

**Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting
Categorized Comments
January 7, 2014**



The following 124 comments were collected at the January 7, 2014 Minneapolis town hall community meeting on the Southwest Light Rail Transit project through the submission of written comment cards/discussion worksheets and verbal testimony. The comments are organized into ten primary topic categories. Please note that some comments include more than one topic but are categorized by what appears to be the main theme. We undertook this analysis and organizing exercise to try and make the comments as accessible as possible coming out of the meetings and to share with project decision-makers.

Please Note: All written comments are typed verbatim from submitted comment cards and discussion worksheets. No grammatical, word choice changes or spelling has been corrected. If handwriting is unclear, then correct spelling is used and the most contextual word choice is assumed or marked illegible. Any personal identifiable information, if provided, has been deleted from submitted written comments. Verbal comments have been transcribed verbatim from an audio recording of the meeting. Personal information is included in verbal comments as this information was shared publically.

Primary Topic	Number of Comments	Percentage
1. LRT Alignment, Ridership or Mode	37	30%
2. Shallow LRT Tunnels	14	11%
3. Freight Rail	14	11%
4. Decision-making Process	13	10%
5. Vegetation, Greenscaping, Trails	12	9%
6. Project Support	8	7%
7. Water Resources	8	7%
8. Town Hall Community Meeting Specific	7	6%
9. Other	6	5%
10. Environmental Impact Statement	5	4%

Primary Topic: LRT Alignment, Ridership or Mode – 37 Comments

Comment 005

1/7/13

Pick a different route. Don't tax Mpls residents for a system to bring suburban residents to downtown.

Comment 006

1/7/14

The city of Mpls CAN NOT allow a train full of EDEN PRAIRIE residents blow through our beautiful lakes without stopping! Eden Prairie residents and the Met Council don't want E.D. residents to have to stop at inner city stations like they'd have on Lyndale. The current route is a complete capitulation to the E.P. Elitist who want to go to a ball game without having to deal with anyone who isn't part of their little

Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting
Categorized Comments
January 7, 2014



world. The City of Mpls cannot allow this to happen! Make the route go through the City!! And stop numerous times- in THE CITY!

Comment 009

1-7-14

Why can't they run LRT from Eden Prairie to Mpls/Excelsior Blvd Whole Foods Mall? Stop LRT there. Let buses or future street car take people downtown. Get that segment built. Avoid contentious section from Cedar Lake area to downtown. There is great transportation at Excelsior/Lake Street. Use it! Thanks.

Comment 011

1/7/14

Please consider a slight re-reroute at the line further into Minnetonka from Hopkins before heading back south/southwest towards Eden Prairie.

Comment 018

January 7, 2014

There are a lot of pissed-off people hear. The LRT plan is not good enough, try again. Start over!

Comment 020

Jan 7, 2014

We love LRT! We just think the alignment stinks! If we are to spend all of this money, lets spend it on a route that needs it. The board that discusses why the uptown route won't work is B.S! Disrupting businesses in order to make our community strong is a small price. DO IT RIGHT FOR OUR FURUTE! Keep our City GREAT!

Comment 023

Absolutely support LRT – however, it needs to serve the most people for all varieties of uses, work, pleasure, shopping, etc. I am concerned that the Mpls citizens are served much less than suburban people. Please plan for all communities needing service. The urban population is growing at a fast and welcomed rate. Also keep our park land sacred and secure!

Comment 024

How many riders does the Southwest LRT need to break even?

Please explain the fact that LRT does not have express train capabilities? Why change the environment. (Please Ad this) The LRT should not go through Kenwood and should go down Hennepin Ave instead.

Comment 025

1-7-2014

My understanding is that the new criteria under the Obama Administration, favors servicing urban residents yet the current route skirts Minneapolis and doesn't serve our population centers. Isn't there a way to ask federal agencies to put our funding on hold so that we can relook at the route to ensure population centers are served in Minneapolis, especially given the escalation costs of the current alignment According to the Met Council the North Mpls stops will service fewer than 800 people. Are we really best servicing the people in North Mpls with this route?

Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting
Categorized Comments
January 7, 2014



Comment 030

1/7/14

I am concerned about the “drift” that has happened since the start of this process. Specifically I am stunned that the fact that Kenilworth/SLP project cost is now within +/- 10% of the uptown route. That the significant increase urban access/ridership has not made that uptown route the obvious best scenario. Summary: Uptown route is best value.

Comment 040

1/7/14

Wrong alignment. Going where there is no ridership. This doesn't solve any ridership problems. Can't use rail to go to emergency room, etc., too expensive compared to route. Legalize jetties. Privatize the bus lines. Allow the free market to work.

Comment 041

7 Jan 2014

Please move this alignment. It doesn't serve North Minneapolis. Royalston and Van White Stations have super low ridership projections. This alignment does not serve Minneapolis.

Comment 042

1 – 7 – 2014

Uptown should be reached by this train. The Kenilworth alignment is wrong, doesn't reach people.

Comment 043

7 Jan 2014

Ridership projections in the DEIS include substantial numbers of future LRT riders who today happily ride the bus (e.g the wifi-equipped bus from Eden Prairie). Poaching bus riders from the bus system is not helping take cars off the road.

Comment 050

1/7/14

Do not feel LRT adequately serves North Minneapolis or businesses (and population centers) along Lake Street and Nicollet Avenue but ruins a gem of Minneapolis with no obvious benefit to Minneapolis.

Comment 053

1/7/2014

How much change to the demographic projections would necessitate considering a new route?

Comment 056

January 7, 2014

The basic problem is that the alignment of the route needs to be revisited. To force the route through the Kenilworth corridor seems a poor decision when other options would avoid this parkland that is so heavily used by visitors and Minneapolis residents. Everyone will have to live with this decision for many years – please take the time to do it right.

Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting
Categorized Comments
January 7, 2014



Comment 058

1-7-14

If we are doing “additional analysis” why is the Uptown route not being considered?

This issue is of greater concern than the type of trees or the freight rail alternatives.

Comment 061

1-7-14

Why are we building a train when buses (rapid bus) do a better job for a much lower cost?

Comment 063

1/7/14

Can The light rail (or trolleys) run on the 394 Sane Lane?

Comment 066

1/7/14

No Light Rail (Streetcars)

Comment 067

1/7/14

Let’s be honest and not refer to this transportation project as ‘Lightrail”, it’s a ‘Commuter” rail project that ties several suburbs together to provide access to Downtown Mpls –nothing more.

The metrics need to be changed from a “Bush era” suburban focused metric to one that applies to urban areas as well.

Comment 077

Question: When it comes to light rail ridership, what are you most concerned about? Why?

Answer: Safe pedestrian station access. co-lo severs the ability for riders to access the stations.

Question: When it comes to the selected route, what are you most concerned about? Why?

Answer: The LRT route is correct, but the co-lo w/freight make the project unsafe.

Question: We’ve heard that there are concerns that SWLRT doesn’t benefit or serve Minneapolis residents or businesses. Can you tell us more about those concerns? What are the benefits that counter-balance these concerns?

Answer: Minneapolis, Hennepin County our region and our state need transportation infrastructure. LRT is but an piece of the transportation solution. BRT, streetcars, bus and bike complete our connectivity needs.

Question: The next ridership projection will be developed later this year after the project scope is established; what would be an effective way to communicate new ridership projections?

Answer: The ridership numbers need to account for riders unable/unwilling to cross freight tracks.

Comment 081

1.7.13

Best meeting on LRT/Rail/Water/Vegetation I have attended. (And I have been at many).

Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting
Categorized Comments
January 7, 2014



Hope the officials know (NOW?) Why the Kenilworth corridor seems so WRONG for LRT & Freight Rail. It is a BAD IDEA!!

Comment 093

Jan 7, 2014

I think it is essential for the new studies to re-evaluate locating the LRT line along 29th street instead of in Kenilworth. I fear there will not be enough riders on the current route to justify the huge costs of \$1.5 billion. We cannot afford to have a very poorly used LRT line (as is happening with Northstar). Then the existing freight lines can be left as is (which seems tolerable).

Comment 094

January 7/2014

Reconsider the Uptown Route!!! people actually live there.
Kenilworth has become a valuable natural resource. Do not damage it & the lakes - !!!

Comment 095

1/7/13

Who is 'the ridership? whom does it serve? Since the recent demographic changes how will this affect the route planning? Do we need a new route? What are doing about cultural pushback? Are the ridership numbers "fake"? How real is the data? What is your substantiation?

Comment 103

Jan 7, 2014

I have not been involved in this dispute previously, but it always seemed to me that going along 29th Street was a much better route. After tonight's discussions, I think it is imperative that that route be re-examined even if it means delaying the process longer. I understand that is not included in the current study which is a major mistake.

Comment 105

1/7/13

Where are the presumably higher ridership #'s for the uptown alignments? Where is the transparency?

Comment 106

1/7/2014

70% of all light rail goes by their cities convention centers. Why have we ignored ours. The LRT Consultants have stated that fact.

Comment 107

1/7/13

1. Safety: LRT and freight should be separate due to accidents at Bacmanitque, Casseton & Nebraska.
2. Need for deep tunnel for LRT if Kenilworth is shared, Still allocate for freight.
3. Ridership estimates questionable, 34 minutes to downtown and 20 minutes to airport or 25 minutes to MOA.
4. Uptown has highest ridership density; No other route does.

Comment 108

Please reconsider a SWLRT that serves North/Northeast, the West side of 394 (not just Uptown). Not a Kenwood or SLP resident.

Comment 110

1. The project was designed under Bush administration criteria, favoring suburban growth over service to city residents. Why didn't the project change to better meet new Obama criteria and updated census results showing a growth in cities and population loss in suburbs?
2. How did the Bush administration's emphasis on suburban commuter's travel time impact the selection of the Kenilworth alignment?
3. At what point in the process is route change to the project possible in response to significant, unexpected factors, like the freight trains not relocating?
4. Based on current demographic information, population growth in the cities is expected to increase. Why should we spend \$1.5 billion on a transportation and development project that does not respond to that growth?
5. How was the fact that density drives ridership ignored as the project was designed within the city?
6. Why isn't a direct stop at the Eden Prairie Mall included in the alignment, a destination for urban youth to access service jobs?
7. According to the Met Council, fewer than 800 people per day might use the two stations closest to North Minneapolis. If providing access to suburban jobs to North-side resident is a priority for the Met Council, why are they trying to meet this need with \$1.5 billion train that simply skirts North-side communities, service so few.
8. If one of the goals of increasing transit is to attract commuters out of their cars, why does this alignment rely so heavily on existing suburban bus users for the suburban ridership?
9. According to the Met Council, this project will reduce car use by about 4,000 during rush hour out of 132,000 vehicles used on I-494 at Hwy 169 every day in 2012. What impacts will that reduction have on congestion?
10. This project's cost escalated to \$1.2 dollars with no additional benefit to commuters due to route changes in the suburbs, why were route changes to better serve the city not considered earlier in the process?
11. How would the process be changed to better plan for high quality projects that meet local needs throughout an alignment, not just in selected communities?
12. How was a project of this magnitude, based on the assumption that a freight company would cooperatively move their tracks, progressed without a legal agreement secured? Whose responsibility was that? How did the Hennepin county Railroad Authority not advise decision makers of this very scenario?
13. This route was shared with developers as the Locally Preferred Alignment long before the public process was initiated How far in advance are routing decisions made before the public process is initiated?
14. Why was the city of Minneapolis asked to approve the shallow tunnel plan with less impacts study than a new stop sign is afforded?
15. What impacts does the Met Council's own information regarding air quality, ridership, development opportunities; targeted populations have on the design and routing of an alignment?
16. When will the full Environmental Impact Study be completed regarding the shallow tunnel proposal?
17. What sound impacts on the lakes will be included in the Environmental Study?

Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting
Categorized Comments
January 7, 2014



18. How much of the Kenilworth channel will be covered by concrete with the addition of the double track bridge, and the new freight bridge?
19. How much vegetation damage if deep tunnel is considered?
20. How will the permanent dewatering impacts of tunnels be assessed on the lagoon between Isles and Cedar lakes compared to the water currently being illegally pumped into the lagoon between Isles and Calhoun? What will be the differences in volume and quality?
21. How will water quality be assured during flooding?
22. How will safety be assured when Flammable freight trains already run in this very narrow residential right-of-way?
23. The relocation of freight rail traffic out of the Kenilworth Corridor was a key condition of the Minneapolis agreement. Why wasn't an agreement with the freight company secured earlier in the process?
24. Why did Hennepin County and the Met Council wait until January 2013 to announce that the railroad had refused to agree with the Met Council's plan to relocate freight out of the Kenilworth Corridor?
25. Why is a shorter commute time to suburban workers through the Kenilworth Corridor given precedence over shorter commute times to Minneapolis workers in South Minneapolis who have to take slow Metro Transit buses into downtown Minneapolis?
26. Why are opponents of the SWLRT alignment criticized as wealthy Kenwood NIMBYs when citizens from all parts of Minneapolis are asking questions about the alignment and the process that brought about this alignment?
27. How do the development opportunities along the Kenilworth Corridor compare with the development opportunities along a South Minneapolis route?
28. Why can't the Met Council work with our congressional delegation to hold federal funding until a better SWLRT route under new Obama Administration guidelines is planned?
29. Why was the suburb of Minnetonka allowed to make a \$300 million realignment of SWLRT to bypass their green space when Minneapolis is not allowed a similar bypass option?
30. Why is the current SWLRT project being sold as an "equity train" which will allow low-income North Minneapolis residents access to suburban jobs when the North Minneapolis neighborhoods adjacent to SWLRT are gentrifying at an accelerated rate?
31. As many people as possible involved in the grade level design.
32. What will revegetation look like? Natural or of mostly designed
33. Not enough space left to revegetate
34. What will be needed – to better visualize –
35. How in de is track
36. How can a decision be made w/o a rendering that accurately portrays the look and feel of the trail
37. Lighting on trail
38. Why isn't it serving greater density (population) in Minneapolis?
39. Width of corridor sufficient?
40. Existing brige historie structure –
41. Sense of place – Big Picture – Step back are we preserving our heritage? Why don't we reconsider uptown route – 100 year investment carrying the vision of Theodor Wirth

Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting
Categorized Comments
January 7, 2014



Comment 112

Sent: Thursday, January 09, 2014 9:06 AM

Subject: Include in public meeting comments

It is clear to me from the posters, that the met council is going to make the same old tired recommendation to the cities. The posters reflect that with titles and excuses like why we can't reroute through uptown and the freight posters about how they have all this federally regulated power to self determine their own route. The LRT should never have gone through Kennilworth . The number of people served is minuscule compared to a reroute down Hennepin, Lyndale or the greenway. Those are and have always been the routes that make the most sense. It would ensure success by actually serving Minneapolis as well as the suburbs. I am reserving judgement about the hiring of a public relations firm. If the purpose is really to hear what the public have been saying, and balance the needs of ALL the communities, then it may help. If the purpose is to just lull us into thinking that Minneapolis' needs are being heard and heeded, and then make the same old tired solutions, then it will be a wasted exercise. Finally, the danger of colocating North Dakota Bakken oil tankers next to an LRT better concern you. We have seen the devastation in three accidents in the past six months. With freight alone, the danger still exists but to add LRT in this narrow corridor is like striking a match. The LRT should be rerouted through a populous area of Minneapolis to best serve the needs of all the communities along the line! If it is not, there should be no colocation.

Sincerely,

Sent from my iPad

Verbal Comments: Captured verbatim from audio recording during table report out session.

LRT Ridership and Route Report – Table 1

My name is Judy. So we had a lot of people around these two tables and it was very hard to hear. So number one involved this process it was hard to hear and that I might not do as good a job about reporting because it was hard to hear. So that was a concern. Another concern about process involved posters up around the room, being biased by whoever wrote them. Biased against questions about the alignment. Now about ridership and route the vast majority of comments here really questioned the alignment. A couple points about ridership. The projects ridership, according to the DEIS, much of it is poached from bus riders. Many of the ridership is Eden Prairie have the Southwest Transit and love that service and do not want to switch to get on LRT. Another point about ridership was that Uptown has a burgeoning population and that we would really love to see southwest neighborhoods with transit dependent populations served by mass transit. This alignment doesn't do that. Another point about ridership, this current alignment favors suburban riders over Minneapolis riders and was it based on Federal criteria under Bush, those have actually changed and under Obama our Federal Transit standard or priorities favor urban density. This alignment does not serve Minneapolis. A point was made about the argument that some have made, that this alignment is somehow going to help North Minneapolis, comments at this too tables, suggest that that is simple not true. Ridership projections for those North Minneapolis stations are very low, this alignment does not go deeply into North Minneapolis and it should not be used as an argument for this alignment. Finally a similar point was brought up to another table, was the fact that Eden Prairie did get a \$300 million in mitigation change to the alignment and why is Minneapolis not going to get the same thing. Thank you.

LRT Ridership and Route Report – Table 2

Hi my name is Kathy Schmidt and I live in the Wedge. I am going to succinctly try do this. One of the major concerns was green space, we want density Minneapolis but we are kind of destroying some of the green space someone said. So we are destroying one the major draws and so this green space is unique and a prize from Minneapolis so we don't want to destroy it. One of the major concerns of our was the density. There are no development opportunities along Kenilworth. Especially for the demographics that live in the Kenilworth neighborhood. There was someone at the table who had experienced that the buses in the neighborhood past used to be full that go around the neighborhood. The demographics have changed and there are just fewer and fewer people riding the buses. It doesn't make sense in that area. We also had a discussion about possibly paying more to get it done right completely. Like making a long tunnel through Uptown somehow so that the density is served and that is serves us for a long period of time. The long term vision is also mentioned with regards to rail in general because we are becoming a denser city and we need more products and things to be moved to the city. Our freight and rail lines need to be able to handle that so we shouldn't take over current or existing freight rail lines with light if possible. Also to keep in mind climate change and cheap energy dilemmas as these things are studied. Also a thing. We also had the concern the service area was more for the south suburbs, connecting more like Hopkins to Eden Prairie but Minneapolis is receiving none of that benefit. And our major sticking point is that we just want the route to be reexamined. We, the table was basically saying that Kenilworth should be eliminated as an option to put the route where the density is and where development can happen, that is a major one, and consider paying more to do it right.

LRT Ridership and Route Report – Table 3

I'll be super brief cause most of the other topics were already cover. The largest amount of time we spent at this table was one the routing through Kenilworth vs. the Nicollet route and the topic of density and we all read the board. But I don't feel that, or I should say that, the tables as a whole, did not feel like those were good reasons, why that isn't a, still a viable route. There is some issues about trust and the reasons why Nicollet is not an options. The reasons seem to keep changing. The ridership numbers are changing as well, and again nothing up there, the cost does not seem to be an insurmountable cost. There were some other discussions here about if we have looked at a Louisiana route for the LRT and maybe the possibility of a West End Station. We also discussed the Deep Bore Tunnel and if there could be an independent analysis on whether that was a viable option to solve some of the safety issues. The key challenge at the table though was trust, trusting the numbers, trusting what we have heard. And then I will also note, there was also a difference of opinion at the table, with some participants feeling that it is more important that we have a line than no line, and other feeling it is more important that we have a right line vs. a line.

Primary Topic: Shallow LRT Tunnels – 14 Comments

Comments 001

LRT Tunnel Table

1.6.2013

Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting
Categorized Comments
January 7, 2014



There is support for both the shallow and the deep tunnel for different portions of the Kennilworth Corridor. We need to examine costs of deep tunnel, shallow tunnel and a hybrid combination that preserves and protects this area. Please ensure copy of this goes to Peter Wagenious also.

Comments 007

1/7/14

Please choose the shallow tunnel option!

Comments 008

1/7/14

We have to go with the shallow tunnel!

Comments 014

1-7-13

Please consider the count/freight analysis re: the Mpls residents. We fear the burden of negative environmental impact on residential area with combined heavy/light rail with no transportation benefit. Please include deep tunnel to minimize cost to neighborhood. Suburbs have several tunnels and accommodations to neighborhood. Livability is a big issue in the city of Mpls. Please accommodate Mpls resident near LRT as Met Council Has in suburbs such as Eden Prairie and Edina which doesn't even allow LRT in its boundaries. Is the alternative, reroute to where dense population is not through the woods, the very edge of Minneapolis. For example the Penn Station is a Prairie area with no road access only ½ mile walk on the bike trails.

Comment 016

1/7/2013

Of utmost importance: Do not allow surface tracks along entire Kenilworth trail. Deep tunnel is preferable, extra cost will put more people to work and help the economy. (A side benefit).

Comment 031

7th/Jan/14

Deep bore the LTR through densely populated Mpls and eliminate the hostility against the surface plan.

Comment 033

1/7/14

Tunnel idea is bad, expensive, threatening to ground water sources to several lakes.

No tunnel!

Reroute the LRT to neighborhoods with people and business development opportunities.

BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD

Comment 046

1/7/14

If the shallow tunnels are selected, the northern tunnel needs to be extended as far as possible towards the Penn Station. This will respect the parkland as much as possible.

Comment 048

1-7-14

I am a resident of the Calhoun Isle Condo Association. I am strongly in favor of the shallow tunnel in the narrow Kennilworth area between the Lake Street Station and the channel (or past Cedar Lake Prkwy). 200+ plus SWLRT trains going through this narrowest area everyday will greatly reduce the quality of life for us due to noise, vibration, congestion at Cedar Lake Parkway and safety at that intersection. I would greatly prefer 3-4 freight trains per day versus 200 plus light rail trains. 200 plus trains a day will turn the Kennilworth into an industrial look area.

Actually, a deep tunnel would be the best solution if Minneapolis is at all concerned with preserving the corridor.

Comment 059

1-7-14

1. a shallow tunnel would essentially 'destroy the character of the Kenilworth corridor
2. a new bid on the deep tunnel options is in order-previous estimate may be ridiculously high
3. freight ruin in the corridor as it is now is OK.
4. the deep tunnel option is the only viable solution.

Preserve ground beauty of corridor

1. freight
2. [illegible]
3. elim 21st st

Comment 084

1/7/14

LRT Tunnels Table:

A major point not brought up by our table discussant (inadvertently) was to increase the length of any tunnel (shallow or deep) especially farther North to keep LRT underground until near Penn Street station – this would maximize preservation and protection of the Kenilworth corridor and provide enhanced mitigation.

As is the Kenilworth corridor LRT route provides very little ridership benefit to Mpls (far less than alternative) but considerable harm to a regional park, community recreational route and residential community.

Comment 090

Question 1: What was your topic area?

Answer: LRT Tunnels

Stuart wants the Deep tunnel -> minimize flyover of Channel No guarantee tunnels will be funded ->

What are the tunnel alignments, dimensions -> Why can't tunnel go under channel -> Extend tunnel

further north -> will sewer system handle drainage -> move tunnel (south portal of S Tunnel) s of Lake

Street -> Construction

Question 2: What (if anything) did your table discuss that should inform the report on water quality and levels?

Answer will be disruptive -> what are the traffic/economic costs when comparing options -> impact

costs during construction -> tunnel done with vegetation -> concern that project done too cheap (it is

Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting
Categorized Comments
January 7, 2014



100 yr old project) -> covered bridge over channel -> preserve trails -> How do you grow a tree over the tunnel

Question 3: What (if anything) did your table discuss that should inform the report on freight rail?

Answer: sound at the mouth of tunnels -> have fed requirements for horns been examined -> wildlife corridor: sound concerns -> During construction will trail be detoured -> Deep tunnel construction details need to be evaluated -> Minneapolis should care

Question 4: What (if anything) did your table discuss that addressed vegetation, greenscaping and trails?

Answer: burden -> preserv. corridor -> 200 trains destroy corridor -> cost difference between deep tunnel & shallow tunnel? -> Impact tunnel to Calhous ([illegible] tower -> vibration from trains ->

Question 5: What were other key themes or major take-aways from your table discussion? Or are there other points that your group would like to share with the entire community at this point in the process.

Answer: vibration for all options -> All tunnels are co-location options at-grade will destroy area -> Absolute worst is at-grade -> ¾ trains per day vs 200 trains per day -> more concerns about shallow tunnel with regard to pollution -> support for deep tunnel

Verbal Comments: Captured verbatim from audio recording during table report out session.

LRT Tunnel Report – Table 1

My name is Patty Schmitz and I will also make an effort to respond, although our responses do not follow the construction of the report out form. The questions that we had before us, one of them was what are you most concerned about when it comes to LRT tunnels. There were concern, one big concern was that they won't be built, even though they are promised. There is concern about newly understood information from a condo building that understands now that the shallow tunnels will be constructed of the Shallow Tunnel will be dug between 1 and 2 feet of the foundation of their 98 year old building condo, former grain elevator. Concern about that bikes and pedestrians, these tunnel will destroy and disrupt, there is just not enough space to logically include bikes and pedestrian trails along that. And a note that this is considered to be a national historic area. The tunnels as they are proposed would significantly degrade those. There is a questions or a consider that to make sure Minneapolis reps, or all reps, keep an open mind to hearing the thought of folks sharing their opinions. There are concerns about the noise and crash walls that are proposed with the shallow tunnels. And then there is also a questions or comment about the \$300 million that was granted to Eden Prairie so that they could move the LRT off of their owned HCRRA, which is what Kenilworth is so why doesn't Minneapolis get that same consideration. The next question about the concern on water resources with the shallow tunnel, and then do you have the same concerns about the deep tunnel and what aspects are you most concerned about. That was probably the shortest one, people don't generally have concerns about the deep tunnel. Most the concerns are about the shallow tunnel and that it will damage either Cedar Lake or the channel in some way, shape or form. There was also concern that the elected officials, they didn't really consider or give the deep tunnel a fair shake and not sure that they had all the information to inform what the costs would be. There is also some frustration that the process has gone this far and that the shallow tunnel is being proposed with what feel like insufficient facts. Then the third question had to do with preservation and what does corridor character preservation mean and look to us. Easy answer, we seem to be unified, it should look the same. Preservation is not restoration. And again the FTA considers this stretch park land and feels like the park land is being changed so that Eden Prairie riders can get to downtown, by in large. And then, a comment that just other cities are trying to replicate what we have in our park system and so to think we would just willing give up something that

people admire and try to achieve in their cities. And then finally the questions, what do you want decision makers to know about light rail in a tunnel and there were comments, such as the decision making process felt like a train wreck, felt like decisions were made before the facts were known. There is a big lack of trust so the fear is that promises will be made and then at the last minute there will be a reason why it can't be done. Also frustration that neighbors who are active in voicing their concerns are just considered NIMBYs and opposed to people that are really concerned about preserving something unique and yep. Then the comment that the tunnels, that LRT is being built in tunnels all across the world, in the US. They are built in tunnels or in commercial corridors and the shallow tunnel feels like neither. That was it.

LRT Tunnels Report – Table 2

Hello, first of all I want to thank Tina, Sue and Charlie for being here from the State and the Met Council people. I appreciate all the work you guys have been doing, it is a lot of work and I, you've taken a lot of crap from all of us and I just want to let you know that we appreciate it. I won't repeat a lot of the stuff that people have said but we are trying to figure out why the deep tunnel is off the table. Our hope, our whole table, 100% of the people at the table want a deep tunnel. I gotta believe that 100% of these people want a deep tunnel and it is off the table. The governor had stated that he wanted all alternatives back on the table, all alternatives in the past research. Well the deep tunnel is not being researched and we want to know why it's not. We also want to know why the deep tunnel is not being compared apples to apples on other sites. It is for example, the shallow tunnel is about 6,000 linear feet and the deep tunnel is about 8,000 linear feet and if you bring these apples to apples, of 6,000 feet then the price is considerable less. We don't believe that you have to tear down the bridge, the Lake Street Bridge or have a deep station. We believe from the research we have done, talked about and we have an engineer at our table, we believe you can start the tunnel at the West Lake Street Bridge and go down and come back up, so there will be no environmental impact, the water table shouldn't be affected. You don't need a new bridge as I said. We let's see here...we also believe that there is also another alternative where you could go with a deep tunnel from the West Lake Street Bridge, once you get to Burnham Road, that is the Burnham Road Bridge and then come up and go with a shallow tunnel for the rest of the way or something like that, again we are not engineers but if you put those two together then that could be the same cost as relocating freight to St. Louis Park at a cost of \$200 million. We don't think, nothing has been analyzed, we have ask for it from the State, the local government and no one has given us an answer of why they are not looking at the deep tunnel. Cheap is not always better and we believe if it costs \$40 million more to have the deep tunnel than having it rerouted through St. Louis Park, it is well worth it. We will preserve all the natural resources, we are not going to lose 1,000 trees. We believe it is not a 100 year solution and... we could talk all day long about the deep so, so all we are asking is to analyze the deep tunnel, analyze it thoroughly. We also believe that CNA has not been contact on doing it, they did the deep tunnel at the airport and I don't believe they have not been contacted. And why they have not been contracted when they did the bridge, I mean the tunnel at the airport, we have no idea why they are not. So that is all I have. Thank you very much.

Primary Topic: Freight Rail – 14 Comments

Comment 003

- Van White area should not become congested as a layover area.

Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting
Categorized Comments
January 7, 2014



- RR's have trump card-veto.
- Are other routings seriously been studied?
- Concerned about relocation being seen thru.
- SLP never agreed to relocate.
- Shallow tunnel doesn't work because trains still exit over bridge
- Berms not safe, SLP needs safe approach.
- Is plan for Mpls Co-loc safe-freight tracks.
- 29th street corridor available for freight.
- Will freight shipments/movements be ↑?
- Is there a plan C, D that could be equally costly or slightly more?

Comment 004

Freight Metrics

- Safety should be added.
- Noise & vibration.
- Property values.
- Length of trains.
- Loss of trees.

Comment 054

1-7-2014

Consider making room for both freight & LRT in Kenilworth by moving the bike & pedestrian routes to Burnham Road and St. Louis Avenue between Burnham Bridge and Lake Street Bridge.

Comment 071

1-7-14

If freight stays LRT must leave Kenilworth; If LRT stays, freight must go!

Comment 072

1-7-14

Freight tankers and LRT can not coexist in this corridor.

Comment 083

Question: When it comes to freight rail, what are you most concerned about? Why?

Answer: Safe pedestrian station access. Co-lo severs the safe pedestrian access to stations.

Question: The Met Council has identified proposed metrics based on community feedback (see Proposed Metrics handout) that will be measured or quantified in the report. Which are you most concerned about? Are there others that you would like to see in the report?

Answer: The metrics do not consider ridership access to the stations w/co-lo.

Comment 086

Incremental increase do to alignment

SLP – School Board – CAC And LRT, concern school

Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting
Categorized Comments
January 7, 2014



Add Metrics below

At grade pedestrian crossing →Stations

At grade crossings →Stations

Add→Ridership

Add→TOD

- How do riders access the station
- Community access to a station
- Impact that Freight has on development opportunities

Comment 087

Jan 7, 2014

I am concerned that we will be promised a tunnel and then the MET council (or whoever) will take it away once construction starts (or shorten it to end at the channel). We have already had a betrayal with freight rail.

I am also concerned about the freight going through our neighborhood with toxic chemicals & crude oil. Our safety is at risk (recent derailments & crude oil explosions). If freight ends up staying we MUST NOT allow more trains or faster speeds.

Why is the Met council going to make a decision before the EIS is done?

Comment 089

- [illegible] burn by school
- All route should be close, therefore Hopkins/SIP route
- Safety: proposed route needs to be safe. Cannot go backwards. Perceived as safe
- Assurances of freight reroute is inoperative
- Deal w/freight & LRT together, but now cannot have 21st station: Three trucks, no access
- Process is flawed: Alts are not lowest costs, other are unworkable.
- Safety is relative. Perhaps too much made about safety to date.
- Think beyond SLP for freight realignment
- Stations: focus on how freight blocks access to stations. Majority of riders impacted by freight
- TOD will be impacted by freight
- Need for honest quantification of safety concerns
- Metrics are not set effectively from the onset
- Conflict w/MetC wiring consultants
- Regional transportation system
- It's about Places: TOD
- Consider a trench in SLP, rather than a burm: visual improvement
- Consider BNSF double track farther West
- Consider "Rails to Trail" reverse course
- Safety
- both for & against
- Regional transportation system-does not include freight alt stations
- Process
- Conflict of MetC & Consultants
- May not be asking the right questions

**Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting
Categorized Comments
January 7, 2014**



- Alt Routes
- Look farther west than SLP
- Consider trench in SLP
- Consider double track at BNSF
- Station Access
- TOD
- Metrics

Comment 092

Freight seems so corrupt/political – At August Meetings they announced that the 25’ safety distance could just be 12’ – this is not safe! Freight is not to be trusted. Too powerful.

Comment 111

Sent: Friday, January 10, 2014 5:55 PM

Subject: Comments on Freight Rail Safety Issues - Please Forward to TranSystems

Please note my comments below on the freight rail issue.

As stated below, I attended the Tuesday SWLRT meeting and voiced some of these concerns, although not in the same detail. However, the reporter for the table I sat at did not include any of my comments in his oral report. I do not know if his omission was intentional or not but I later learned that he may be biased in favor of TC&W and has in fact spent considerable time with the President of TC& W.

One of the recipients of my email below suggested that I forward my comments to you so that they can be shared with the independent consultant, TranSystems, as they continue to work on their study and report.

It would be appreciated if you could confirm that you will share these as part of the overall community comments solicited from the public this week.

Thank-you,

Sent: Thursday, January 09, 2014 1:09 PM

Subject: RE: More on oil tankers

Thanks again __for keeping this group informed of new information.

This is an important safety issue wherever there is freight rail traffic. Safety of freight has always been a major consideration for St. Louis Park in connection with plans for the SWLRT but I am not as confident that people in Minneapolis have the same appropriate level of concern.

I was at Tuesday night’s community meeting and heard a few people say that they would be OK with freight remaining on the Kenilworth corridor, and that they even prefer freight, as long as the light rail is underground in tunnels. However, I fear they are basing this on TCF&W’s historical use of this corridor which has been limited to approximately 20 trains a week, traveling at a speeds of about 10 miles an

hour, and hauling mostly grain and other nonflammable cargo (although we are seeing increasing levels of 100-car trains hauling ethanol which is flammable.)

Decisions should not be based on present use. It is my understanding that there are **no limits** on the number of trains or type of cargo that TC&W can run through the Kenilworth corridor; that speeds can increase to 25 miles an hour (a stated objective of TC&W in discussions of any reroute through St. Louis Park); and that TC&W can allow other railroad carriers to use these tracks as long as there is a TC&W engineer in the cab. Since they are a private company that wants to increase profits, presumably they will take advantage of these rights to the fullest extent possible in future years.

Pardon my skepticism, but I am concerned that TC&W is very carefully maintaining its historical presence to quell concerns about their future plans and that, once a final decision is made to keep freight on the Kenilworth trail, they will begin to exercise their rights to increase the number of trains, increase speeds, increase subleasing rights to other trains, and expand the types of cargo. While they have publicly stated that they do not prefer one route over another, I believe that TC&W prefers to remain on the Kenilworth corridor for at least two reasons: (1) the relatively flat terrain of the Kenilworth corridor will save it fuel costs, versus a route with more elevation, and (2) because the land is owned by HCCRA, they believe they have at least an argument for “shared liability” if there should be a future derailment (similar to what I presume they argued when there was a derailment in the last 1 or 2 years and which caused HCCRA to settle with them – information I learned from documents posted by the Met Council in connection with a Met Council corridor management committee meeting last Fall). While I can understand why the RR might want this, I wonder whether federal law requires that these factors be considered when moving existing freight to another route. While the RR may have a right to require that any reroute be as safe and not “more” costly than an existing route, do they have a right to require the route that is most profitable to them? Public safety concerns should be paramount to RR profitability.

I voiced my concern on Monday night that the current freight rail study in process analyze safety of freight rail through Kenilworth based on *future* projected uses, *not historical*, taking into account the proximity of the freight not only to homes but also to pedestrians and bicyclists, and light rail when at grade. In particular, under the colocation proposal, at the channel crossing, freight will be running closely adjacent to the LRT, a bikeway and a pedestrian trail, with canoes traveling below. Additionally, where the freight currently crosses the channel, the adjacent land on the south side drops steeply to the channel and the backyards of families.

Unfortunately, my comments did not get included in our table’s report on Tuesday night, and I am not able to attend this evening’s meetings, so I am taking this opportunity to share my concerns with this group.

Verbal Comments: Captured verbatim from audio recording during table report out session.

Freight Rail Report – Table 1

We were discussing and learning about freight rail systems and the things that impact them, in the first question about what was your area. We were talking about fact that there are potential damages and

costs to the City of Minneapolis that are way in excess of the benefits the city is going to get, particularly since some of the benefits like the 21st Street Station have been removed and the fact that there aren't many potential riders along that whole stretch anyway. And the possibilities of accidents and things such as oil fires, like they have had in North Dakota, water quality problems and noise and vibrations. The people that live along there said that they would really prefer to have 3-4 freight trains that they have now per day, rather than 200 LRT trains. We didn't have anything to contribute to question 2, question 3 what is anything did you table discuss we discussed that could inform freight rail. We learned, we were lucky to have a retired person from the Minnesota Department of Transportation at our table, so we learned a lot of history. The St. Louis Park Right of Way is very narrow and is only lightly used and the big problem for the rail road, from their point of view, is there is 47 foot grade difference of the two tracks that need to be connected out there. We didn't have anything for 4. Questions 5, what were the other key themes or take aways, we felt the hunger for federal money on the part of everyone in this process is trumping good planning and design. The Federal rules used to prefer suburban commuters on LRT lines, over city commuter, but in this Metropolitan area we have just learned that Minneapolis is the area where the population is growing and not in the suburbs. We like the idea of moving the Right of Way north of Cedar Lake because it is much bigger. The City could still have the Van White station that they want badly and move the LRT to St. Louis Park and keep the freight trains in Kenilworth. There was a strong sigh of relief at our table when someone mentioned that at our table, everyone thought that was a great idea. Then what was the hardest and most challenging part? Question 6. Why do the railroads always get their way and apparently that is because of this Federal Surface Transportation Board is very powerful and is the elephant in the room, along with the Federal dollars, and that the railroads have condemnation Right of Way powers and all sorts of other things going forth that trump the State Government and everybody else. So that's it.

Freight Rail Report– Table 2

Good evening, I am Ryan Fox and rather than reiterating some of the same things already said, I will focus on some of the things we had that were a little different. I think the big thing that came out of this one, was that we talked about how, the Green Line Extension is part of a regional transportation system that includes LRT, proposed streetcar, bus, car transportation, and bike and pedestrians as well. But it doesn't include freight rail because it proposes, it imposes a lot of impacts to the stations and we focused a lot on how do we get people to the stations. We when took a look at the metrics here, we didn't see how those metrics were being address there so we wanted to add in a couple. One being ridership, how are riders going to access the station when they are adjacent to freight rail tracks. Also wanted to measure some community access to those stations, so get a metric in for that. Also we felt that the transit oriented development opportunities along the stations would be impacted with freight rail next to those tracks. Wanted to have a look at alternative routes for the freight rail that were outside of St. Louis Park, father west. There was also consideration of double tracking the BNSF line, on the north side of Cedar Lake and then connecting father out west. There was also some consideration for, rather than berming in St. Louis Park connection, to put it in a trench so that you don't have the visual impacts of the freight on a berm but rather have it in a trench. That about covers it.

Freight Rail Report – Table 3

Hi, hi, I am Adam Platt and I live in Kenwood. Our group was also discussing freight rail. It was kind of a mix of St. Louis Park and Minneapolis residents so there was not a lot of consensus among the group. People were pretty well set into certain camps and there is lot of opinion being expressed which isn't

necessarily consistent with a lot of the facts that have been exposed or delineated in a lot of the studies done to date. I would say that a lot of the skepticism of the things on many of these boards seems to be rooted in the government agencies failure to properly anticipate the problems of the St. Louis Park reroute and alignment. It has caused people to call almost everything that is being posited right now into question. As a specific concerns under number 3, safety kept coming up as a big priority both among St. Louis Park and Minneapolis residents. Clearly, St. Louis Park, it is a primary concern for St. Louis Park, but also with the Shallow Tunnel and the bridges, noise and vibration in Minneapolis is also a consideration there. For the Minneapolis folks the issue of keeping the promise of moving freight rail out of the corridor is primary to a lot of people. It is perceived as a betrayal. A lie on the part of government and whatever the outstanding issues are or the mitigating factors, the failure to keep that promise looms very large. People are concerned about property values, whether the trains are moved or retained. If their property values decline, how will they be compensated, will they be compensated. Will they be required to sell their homes at a loss and just suck it up. From the stand point of vegetation and greenscaping the main concern was tree loss and tree loss as a result of the building of tunnels, especially the shallow tunnel because of the mode of construction. The key themes or major take-aways, from the discussion was questions about the railroad's roles or prerogatives. The idea that the railroads have a veto kept coming up, why do railroads have this veto. Are we being too, are we giving the railroads too much of a presumptive control over this process and is it worth considering the options of challenging the railroads perspectives if what the citizens and government want is not in line with what the railroads want. As I stated before, there is a lack of consensus. There is a general lack of consensus between the Minneapolis residents and St. Louis Park residents on the appropriate outcomes. What is consistent is that there is a distrust of the railroads and their intensions. There is a lot of catastrophic fears being expressed, worst case scenarios. I don't know how many of those scenarios are rooted in likely hood but there is a lot of talk about horrific train derailment and fuel, oil conflagrations, etc, etc. As far as our most hard or challenging questions, one person considered whether the 29th Street Corridor could be reestablished as a freight rail route. The closure of that corridor at Hiawatha Avenue is what put the freight rail trains into the Kenilworth Corridor to begin with. If we are looking at spending \$300-500 million more to build tunnels, what if those monies were spent instead on getting the trains out of Minneapolis without putting them in St. Louis Park and that is why the 29th Street route was a questions. Or are these plans C or D or the UTU option, the Chaska cut off. Of course they are not easy solutions. There are no easy solution left, but given the sums at money that are look at being spent in Kenilworth or St. Louis Park could those options be made to work and create a win - win for these two constituencies that are so concerned. Is the state of the economy or the improvement in the economy likely to make additional funds available for the project. Finally there was some concern about what are the future freight movements in the corridor and if there could be many additional freight trains in the coming years due to the stronger economy. That is the gist of it.

Primary Topic: Decision-making Process – 13 Comments

Comment 015

1/7/14

Start Over!

1. The math doesn't work, you don't have the money.

Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting
Categorized Comments
January 7, 2014



2. The LRT is supposed to be “Mass Transit” therefore the route should go where the masses are/will be, apartment buildings, restaurants, stores, not through neighborhoods and parkland.

Comment 026

1/7/2014

Find opportunities to assess the usage by N Mpls offer this route and get their input

Comment 036

Jan 7, 2014

I am generally opposed to building a tunnel through the Kenilworth corridor. It shows a distortion of priorities to consider it, especially if the major motivation is visual impact. The tunnel distance proposed is almost the same as going from downtown Minneapolis to Lake Street.

I would have preferred a routing through Uptown. But the Kenilworth routing should be done in the most reasonable way possible. The most straightforward option would be to co-locate freight and LRT at-grade and reroute the bike trail. It does not need to deviate very far to get around the worst choke points. If the bike trail can't be relocated, the freight line would be most reasonably relocated along the North Cedar Lake Trail again, that trail would need to be moved but there is a potential benefit of routing cyclists through nearby commercial areas. There is a complication that the US-169/Excelsior interchange would need to be modified, but it seems that it would be far cheaper than building tunnels for LRT.

Comment 038

1/7/14

Once the biking and pedestrian trails are moved out of Kenilworth they will never move back. Just like the railroad freight that was supposed to be temporary in Kenilworth now seems to be permanent.
NO KENILWORTH LRT.

Comment 047

1/7

No tunnel! Have a short single track one way then switch from Lake Street to about 22nd Street. There is a stretch of single track in Denver's system that works. There is enough room for a single LRT track and the freight track. The one way section is short enough that repairs could be completed with minimal disruption. No Tunnel! Think about it.

Comment 052

1/6/13

What will you do about these questions? How will you act in the face of so much community objection to the Kenilworth corridor, also the Met council representative took over for us when our table was answering and asking questions, that was objectionable.

Comment 064

1/7/14

Proposed SWLRT “Shallow Tunnel” option eliminated 21st Street Station

Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting
Categorized Comments
January 7, 2014



Concern: #1 Burden of LRT, Freight traffic & 2 years of heavy construction by residents of cedar/Dean & Kenwood but have no local access to rail.

#2 Cost of Shallow tunnel \$160 million is relocation & freight \$200 million is not equal comparison because shallow tunnel option eliminates 21st belt station so if you add cost of 21st street station to shallow tunnel option the costs are the same.

Comment 065

1-7-13

Why are we spending so much money on leaving the debt to our children?

Comment 073

1.7.2014

Why do we now speak of costs of the project at 1.25 billion and focus on plus costs for heavy rail & tunnels? Why aren't we evaluating the costs of Eden P realignments and wetland avoidance? Initial announced costs were + 800 million. Put all 'Changes on the table'.

Comment 078

January 7

I appreciated the opportunity to share views. My overall frustration is that we're pretty far down the planning process & have only crummy options left & that we are surprised to be in this place.

Comment 080

1/7/2014

- Acceptable "metric" study levels need to be determined before the study's results are released – critical for increasing flagging confidence in studies to date.
- If project doesn't go thro' in this decade \$1.3 billion busy a lot of " Bus RT – without the enviral impact
- As much as I support LR projects (like Hiawatha & Cent. Corridor) , the only word coming to mind (considering lake, neighborhood, & green "esthetic issues" is "boondoggle", not to mention the huge cost (compared to & Hw. & Cent-Cor. lines).

Comment 100

1-7-14

-With all the distrust surrounding this project, The meeting needed to be much more transparent. Decision makers should have been identified; any representatives from vested interests (railroads, developers and/or their lobbyists) also should have been identified (or identify themselves).

-What happened to the long time promise of definitive freight relocation in return for putting LRT through the Kenilworth Corridor? That has still not been sufficiently answered, nor has the role and power of the railroads and federal governing bodies been made clear, especially as to what influence they have on the Met Council, the city of Minneapolis, and the State of MN.



Comment 104

Jan 7, 2014

My concern is whether developers have already made significant investments along the Southwest corridor based on the current alignment and whether they have power to drive the outcome, or whether the Met Council has ultimate authority to change the alignment over objections of developers.

I would like to see transparency in who and what development is proposed along the route.

Primary Topic: Vegetation, Greenscaping, Trails - 12 Comments

Comment 002

1-7-2013

Regarding landscape/Greenscaping – what is the objective? If reforestation occurs what guidelines will be used? To reestablish components of “urban scrub forest” or to incorporate ecologically scientifically planning, will hope to see retention of prairie landscaping and then ecological aesthetic thinking for tree scapes.

Comment 010

Water Resources

Question 1: When it comes to our water resources, what issues are you most concerned about? Why?

Answer: Destruction of channel, water quality.

Vegetation, Greenscape, Trails

Question 2. When it comes to our water resources, what issues are you most concerned about? Why?

Answer: Destruction of channel, water quality.

Question 5: What else do you want decision makers to know topics?

Answer: It would be nice to see a projection of what the vegetation/greenscape/trails would like after completion of tunnel. My fear is it would never be the same.

Light Rail Transit-Ridership and Route

Question 2. When it comes to the selected route, what are you most concerned about? Why?

Answer: Preservation of Kennilworth trail.

Question 3: We’ve heard that there are concerns that SWLRT doesn’t benefit or serve Minneapolis residents or businesses. Can you tell us more about those concerns” What are the benefits that counter-balance these concerns?

Answer: See above answer

Question 5. What else do you want decision makers to know topics?

Answer: Greenway/Nicollet Ave would be far better route. Serves more businesses. Doesn’t disrupt Kennilworth.

Light Rail Transit-Tunnels

Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting
Categorized Comments
January 7, 2014



Question 1. When it comes to light rail tunnels, what are you most concerned about? Why?

Answer: Removal of trees, change to aesthetics.

Question 2. We've heard that there are concerns about impact on water resources with the shallow tunnel option. Do you have the same concern about a deep tunnel? What aspect of water resources are you most concerned about?

Answer: Yes some concern, water, clarity, preservation of unique channel.

Question 3. We have also heard concerns relating to the tunnels about preserving the character of the corridor. What does "corridor character preservation" mean or look like to you?

Answer: Ability to kayak/ski through channel without disruption to trains/LRT. Preservation of aesthetics.

Other

Question 2. What do you want decision makers to know about your concerns

Answer: Coexistence bad idea, Kennilworth is unique asset for recreational use, don't change it. LRT should go down Greenway/Lake Street S Nicollet, not Kennilworth. Increased pedestrians traffic due to LRT particularly at stations. Will cause safety issues with bikes. Bikers will not ride it they can't ride without slowing down or avoiding pedestrians. Water clarity issues, our lakes are sacred. LRT through Kenilworth serves no one, no businesses.

Comment 012

1.7.2014

This is as an enormous boondoggle! I am diametrically opposed to the light rail through the chain of lakes. IT WILL DESTROY this beautiful pristine environment. I am aghast at this proposal and outraged. It benefits no one in Minneapolis. Residents of Cedar Beach Apartment.

Comment 027

1/7/14

If the LRT route goes through Kenilworth corridor please maximize preservation of existing corridor by considering deep tunnel, extend any tunnel (shallow or deep) further North to near Penn St Station. Minimize flyover distance and impact/foot print. Enlarge landscaping. Preserve the corridor maximize design to mitigate LRT impact through corridor and ideally choose a relocation of LRT out of corridor to maximize ridership. As currently designed LRT through Kenilworth corridor provides little ridership benefit to Mpls and Considerable negative impact on a regional park and non motorized commuter and recreational and community area.

Comment 045

1/7/14

Tunnels; most concerned about the tunnel construction being done in such a way that the end result will be a very barren and industrialized look and feel rather than the community and neighborhood we have now. Concerned about the visual and sound impacts on the neighborhood at tunnel entrance and exits, (including bells, cover lights, etc. Concerned about the sliver of property needed to temporarily move the freight during tunnel construction and that will destroy homes, trees, etc. and that the freight needs to be moved over at all. Figure another way! Need to make absolute certain that preservation is top

Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting
Categorized Comments
January 7, 2014



consideration and concern. Do not move the freight for construction and leave it, enough empty promises. Continue, more the start of the tunnel to south of the Lake Street bridge.

Comment 060

1-7-14

vegetation/greenspace/trails

a personal response

Our table was deeply engaged in the conversation regarding trails/vegetation/greenspace. This is a group that cares about the natural beauty of the area & the importance of the area (historical, recreational, environmentally). There seemed to be a lot of distrust that the recreational trails will remain & that the construction will disrupt the vegetation & severely reduce shade, physical beauty, & the “feeling” of the trails. There is a concern that the trails & the transit must succeed, therefore the design & core given to input by citizens & environmental experts must consider the human experience of riding the light rail, of using the adjacent trails, & using the water ways that intersect the line.

I am hopeful there will be a successful implementation going forward & I am grateful for citizen input & that the Met Council has hosted this meeting and in this way. Thank you.

Comment 070

1-7-14 (Kenwood)

HOW WILL THE BIKE & PED TRAILS BE LOCATED DURING CONSTRUCTION

Comment 082

1/7/14

Today’s Star Tribune stated the bike & walking trails would be relocated temporarily. I don’t trust that the trails would ever return to Kenilworth. The freight trains – were supposed to be only temporarily in Kenilworth. Now we can’t get rid of it.

Comment 097

1-7-14

The “current plan” for Kenilworth Corridor will ruin it, unless the shallow “cut & cover” tunnel is replaced by a deep bore tunnel so the LRT is hidden throughout the corridor. Noise! Trees cut down! Water quality & level in Lk of Isles & Cedar will be very negatively affected by the shallow tunnel noise & the “in & out” movement over the channel require a huge new bridge –unsightly!.

Comment 099

Jan 7, 2013

One reason there is so much opposition to the LRT route is that in the 1980s the railway was abandoning their route and were intending to sell the land to developers. The community organized, partnered with the city and park board to turn the area into park. Hundreds of volunteers over many years worked to plant, design and create this park and commuter bike trails. All this work and love is being ignored and this makes people very angry.

Comment 101

01-07-14

I believe that a compromise solution could be made to compensate the M.P.R.B. & the community for the disruptions & impact on the Kenilworth Bike Trail. The Park Board owns land easements around Cedar Lake & through the Kenilworth Channel. There should be a recreation corridor constructed on P.B. land that would branch off from the Cedar Lake Bike Trail, meander through the woods on the N.E. side of Cedar Lake (a rather desolate unharmed area as it now exists) get to the Kenilworth Channel & pass through it, connecting to Lake of the Isles. The P.B. owns a minimum of 40' on either side of the channel. Currently, this is the same route followed by the City of Lakes Loppet. In 1997, the Park Board hired a world renowned landscape firm (Michael Van Volbeberg & Assoc) to consult on the Chain of Lakes Renovation. Their proposal for Cedar Lake was paths around the entire lake, & parts through the Kenilworth Channel linking up to Lake of the Isles. It is the perfect time to implement Van Volbenberge" recommendations. They would endure the enhance the entire community, blend in with the Kenilworth Bike Trail, & [illegible] the impact of LRT!

Verbal Comments: Captured verbatim from audio recording during table report out session.

Vegetation, Greenscape, Trails Report

My name is David Lilly and I can't jam my notes into the contours of the question outline, I'll just review things as they came up. First questions was, we cannot replace the old trees that are currently there and that would come out, at least under the current proposal. Trees provide a sound buffer and essential aesthetic element in the neighborhood. And actually how much land should be co-located? How much land around the shallow tunnel will be available for re-vegetation? The concept of a great deal of concrete and a lot less dirt in which things can grow. Will vegetation be removed from private property and in that regard how much condemnation will actually occur. The width of the bridge, the proposed bridge, was viewed by our tables as being totally inconsistent with the aesthetic of the both chain of lakes and the existing trail system, which brought us to the point that the alignment is inappropriate given its overall environmental impact. It is interesting, and I didn't bring this up, but at our table, it was pointed out that we have spent a great deal of money, we, the Metropolitan Council has allocated a great deal of money for suburban mitigation, close to \$300 million to move the alignment away, in the suburbs from their bike path. Leaving the project left with insufficient funds in Minneapolis to do the right thing in terms of alignment or mitigation. The claim is now made that it is, our group was most concerned about preserving the characteristics of the corridor. Whatever is done, please do not make it look artificial. There was a great deal of discussion about need for important landscaping design. One idea was to add an additional bike trail through existing park, to the west of the corridor, as a possible way to relieve some congestion. We believe a bike safety analysis should take place. We don't know what the provisions are for grade crossing and there was a feeling there should be intense neighborhood involvement in designing grade crossings to make them safe for pedestrians, bikers and for children. And we believe that as many people and as many constituents as possible should be involved in overall grade level design. We wanted to know what the re-vegetation will look like. There have been no, there have been no believable computer renderings and it is a relatively trivial task to provide designs that can be analyzed and reviewed before ultimate decisions are made. There is insufficient visual data for anyone to understand what the ultimate look and feel of this project will be. There was also basic questions like, how wide is the track, haven't really been analyzed, or something that is not understood by the local population. There was as strong feeling that we need to talk about lighting on the trail. Currently there is

not lighting. Reflecting early comments, overall question, why isn't this trail serving greater population density in Minneapolis. This trail runs fundamentally neighborhoods that are neither dense nor have populations that would actually use transit, assuming there are station stops, actually use this corridor. It is not moving people that desperately need public transportation to suburban jobs, it is not designed to do that and does not reflect the new Obama administration guidelines. And finally, we thought we need to step back and we put this in the context of a 100 year investment and in the context of Theodore Wirth's vision for our parks. What are we doing to what is essentially an interconnected and interrelated, stunning urban environment?

Primary Topic: Project Support – 8 Comments

Comment 022

1/7/2014

Build it now! LRT "Done Right" is LRT that after years of debate is finally put into place. It is my fear that changing the project now risks federal funds and will be political fodder for republican extremists running for legislative and governor offices.

Comment 028

1/7/14

Just do it! Sooner better

Thanks

Comment 029

7th/January/2014

The time for action is now. Build it before the Federal Funds are diverted to a competing city. The Southwest LRT is an environmental friendly project. It will idle thousands of cars on a daily basis. It will expedite transit throughout the metro area. Commuter trains will encourage residential development and new business and development brings a new source of revenue to the metro area. We live in a community whose main form of transportation is supplied by the internal combustion engine. We as a community need to progress into the 21st century with a state of the art transportation system and commuter trains are the answer, the solution.

Comment 049

1/7/14

"Just build it" - I agree. Want speed in transporting people over distances with buses other devices feeding people to LRT Stations.

Comment 051

1/7/14

I favor leaving the freight line as is in the Kenilworth corridor and then put the SWLRT in a shallow tunnel. I would far prefer 3-5 freight trains a day than 200 plus LRT at-grade trains. The corridor is too narrow to have LRT at-grade it would be far too disruptive to the neighborhood.



Comment 096

1.7.14

1. Thanks for the venting session but it is difficult to see how our comments will lead to something useful.
2. Just build it! Please Don't let one neighborhood stop the entire project.
3. Do reconsider an Uptown option! How about MTG & north one Hennepin

Comment 102

January 7, 2014

Dividing the facilitator speaker between 2 tables is all wrong. Each table should have their own facilitator. Having the LRT South will be a significant boost to the whole economy of the communities involved. I know the city of Mpls wants to put a trolley along Nicolett how about if it connects to the LRT uptown going west 1st, then build future connection heading east to connect to the Hiawatha on Lake Street. Making a loop. Also once the LRT south is built, no matter the route. I believe we should as a community also consider building the Boutinee's route through the North of Mpls. Golden Valley, Brooklyn Park, and Brooklyn Cente.

I look forward to more involvement in future discussion of LRT. Cordially a concerned and involved citizen

Comment 109

1/7/14

Though there was a lot of critiques about the alignment because not all stations have large population or jobs, but I applaud them to some extent because those stations can be seen as "cultural" or "nature" stops to connect the Minneapolis and Suburban populations to our west beautiful parks and lakes (Stations near Bryn Mawr, the lakes). Seems good for tourism too similar to the Minnehaha Falls stop.

Primary Topic: Water Resources – 8 Comments

Comment 032

1/7/14

An apartment building was in the news recently because it unexpectedly has needed to continue to bilge water into channel between Calhoun and Isles. Wouldn't it correlate that a much bigger tunnel project would have unexpected consequences that would negatively impact our lakes, making our lakes unusable in winter. Is water and soil evaluation being done during all 4 seasons? The LRT SHOULD **NOT** go through Kenilworth, its not too late to correct the error. Council members and Met Council are **too** invested in plowing ahead with LRT in Kenilworth. We made a mistake - let's correct the erroneous decisions.

Comment 034

1/7/14

A new bridge would make the environmental water quality better for our communities because that old bridge could be dangerous!

Comment 035

1/7/14

The Chain of Lakes are a precious asset to Mpls. The culture of the lakes area is unique and sets us apart from other cities nationally and worldwide. The last 10 years it seems as though the city cares less and less about the health of the lakes. Every year Cedar Lake looks more polluted (murky & cloudy). I don't understand why MN lawmakers and decision makers would consider any plan that could potentially affect the quality of the water and beaches. I support making the lakes accessible to more people but believe it can be done in a way that won't harm fresh water springs, lake water cleanliness, vegetation, loons, fish, ducks, etc. If the lakes are damaged or polluted people won't want to swim in them which defeats the purpose of making the lake accessible. I moved to Colorado for 7 years from Mpls. and returned because I couldn't live without the Chain of Lakes. They feed our calm and peace. Thank you!

Comment 075

1/7/14

1. WHAT ROLE OF SUPERVISION ABOUT WATER QUALITY WILL THE PCA (STATE GOVERNANCE) OR WILL THE MET COUNCIL BE RESPONSIBLE.
2. WE FEEL THAT THE WHOLE PROCESS IS A RUSH TO JUDGEMENT & IS A FINANCIAL DECISION.

Comment 076

1-7-2014

[illegible] Water Quality

At this late stage in planning process, too many basic questions remain to give in confidence in low Met Council, which seems to be reacting & citizen concerns rather than anticipating scientific questions and leading on these ideas.

Comment 079

1/7/2014

If/When water issues occur – what is the plan? water run off issues – fertilizers too, plants/animals too. If our data turns out this is not good to go this route – please choose another route (Uptown could be revisited) we want LRT now and in the future of course.

Verbal Comments: Captured verbatim from audio recording during table report out session.

Water Quality Report – Table 1

I'll just follow my notes, there is no real organization to them. But there was a lot of emotions, water, our City's water is an emotional issue. Questions were, is the shallow tunnel already a given and that perhaps the deep tunnel should not be off the table, and that we should do some water and soil evaluation of that as well? And would the deep tunnel be environmentally better or worse? Are we getting the latest technology and costs? Many of the cost estimates for the tunnels and other forms are years old and technology is always improving and is also cheaper than it was years ago. So are we getting those current cost? What are the dewatering impacts, thermally, biological, groundwater etc? There was news recently about an apartment building that needs to keep belching into the City waters and with the big study of tunnels, wouldn't there be those kind of issues that we did not foresee? We disrupt the soil, anytime you disrupt the soils there are contaminants and things that you can never expect to run into. There was, I guess there was distrust and fear, kind of a skepticism of the whole

process, afraid of polluting and losing our lakes mostly. Climate change is all about water and so it seems like most of the people at our table oppose the route completely. A bad decision seems to have been made, reroute the LRT, it seems like it is being sort of railroaded or hurried through so that we don't lose our federal funding. And it is just too risky to lose our lakes. Drilling and we don't we know the processes. Drilling a few holes along the way during one season, there are 4 very distinct seasons or maybe 8 seasons. So it is just too risky. The Kenilworth Corridor seems like, this is all interrelated to water, but this seems like a bad choice. There won't really be a lot of ridership around it, which has already been addressed. There is no room for development, a coffee shop, whatever you want to develop. Why not have the route go way from the lakes and to businesses that it could help. Someone mentioned that a Bridal Veil Creek was dredged up to relieve flooding and there were all sorts of chemicals and it killed all the fish, and there was a lot of concern expressed for wildlife on all sorts of levels. Microorganism, it would totally, we feel, disrupt our environment and we really don't trust the study. Mostly just unexpected consequences of any digging. And I don't care how many studies you do.

Water Quality Report – Table 2

I am going to stand up here, not because, well because that is where our table is. So my name is Will Schroer and number 1, our topic area, is the water resources and we had three suggestions for the water study that we hope the study will reflect. One of which comes before the water study is released and this is really, I think, our top recommendation. Is that the decision criteria should be announced before the results of the study. There was some concern expressed that if you wait to announce the decision criteria until the results of the study are known, like what will be the phosphorus level be, then the criteria will just change to be just under that what the decision criteria is. So announce that now, or asap. And then, put those decision criteria not only in the static context of where the lakes are now but what the goals for what those lakes are and the dynamic context going forward. Number 2, help the community understand ascertains of certainly or comfort to the extent possible. So we spent some time talking about the fact, echoing the gentleman, a lot of work has already been done and we are grateful for that work. Some skepticism about some of the results that have already been release and we had a discussion about that with no particular resolution. We bring it to experts, is there a way to help get the community comfortable with assertions of near certainty about likely impacts. The suggestion to the extent that we had them in terms about how the Council and contractors could help the community get to that comfort level was to provide the community with examples from elsewhere or case studies for elsewhere, where something similar kinds of constructions were made and similar situations, if that is possible, and X result happened. Contrary to that, the table wanted the Council and other decision makers to understand that some of the skepticism coming out of current experience with the condo on Knox and the ground water impacts on the challenges and the presumption that that project went through many of the same environmental reviews that this project is going through and those processes did not catch what is now a substantial problem and which has have substantial impacts to the channel. Number 3, a general process concern, and in addition to sharing that, which has already been shared, is a desire that these studies not be rushed to... be... arbitrary deadlines. Does that capture the top three? I just want to make sure I am reporting appropriately. Thank you.



Primary Topic: Town Hall Community Meeting Specific – 7 Comments

Comment 013

1-7-13

I think this format is impossible. You can't really hear any kind of discussion and it's impossible to follow any a complicated set of issues in the middle of a gym in middle of a dozen other conversations. I don't have any ideas for how this could be done better, but this way doesn't work, at least for me.

Comment 017

1 -7 - 13

Extremely hard to hear! Assumption that SWLRT is a done deal rather than a horrible plan, go back to the drawing board.

Comment 019

7 January 2014

1. Holding this meeting in a gymnasium was a bad idea from an acoustics POV. Perhaps, with there being an elementary school next door, the small groups should have been held in some of the classrooms, which are designed specifically for listening. I'm sure the school board would be willing to accommodate such a deal.

Comment 044

1-7-2013

Unable to hear, set-up was very bad. Surprised so many comments were made. Address noise and speaking availability.

Comment 055

1/7/14

Room too small for this many people couldn't hear what people at the table were saying. Tables need to be further apart – and people @ the tables need to talk louder.

Comment 088

7 Jan 2014

It is impossible to hear what is being said in this Large room. In future; there should be 6 separate rooms for the 6 topics. Too much noise!

Comment 098

1/7/13

Train your facilitators better. We wasted the first 20 minutes bickering about protocol and letting an extremist [illegible] on a soap box speak for 5. This wasn't really a discussion, at least not for the first significant chunk. To be fair, this did improve throughout at least. A bit too much interplay from the facilitator.



Primary Topic: Other – 6 Comments

Comment 021

1/7/14

A parking ramp is needed by the Lake Street Station.

Comment 039

I am concerned about the removal of the 21st St Station. Without it Kenwood and much of Mpls (Lowry Hill, Isle, etc) will become more of a suburb than the suburbs. To have a train and access to a train is a vital piece of city livings. It improves connectedness, air quality and community.

Comment 068

07Jan14

The [illegible] which has brought us to this point is myopic goal and poor due diligence. As a result the options on the table are all poor and the go-forward decision(s) will be a compromise of “poor” solutions.

I get the need for big projects, however instinate suggest decisions have been made, and the costs to move forward, outside the construction costs will be buried.

All to say...poor leadership from many angles.

Comment 069

07Jan14

The statement made by the Met Chair along the lines of “SWLRT is important to the region.” is indicative of the reality that decision have been made regardless of how unpopular this appears to be

In addition an independent consulting agency with no political reference (e.g. Wellstone) should have been chosen

In summary, the chair’d statement and the consulting agency show a bias.

Regarding Costs: [illegible] suggest the costs associated with paying for a consulting agency and pending litigation will be buried or not reported as part of the overall SWLRT costs

Comment 074

1/7/14

Reverse commuters > going to suburbs for jobs. How do these commuters get to their jobs once they get to their station? Is the Transportation infrastructure built to accommodate these reverse commuters?

Verbal Comments: Captured verbatim from audio recording during table report out session.

Other Report

My name is Steve Smith. The other table, where people that just kind of wondered in and didn’t know where to fit in here. One of the main components of the folks that were discussing here is the distrust and the poor leadership during this entire process. From the voting on the stadium that we didn’t get to vote on, the people of Minneapolis didn’t get to vote on this as well. There is distrust of the Fed, State, the Hennepin County, the City of Minneapolis and the Met Council and that kind of flowed through all of our discussions. They thought both buses coming out were more effective than a light rail and a couple

times, a couple folks said, this is not a light rail project this is a commuter project, much like Northstar. It is bringing in Eden Prairie folks into Minneapolis with no benefit to Minneapolis. Eden Prairie and a few of the other suburbs out there have the Southwest Transit. They have those new buses with their Wi-Fi. They get to the Twin Cities in 20 minutes with no stops. Why would they want to take a light rail and stop a number of times and take 40 minutes? That does not make any sense. You are cannibalizing the existing structure that is already there. The cost effectiveness of, you know, the 1.6, you know, million..trillion...how much does this cost? Billion dollars, getting my numbers mixed up. Along with all the national debt that doesn't have the money, so they are just borrowing from future generations of this. All of Twin Cities will be taxed for a few ridership. Minneapolis is bearing more of the burden and less of the benefit for this entire project. They have a number of limited stops. They can't use it. Why are the Minneapolis trees and water valued less than Eden Prairie's. That was a question that was brought up a number of times. The concern was to promote suburban sprawl, which is the opposite of what is happening. People are moving back to Downtown, back to urban areas. This is going to contribute to suburban sprawl. The freight issues again, the involvement of the Federal Government has kind of already been said and the alignment and ridership. This is the only project going through a neighborhood. All the other projects have gone through industrial or all the other projects that could be re-gentrified. This is going through an existing neighborhood with no prospect of that. The folks in Eden Prairie aren't going to spend 1.5 hours riding the light rail to Minneapolis then all the way to the airport, they are still going to jump in their cars and drive 20 minutes to the airport. So this again this is just a commuter line with no benefit to Minneapolis what so ever.

Primary Topic: Environmental Impact Statement – 5 Comments

Comment 037

1/7/14

Too many activities in nearby corridor! Even with shallow tunnel it does not solve the problem over the channel. All activities (trails, freight & LRT) additional space will need to be used, thus closer to homes.

Comment 057

1-7-14

REMOVE TREES AND THE NOISE VOLUME INCREASES, EITHER SET OF TRACKS – IF FREIGHT MOVES EAST – RUNS BETWEEN BROWNIE & CEDAR LK-WEST, THAT TRAIN NOISE WILL ALSO IMPACT NEIGHBORHOOD ON WEST SIDE OF CEDAR/ LOTS OF ANIMALS LIVE IN THE WOODS SURROUNDING THE TRAIL. HOW WILL THIS IMPACT THE CRITTERS?
LRT BELONGS WHERE RIDERS WOULD USE IT!

Comment 062

1/7/14

Issue #1

The combination of train & light rail noise & airplane noise created by the FAA's proposed flyways will create hugely increased noise in our neighborhood. This will completely change volume levels, lower property values & drive people (residents) out.

Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting
Categorized Comments
January 7, 2014



Issue #2 – Location of this line will promote urban sprawl beyond Eden Prairie without providing transportation in populated areas where its needed.

Comment 085

1/7/14

Concerned about (deep or shallow) tunnels, underground Dangerous vibratious for buildings. houses, condos/ and people. (e.g like fracking & mild earth quake like earth moving & noises) How about the property, property values loosing and who will Repay this home & Condo owner.

Comment 091

01/07/2014

Question/Comment

Have peak oil (so called cheap energy) & climate change issues been factored into this “ridership & route” discussion? if “yes” great!! if “no” why not??