the landscape will not minimize the potential adverse effect to the historic property as a whole.

Although the proposed splitting of proposed crossing structures into three separate elements will only increase the amount of new construction by five feet, we feel that this proposal is moving in the wrong direction. If the agency's effort is to minimize adverse effects, then adding additional infrastructure does not achieve this goal.

The extreme example of this is presented in the Configuration 4B-Skew which is the most intrusive design of the four options. This is primarily due to the fact that it would not only increase the physical impact to the historic property by the greatest extent with a larger footprint of new crossing infrastructure, but also that construction of this alternative would result in additional land acquisition, tree removal, and grading. We appreciate the fact that the submittal included plans, cross sections and profile views which provide at least an initial understanding of the potential impacts of the proposed crossing structures as a whole, including wing walls, retaining walls, ballast curbs and grading, required for each design. Although there are some design elements in each of the Configuration 4A, 4B, and 4C options presented, including thinner bridge decks and staggered pier placement (thus avoiding another type of tunnel effect at the water level), we do not have a preference for one single design as currently presented.

Overall, in order to minimize adverse effects, if this is possible, we recommend that your agency pursue a design solution which may include a combination of the most minimal design elements – including a reconsideration of the original two-bridge crossing option - including pier numbers and configuration, deck thinness, wing walls, and retaining walls. Also, take into consideration the importance of avoiding direct adverse impacts (which may include removal during construction and/or obscuring access/views by new crossing structures) to the historic WPA retaining walls located along the edge of the channel. If direct impact avoidance cannot be achieved then the most minimal treatment of these features should be considered, including selective rehabilitation or restoration in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.*

We look forward to continuing consultation on this aspect of the project. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this comment letter, please feel free to contact me at 651-259-3456 or sarah.beimers@mnhs.org.

Sincerely,

Sarah J. Beimers

Sarah Beimers, Manager
Government Programs & Compliance

Minneapolis
City of Lakes

Community Planning and Economic Development
105 Fifth Ave. S. - Room 200
Minneapolis, MN 55401
TEL 612.673.5009

www.minneapolismn.gov

June 1, 2015

Greg Mathis
Minnesota Department of Transportation- Cultural Resources Unit
395 John Ireland Boulevard
St. Paul, MN 55155

RE: Southwest Light Rail Transit Project, Hennepin County; Minnesota; Comments from April 22, 2015 consultation on potential effects. (SHPO#2009-0080)

Dear Mr. Mathis,

Thank you for providing the materials from the April 22, 2015 meeting. The City of Minneapolis Long Range Planning Division submits the following comments on behalf the Minneapolis HPC, a consulting party to the Section 106 review.

CPED- Long Range Planning has reviewed materials provided as part the April 22, 2014 including the four new bridge configurations for the Kenilworth Channel/Lagoon Crossing. We look forward to continued consultation as the bridge designs evolve to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse effects on properties.

CPED-Long Range Planning looks forward to continued discussion and consultation regarding the mitigation and potential interpretation of the Sites 21HE0436 and 21HE0437.

Thank you again for the opportunity comment.

Sincerely,

Brian Schaffer
Principal City Planner, AICP
City of Minneapolis- CPED-Long Range Planning
105 5th Avenue South, Suite 200
Minneapolis, MN 55415
Phone:(612) 673-2670
brian.schaffer@minneapolismn.gov

cc: Sarah Beimers. MN SHPO (via email)
Jack Byers, CPED-Long Range Planning (via email)

Meeting Title: SWLRT Section 106 Consultation

Date: 6/17/2015 **Time:** 1:00 pm **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)

Invitees: SHPO: Sarah Beimers, Natascha Wiener
Eden Prairie: Regina Rojas, Lori Creamer
Minnetonka: Elise Durbin
Hopkins: Nancy Anderson
St. Louis Park: Meg McMonigal
Minneapolis: Brian Schaffer, Jack Byers
MPRB: Jennifer Ringold, Michael Schroeder
KIAA: Jeannette Colby, Tamara Ludt
Three Rivers: Bill Walker
Hennepin County: Dave Jaeger, Kim Zlimen, John Doan
CIDNA: Craig Westgate
FTA: Maya Sarna, Amy Zaref
USACE: Melissa Jenny, Brad Johnson
SPO: Nani Jacobson, Jim Alexander, Ryan Kronzer, Mark Bishop, Leon Skiles, Sophia Ginis, Dan Pfeiffer, Nkongo Cigolo, James Mockovciak, Sam O'Connell, Jenny Bring, Lance Meister, Tim Murphy
MnDOT: Liz Abel

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

--- Agenda Topics ---	
1.	Welcome & Introductions
2.	Historic Properties and Transit Noise and Vibration Overview
3.	Kenilworth Crossing Bridge Design Update
4.	Next Steps

DISCUSSION:

	ACTION ITEMS:	PERSON RESPONSIBLE:	DEADLINE:
1.	Follow up with the City of Minneapolis and begin planning for mitigation through interpretation incorporated into the Royalston Station Design.	Greg Mathis	
2.	Consider the bridge configuration options after the meeting and provide any additional comments to SPO	Consulting parties	5/27/15
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			

Minnesota Department of Transportation

Office of Environmental Services
Mail Stop 620
395 John Ireland Boulevard

Office Tel: (651) 366-4292
Fax: (651) 366-3603
greg.mathis@state.mn.us

June 8, 2015

Sarah Beimers
State Historic Preservation Office
Minnesota Historical Society
345 Kellogg Blvd. W.
St. Paul, MN 55102

RE: Southwest Light Rail Transit Project, Hennepin County, Minnesota; consultation on project effects, SHPO #2009-0080

Dear Ms. Beimers,

We are writing to continue our consultation regarding the Southwest Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project (Project). Following standard practice, all Section 106 consulting parties for this Project are copied on this letter.

In our letter of February 3, 2015, we notified your office that the Minnesota Department of Transportation Cultural Resources Unit (MnDOT CRU), per authority delegated by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), would be continuing a series of meetings with consulting parties, FTA, and the Project sponsor, the Metropolitan Council (MC), to consider and resolve adverse effects on historic properties. As part of this effort, the following meetings have been held with consulting parties:

- February 6, 2015: effects to historic properties from the proposed crossing over the Kenilworth Lagoon element of the Grand Rounds Historic District;
- February 24, 2015: effects to other historic properties along the Project corridor; and
- April 22, 2015: mitigation for the adverse effect on Archaeological Sites 21HE0436 and 21HE0437, and continued consultation on the design of the proposed crossing over Kenilworth Lagoon.

Thank you for participating in these meetings and for the comments you provided. Per our previous communication, we are holding the next meeting on June 17, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. at:

Southwest Light Rail Project Office
6465 Wayzata Boulevard, Suite 500
St. Louis Park, MN

This meeting will cover the following:

1. Noise and vibration effects on historic properties

   Throughout the consultation process, a number of comments and questions have been received from consulting parties regarding the effects of noise and vibration from both construction and operation of the Project on historic properties, including what would and would not constitute an adverse effect under Section 106. To address these comments and questions, the Project's noise and vibration consultant, Lance Meister, will give a presentation on FTA noise and vibrations impact assessment process. Mr. Meister also co-authored the FTA's noise and vibration impact assessment manual, which is available at: http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf. Mr. Meister will also review the results of noise and vibration impact assessments for historic properties within the Project's Area of Potential Effect.

2. Update on the design of the new crossing over the Kenilworth Lagoon element of the Grand Rounds Historic District

   During this portion of the meeting the Project will provide consulting parties with an update on

advancing design for the new crossing over Kenilworth Lagoon based on comments received from consulting parties in response to the materials provided on April 22, 2015, as well as input provided by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MRPB) in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding entered into between the MPRB and the Metropolitan Council on March 12, 2015. The update will include a brief introduction to several crossing elements that have been given a lot of consideration during previous consultation meetings on this topic.

The meeting agenda is attached for your reference, as are comments received from consulting parties in response to the consultation materials provided during the consultation meeting held on April 22, 2015, along with draft meeting notes from the meeting.

Sincerely,

Greg Mathis
MnDOT Cultural Resources Unit

Enclosures: SWLRT Section 106 Consultation 6/17/2015 meeting agenda
Letter from the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office to MnDOT CRU, dated 5/28/2015
Letter from the MPRB to MnDOT CRU, dated 5/27/2015
Letter from the City of Minneapolis to MnDOT CRU, dated 6/1/2015
Letter from the Kenwood Isles Area Association to MnDOT CRU, dated 5/15/2015
SWLRT Section 106 Consultation 2/24/2015 meeting notes – final
SWLRT Section 106 Consultation 4/22/2015 meeting notes – draft

cc: Bill Wheeler, Federal Transit Administration
Maya Sarna, Federal Transit Administration
Amy Zaref, Federal Transit Administration
Melissa Jenny, United States Army Corps of Engineers
Brad Johnson, United States Army Corps of Engineers
Nani Jacobson, Metropolitan Council
David Jaeger, Hennepin County
John Doan, Hennepin County
Kim Zlimen, Hennepin County
Lori Creamer, City of Eden Prairie
Regina Rojas, City of Eden Prairie
Nancy Anderson, City of Hopkins
Brian Schaffer, City of Minneapolis
John Byers, City of Minneapolis
Elise Durbin, City of Minnetonka
Meg McMonigal, City of St. Louis Park
Jennifer Ringold, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
Michael Schroeder, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
Bill Walker, Three Rivers Park District
Jeanette Colby, Kenwood Isles Area Association
Craig Westgate, Cedar-Isles-Dean Neighborhood Association
Tamara Ludt, Preservation Design Works

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).
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Sarah asked about the long term tunnel maintenance/reconstruction plan.
  - Mark responded that it is built for 75-year lifespan.
- 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
	  ○ Nani presented public involvement opportunities for the Section 106 process that will be integrated into other public involvement activities in 2015.
	• Upcoming meeting schedule
	  ○ 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.
	  ○ February 24
	  ▪ Corridor-wide discussion of effects
	  ▪ Section 106 Agreement overview
	  ○ 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

DRAFT – Work in Process

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 ---	
1.	Welcome & Introductions • Nani Jacobson from SPO opened the meeting and led attendee introductions. Greg Mathis from MnDOT CRU gave an overview of the agenda.
2.	Section 106 Process Overview • Greg Mathis from MnDOT described elements of the Section 106 process and the status of each: o The following steps have been completed - initiating the process and determining the Area of Potential Effect (APE). o 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

	the 30% design milestone and due to project changes resulting from a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the City of Minneapolis. o 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. o 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. o Greg asked if there were any questions, and none were asked.
3.	Discuss effects to historic properties • 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) o 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. o 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. o 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. o Jeannette Colby from the Kenwood Isles Area Association (KIAA) asked why these sites are significant and what they can tell us. ▪ 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. o 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. o 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. o 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. o 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). o 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. o 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. o 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. o 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. o 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

	edges could be grated to allow in more light, and overlook options could be built into the trail design. ▪ 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. **Action: Nani asked the consulting parties to consider the bridge configuration options after the meeting and provide any additional comments to SPO.**
4.	Additional Comments Received • 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.	Next Steps • 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 o The next consultation meeting will likely be in June. • Develop Section 106 Agreement o 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