

All comments are recorded verbatim from 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 these comments

001

LRT Tunnel Table

1.6.2013

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 Wagenius also.

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.

003

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

004

Freight Metrics

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

005

1/7/13

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

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

007

1/7/14

Please choose the shallow tunnel option!

008

1/7/14

We have to go with the shallow tunnel!

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.

010

Water Resources

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

Destruction of channel, water quality.

Vegetation, Greenscape, Trails

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

Destruction of channel, water quality.

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

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

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

Preservation of Kennilworth trail.

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?*

See above answer

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

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

Light Rail Transit-Tunnels

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

Removal of trees, change to aesthetics.

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?
Yes some concern, water, clarity, preservation of unique channel.

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

Other

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

015

1/7/14

Start Over!

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

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.

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).

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.

018

January 7, 2014

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

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.

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!

021

1/7/14

A parking ramp is needed by the Lake Street Station.

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.

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!

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.

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?

026

1/7/2014

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

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.

028

1/7/14

Just do ti! Sooner better
Thanks

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.

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.

031

7th/Jan/14

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

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.

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

034

1/7/14

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

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!

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

042

1 – 7 – 2014

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

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.

044

1-7-2013

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

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 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

053

1/7/2014

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

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.

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.

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.

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!

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.

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

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.

061

1-7-14

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

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.

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

063

1/7/14

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

064

1/7/14

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

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.

065

1-7-13

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

066

1/7/14

No Light Rail (Streetcars)

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.

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.

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

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.

070

1-7-14 (Kenwood)

HOW WILL THE BIKE & PED TRAILS BE LOCATED DURING CONSTUCTION

071

1-7-14

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

072

1-7-14

Freight tankers and LRT can not coexist in this corridor.

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'.

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?

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.

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.

077

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

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

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

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

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

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?

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

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.

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.

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).

081

1.7.13

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

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

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.

083

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

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

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?

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

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.

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.

086

Incremental increase do to alignment

SLP – School Board – CAC And LRT, concern school

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

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?

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!

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 berm: 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

Alt Routes

Look farther west than SLP

Consider trench in SLP

Consider double track at BNSF
Station Access
TOD
Metrics

090

1. *What was your topic area?* 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

2. *What (if anything) did your table discuss that should inform the report on water quality and levels?*
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 100 yr old project) -> covered bridge over channel -> preserve trails -> How do you grow a tree over the tunnel

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

4. *What (if anything) did your table discuss that addressed vegetation, greenscaping and trails?*
burden -> preserv. corridor -> 200 trains destroy corridor -> cost difference between deep tunnel & shallow tunnel? -> Impact tunnel to Calhoun ([illegible] tower -> vibration from trains ->

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.*

bivration 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

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??

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.

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 it is (which seems tolerable).

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 - !!!

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?

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

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!

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.

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.

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.

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 Volbeurg & 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!

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

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.

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.

105

1/7/13

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

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.

107

1/7/13

1. Safety: LRT and freight should be separate due to accidents at Bacmanitique, 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.

108

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

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.

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?
 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?
How much vegetation damage if deep tunnel is considered?
 19. 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?
 20. How will water quality be assured during flooding?
 21. How will safety be assured when Flammable freight trains already run in this very narrow residential right-of-way?
 22. 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?
 23. 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?
 24. 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?
 25. 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?
 26. How do the development opportunities along the Kenilworth Corridor compare with the development opportunities along a South Minneapolis route?
 27. 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?
 28. 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?
 29. 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?
-
11. As many people as possible involved in the grade level design.
 12. What will revegetation look like? Natural or of mostly designed
 13. Not enough space left to revegetate
 14. What will be needed – to better visualize –
 15. How in de is track
 16. How can a decision be made w/o a rendering that accurately portrays the look and feel of the trail
 17. Lighting on trail
 18. Why isn't it serving greater density (population) in Minneapolis?
 19. Width of corridor sufficient?
 20. Existing brige historie structure –

21. 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

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.

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 collocating 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