

*Comments were typed verbatim from an audio recording of the community comment and question section of the agenda.*

**Panel:**

- Metropolitan Council Chair Sue Haigh
- Metropolitan Council Member Gary Cunningham
- Metropolitan Council Member Adam Duininck
- Metropolitan Council Member Jennifer Munt
- Della Young, Environmental Consultant, Burns & McDonnell
- Jim Terry, Freight Rail Consultant, TranSystems
- Jim Alexander, Director of Design and Engineering, Southwest LRT Project Office
- Mark Fuhrmann, Project Director, Southwest Project Office
- Ann Wiesner, Principle, Grassroots Solutions

**Verbal Comment 01**

Commenter: With the light rail running so close to those tunnels, what's going to be the impact as far as vibrations, as far as leakage, as far as how they're going to stand up to those vibrations?

Jim Alexander: That is something we will be looking at as we do the structural design for the tunnels that will carry the LRT. So everybody understands the configuration through the Kenilworth Corridor under that proposed plan, the freight rail would be located at-grade essentially pretty much where it is located today, I'm talking about the piece south of Cedar Lake Parkway. Then there would be a tunnel for the two LRT tracks right adjacent to that to the east and right on top of that the trail. So we will have to design that tunnel to accommodate the vibration from the freight that runs through there as well as the LRT.

**Verbal Comment 02**

Commenter: My question is, where there actual borings done to see what the water levels are in between the chain of lakes, the two lakes, at the time? It doesn't sound like there was any actual drilling or borings to see what current water levels are, is that part of your analysis?

Della Young: There were water level information provided as part of the report and we do have that in the draft report.

Jim Alexander: Yes I can answer that, we've actually put in thirteen of those piezometers that have been spoken of along the linear length of the route through the Kenilworth Corridor. We've also done, I believe its forty-six, explorations in that area essentially between Penn Station and West Lake. And based on the recommendations that Burns & McDonnell's are making, calling for maybe some additional of those piezometers going crosswise, east to west if you will, we will be doing that as well. I would just say we have a very good handle on the soil and ground water conditions through there. Let me just also add that we would pursue a monitoring plan through design as well as through construction and into operations so we understand, have a baseline for where that ground water is and be able to monitor that during construction and also monitor it during operations.

**Verbal Comment 03**

Commenter: You said that in your analysis you identified no fatal flaws, there's a lot of degrees shy of fatal. Do you categorize the flaws you did identify as minor, inconsequential, medium?

Della Young: They were minor, inconsequential.

**Verbal Comment 04**

Commenter: This is maybe less to do with the water but could the tunnel be built, this is an engineering question, could the tunnel be built continuously across the, enclosed continuously across the lakes so it doesn't have to come out? You know right between where it comes out and where it goes, could it be enclosed the whole time?

Jim Alexander: Yes, I believe what is being spoken of is between Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles, there is a water channel and we formerly had a proposal for a deep bore tunnel which essentially would have done just that. Starting at West Lake going all the way up to approximately to where the shallow tunnels end, about one thousand feet north of 21<sup>st</sup> Street and would have gone under that water channel as well. That was one of the proposals put forward back in September, I believe, the Corridor Management Committee had indicated that we should no longer pursue that primarily due to cost.

**Verbal Comment 05**

Commenter: Hi, thank you, can you describe those infiltration chambers a bit more in detail?

Della Young: Yes, the infiltration chambers that are being proposed are, they are underground, for a lack of a better term, boxes that water would be able to go in and there is sand and media where the water would be able to go through it and go into ground water.

Commenter: So the ground water level is below that?

Della Young: Correct.

Commenter: Does the bottom of the tunnel, grade of the bottom, ever breach the ground water level?

Della Young: It does.

Commenter: But you said you're not doing dewatering in the tunnels.

Della Young: Right, the way the design is set up is that they are going to be putting these cells in place. There is going to be this sheet pile wall and then there's going to be the bottom and its going to keep the groundwater out. And out of the chambers, let me rephrase, not the chambers but the cells, they're going to take the water out and continue building the cells that way, but there's not going to be any more water coming in there. For the infiltration chambers, as we understand it, that is going to be closer to the ground so that water that comes in will have to be pumped into the infiltration chambers to be able to filter through and get down to groundwater. So there is a separation as proposed.

Commenter: And where are those pumps? Like at what elevation? I'm confused.

Jim Alexander: Perhaps I might intervene. We have not gotten that far in the design but we would intend to locate those infiltration chambers close to the portals, there are four under this proposed design, so they would be located near there. And I think just for a little more clarification, the design

that is being proposed is intended to really block out all groundwater, but anything you put down into the ground there is always going to be, expected, some kind of seepage and that's the analysis we had done and the analysis that Burns & McDonnell had taken a look at, what we had done to verify. Our assumptions are valid in terms of seepage. Water may end up getting into the tunnel and so these infiltration chambers are designed to catch any ground water that might get through the first line of defense, that sheet pile wall, before it gets into the tunnel, we could transport it back into the ground so there isn't that delta in the water level, overall water levels out in the Kenilworth Corridor. Hopefully that helps explain it, our design on the chambers will come forward if we do end up with the shallow LRT tunnel as part of the project. As part of our engineering analysis, we would define where the chambers are going to go and that would be part of our design.

Commenter: Thank you for that clarification. Then my question would be then how do you deal with the separation you achieve there in water level between say Lake of the Isles and Cedar Lake, which is what that tunnel will separate, right those two lakes, doesn't that create a separation of the connectivity of those water levels, doesn't it exist does it not?

Jim Alexander: Well its, essentially what this would involve is a tunnel that is about twenty-four feet down below the ground surface. The groundwater we believe is about a third up from the bottom of that. And so this is an area where its primarily sandy material and as Burns & McDonnell validated, at least in my interpretations of their report and what Della's been reporting and our belief as well, is we've done all these borings to understand the groundwater and soil conditions. Groundwater will freely flow underneath that tunnel and go to the other side if it does transport that way. So it really came to the question that was raised, is there going to be any flooding or any damming of people's basements for example, and we believe there will not be. And I believe the Burns & McDonnell report did validate that premise.

Della Young: Correct.

#### **Verbal Comment 06**

Commenter: Sarai Brenner from Minneapolis, and I'm just wondering if you can guarantee that the lakes will not get more polluted because of these tunnels and can you guarantee that the water will not go into people's basements because of these tunnels? Can you guarantee that?

Jim Alexander: Well I'm going to be reluctant to guarantee that but I will say that the chances of flooding anyone's basements is practically non-existent and the chance of transporting any contaminants into the ground water or the lakes is practically non-existent as well.

#### **Verbal Comment 07**

Commenter: Actually I have a question about, did Minneapolis do a water study before they allowed Knox and Lake to dump 240,000 gallons of water a day into the lagoon? I mean our lakes are precious and I understand people's concern, all over our metro area we have great lakes but we're talking kind of a different situation here and that Minneapolis allowed and still allows a huge amount of untreated water to be dumped into the lagoon.

Jim Alexander: Well, I can't really speak for the city. Are you referring to the 1800 Lake Street? Just so ever body is aware, it's been put out, there is a condominium or apartment complex about, just northeast of Lake Calhoun that has recently been constructed and the construction goes down deep into the groundwater level. And what is currently occurring right now is there is a discharge of about 180

gallons per minute. That has to go somewhere so they're transporting it over into Lake Calhoun. It was raised as an issue earlier last year when it was being discharged into a lagoon just between Lake of the Isles and Lake Calhoun and it was melting the ice. And so that was one of the concerns the City came to us because they don't want that to happen again. I can't really speak for that project and what the City had done or not done but because of that project there is kind of a heightened awareness of, we need to be walking carefully, as we look at any designs that may go down into the groundwater and how we deal with that.

**Verbal Comment 08**

Commenter: I have a curiosity about the pumping system, if the pumping system will be able to accommodate flash flooding conditions like a six inch rain fall or something or would that shut down the drain system in the tunnel?

Jim Alexander: Well in terms of the flash flooding, we're talking such low values that we don't anticipate that being an issue in terms of flooding the trains but we will have certain redundancies in the design to accommodate that because we don't want our trains to be in water as well. Water and electricity doesn't mix very well and we'd soon to keep those dry and keep our customers moving.

**Verbal Comment 09**

Commenter: Hi, where are the costs for maintaining this or fixing it if something breaks, how are the dollar amounts figured into ongoing budgeting overall?

Jim Alexander: I will start with that and maybe Mark wants to chime in. But as we develop this project or any project, we develop operations and maintenance program and an understanding of how much cost we have, so as we develop the design we have to anticipate what those costs are going to be to run those pumps, run the lights, run the electricity, so that will be factored in to our overall project as we move this project forward.

Mark Fuhrmann: I would just add to what Jim said that we have the Blue Line and we've had that in service a little over nine years. So we have experience maintaining a tunnel, the two tunnels underneath the airport. So we know what it takes to maintain those tunnels and certainly serve the track and clean those tunnels out. So we can apply those costs and we have for our operational costs forecast if tunnels were to occur here for the Kenilworth shallow tunnels.

**Verbal Comment 10**

Commenter: Just a quick question regarding the 1800, how much of the data was used for your study as far as the hydro, 'cause I know there was quite a bit of study for 1800 before it was done?

Della Young: Correct, as we looked at this project we reviewed the information that's out there by Barr Engineering Company and looked at their data to see.

Commenter: Actually it was Braun.

Della Young: If that was applicable in this situation, but we did review the data report that's out.

Commenter: Ok, so as far as the flow rates, the anticipated flow rates, cause you mention 1800, I know for a fact it was peaking at 400 this summer from 1800 so how does that affect as far as the tunnel and have you guys thought about re-injection wells?

Jim Alexander: I'm not sure if I really fully heard the question, can you repeat that?

Commenter: As far as the maximum flow rates that were recovered out of 1800, they were, sometimes they reach 300 – 350 gallons a minute, which is quite a bit for a re-infiltration cell, have you guys thought about re-injection wells instead of cells?

Jim Alexander: I'm not sure what you mean by injection wells in this case but would just say that the amount of discharge we would anticipate both between the sheet piles and the tunnel itself and within the tunnel is on the order of fifteen gallons per minute or less that we would anticipate. Injection wells, I'm not really sure, following what your question is on that, you might have to clarify that.

Commenter: Often, as for dewatering you can re-inject back into groundwater, as far as having a re-injection well. That was one of the options discussed with 1800, I'm not sure where it went or not. So just kind of re-circulate it back in the groundwater.

Jim Alexander: Right, well that's what we intend to do with the infiltration chambers that, during construction, Della had shown the cells, we would take, we would be removing the water inside those cells and discharging that with appropriate measures during construction. But once we are all said and done, any ground water that comes through those sheet piles that will remain in place and the concrete tunnel that would essentially be re-entered into the ground through those infiltration chambers so we are not taking that out of the system. Any water that goes inside the tunnel, we're required to dispose of that through a sanitary sewer, but again those rates are very, very low.

#### **Verbal Comment 11**

Commenter: I think my question was misunderstood or I didn't state it clearly enough, I know you will be coming up with a number for what it's going to cost to maintain the tunnels or fix repairs as they're needed, that you'll do that. But I'm wondering, is that going to be a separate number that's going to be looked at when comparing all the numbers for everything that's being considered here, is that going to be a stand-alone number that you know, here's how much it's going to cost to dig the tunnels and here's how much it's going to cost on an annual basis or whatever to maintain them that, a number that would not be present if the tunnels were not built, that's what I'm curious about and if you have a general ballpark idea given your experience with the tunnels at the airport what that number might be?

Mark Fuhrmann: Our focus to date has been on the capital construction cost for the assorted options. To your specific question about operating and maintaining tracks and tunnels, what we have found with the Hiawatha Blue Line tunnels is that the cost to maintain the track in the tunnels is very similar to maintaining the track at-grade. The real only change element for the tunnels is to have the pumps, when they do need to be activated in the event of a heavy rain squall and so they're not operating all the time, and annualized it's a very modest incremental cost for tunnel maintenance.

#### **Verbal Comment 12**

Commenter: Good evening everybody. Hello everybody. How are you? Thank you for coming this evening. I am Jeff Jacobs and I'm the Mayor of St. Louis Park and I want to thank you all and welcome you to our community and thank you for coming Chair Haigh and members of the Met Council and Jim Alexander and Mark Fuhrmann, it's great to have you here. Most importantly, I'd like to thank you for listening to the facts here this evening. You can tell, those of you who know me in St. Louis Park, I have a script this evening which believe me is a good thing. So I'll say that but I wanted you to know something

very important this evening. Generally in St. Louis Park when council members speak we speak for ourselves, we talk about we our one of seven. Tonight ladies and gentlemen I want you to know this is from all of us, this is unanimous.

I stand here before you tonight not just as a longtime mayor and resident of St. Louis Park, but as a representative of a unified St. Louis Park City Council that strongly believes that Southwest light rail will be a significant asset to the entire region. We have been consistent in our long-standing position that we will not support re-routing freight rail in our community if other viable options exist. And we repeat that tonight and there obviously are.

The Council is united in its belief that a decision on a freight rail route must be decided on the facts which have emerged over many, many months of study, discussions and deliberations.

I have my script so here it goes.

The TranSystems plan for rerouting trains in St. Louis Park is not materially different from the plans that have already been rejected.

It also fails to include an effective or accurate cost comparison between its suggested route and the previously identified routes. For example, the TranSystems cost estimate does not include:

- the cost of property acquisition or relocating residents, businesses or the community's emergency assistance program and food shelf called STEP, they spent 35 years trying to find a home for themselves now you'd relocate them;
- it does not include additional costs for construction on the former National Lead superfund site or costs of mitigation for lost wetland or the many other mitigation needs previously identified;
- it does not include any costs for the so-called "clipping" of the Xcel Energy substation which is right on highway 7.

But even though we don't know yet what the cost of the TranSystems plan would be, we do know that there are at least five viable combined LRT and freight rail options in the Kenilworth corridor. In fact, TranSystems has acknowledged that routing freight rail in the Kenilworth Corridor is viable. Tonight we heard that.

So let us be very clear about the two freight rail options before you, and what it would take to undertake the at-grade LRT and TranSystems St. Louis Park plan as compared to the Kenilworth freight rail and LRT options:

The TranSystems St. Louis Park plan requires taking homes and businesses. The Kenilworth option recommended by the Corridor Management Committee does not.

The TranSystems plan requires over 3,000 feet of new freight bridges. The Kenilworth options do not.

The TranSystems plan requires lowering a state highway by three to four feet. The Kenilworth options does not.

The TranSystems plan requires the construction of 4,500 feet of retaining walls. The at-grade Kenilworth options do not.

The TranSystems plan would require closure of important local streets and rerouting traffic circuitously around schools and within neighborhoods. The Kenilworth options do not.

The TranSystems plan would require raising the elevation of the tracks, which in some places will be over 20 feet above adjacent single-family yards. The at-grade Kenilworth options do not.

The TranSystems plan would require elevated trains to “clip” a major Xcel substation site. The Kenilworth options do not.

And the TranSystems plan has trains that will pass close enough to a high school to disrupt learning and create safety issues each time they pass. The Kenilworth options do not.

There is an option that has already been proven as viable as recommended by Met Council staff and endorsed by the Corridor Management Committee by a nearly unanimous vote of fifteen to one: freight rail continuing to exist at-grade and the use of shallow tunnels for LRT in the Kenilworth corridor.

The Met Council has indicated its goal is not to select the cheapest route to accommodate freight and light rail, but to select the best overall route. This shallow tunnel option is not the least expensive option, but we believe the shallow tunnel option meets this goal. We also believe this option is fair to both Minneapolis and St. Louis Park.

Under that plan:

- Park would continue to have freight traffic just like it does today and experience light rail traffic at grade through the community too.
- The Kenilworth corridor would continue to have freight traffic just like it does today. And light rail trains would travel through the Kenilworth Corridor too, but they would be almost entirely hidden underground instead of travelling past homes and valued green space.

The shallow tunnel plan has been on the table for months. It’s undergone intense scrutiny and it has enjoyed strong support from corridor leaders. It is a sound solution selected through a transparent and thorough process. And I do want to thank Chair Haigh for running that process, that was difficult, you had to bear, you bore a lot of slings and arrows of outrageous fortune doing it and I admire that.

If that process can’t be respected and a reroute through the core of St. Louis Park is back on the table, then all of the less costly Kenilworth options need to be back on the table too, including freight and light rail both at grade.

All of these facts make clear that there is a fair, viable option for locating both freight and light rail in the Kenilworth Corridor. If instead those facts are ignored and the rerouting of trains in St. Louis Park is viewed as the chosen option, it will be difficult, shall we say for the St. Louis Park City Council to see a path forward to municipal consent. And by difficult, I mean the level of difficulty you might have by playing the Hungarian Rhapsody on the piano with a broken hand.

In closing, let me say once again how much we do appreciate and we do, for you taking time coming down here this evening and listening to our community. We look forward to working with the Metropolitan Council to bring the SWLRT project to completion.

So once again I want to thank Chair Haigh, the members of the Met Council, Mark Fuhrmann and Jim Alexander for coming here tonight, we really thank you for this. Thank you. We know you'll do the right thing. Thank you much.

**Verbal Comment 13**

Commenter: Thank you, I have a three part question, first has the Twin Cities & Western provided their assessment of the TranSystems' plan, their official assessment? Secondly, if the Twin Cities & Western rejects the TranSystems' plan concept what's the Met Council's next moves, specifically would they consider going to the Surface Transportation Board asking for adverse abandonment of the Kenilworth Corridor? Third, if the Twin Cities & Western conceptually agrees in concept with the TranSystems' plan how long would it take to complete the necessary detailed engineering for the Twin Cities & Western to officially sign off, would it allow you to still meet the end of March decision period for making the reroute decision for the Met Council, thank you?

Jim Terry: Let me start with answering as much of that as I can.

Chair Haigh: Jim, those are my questions to answer and I'll try and do that. As to your first question, no we have not received any formal correspondence from TC&W on their response to it and we hope to get that soon, I think they're working on that. Second, I think your second question was if we get a response from them and they say they accept this, what would it take for us to re-engineer that, how long would that take. I'm going to ask Mark to respond to the time length question on that.

Mark Fuhrmann: Thank you Madame Chair, we would say that this plan as brought forward by TranSystems here really is, say Jim, three-four-five percent developed.

Jim Terry: Something less than ten, I will agree with that.

Mark Fuhrmann: And so it would take a number of months to further define and develop a more detailed design plan of the TranSystems' concept. I would guess certainly three months or so. We would have to engage all of our partners including St. Louis Park and the freight railroads through that process.

Jim Terry: That would be optimistic. Again, need the hard survey, work it all together, I would lean a little bit more towards four or five months Mark. Making it happen somewhere in that area.

Ann Wiesner: So I think the third part of that question was related to the decision making process and how those two things match up.

Chair Haigh: So I think your question had to do with what role the Met Council play with respect to the STB process if it was necessary to go to the STB for the abandonment. We are looking at that process right now, we are consulting with experts we have hired who work with the STB in Washington DC and we really haven't come to a final conclusion on that. But we'll be working with Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and St. Louis Park to better understand that.

**Verbal Comment 14**

Commenter: Hi, I'm a resident of the Brunswick, the Bronx neighborhood in St. Louis Park, my property actually backs right up onto the tracks. And on slide forty-one it talks about how the route must not unduly impact the community and I'm here to tell you I'm impacted now. And I've lived in the



neighborhood for eight years now, I really wasn't aware of all the on-goings with the train at the time I bought my home, it went by twice a day at nine in the morning and one in the afternoon and after many years it started coming by in the evenings at five or six and in the last several years it comes by anywhere between 10:30 and 11:30 at night with more frequency now on the weekends. They woke me up out of a dead sleep at 12:30 in the morning a few nights ago, which is the latest they've come by. You know so I'm already impacted, my house vibrates every time the train goes by. I can only imagine what it's going to be like with longer, faster, more frequent trains. There is things you guys don't hear about and if it weren't for Safety in the Park, I wouldn't have really even known about this issue. You know my neighbors homes won't sell, one of my neighbors' dog was hit and killed by the train a couple of months ago. You know where is, you talk about impact to the community, where is the outreach trying to find out this information other than these meetings because I hear a lot of the same things but not the full impact to the community and how all the changes to the freight reroute would happen. So, what's going to happen, I'm not going to be able to sell my home if, in a few years, the situation is changed with the freight train.

Jim Terry: Alright, let me try to address your question, taking it one at a time as best I can. I'm sorry that when you bought your house you didn't know, or say there's probably some real estate agents in the room who may not have told you that the track was back there. In addition the frequency of the trains, let me be the first to tell you right now, CP runs basically the schedule you're talking about, it's kind of whenever the business is and again there is not going to be a lot of regularity, so.

Ann Wiesner: So Jim, I just want to see if we can condense this question into, it sounds to me like you're asking when you talk about impact on the community, exactly what elements are you talking about when you define impacts on the community. I think it would be helpful, does that seem accurate to you? I just want to make sure we're staying tight here, so can you just tell us specifically when you talk about impact on the community what were the elements that you looked at?

Jim Terry: One of the things that we wanted to look at and the way we did it was we literally took the railroad and went 150 feet on either side of the existing railroad. There were about 140 homes that were on either side of the railway and we said those are going to be affected as far as the community is concerned. I'm sorry about the fact that you bought by the railroad if you didn't know the railroad was there. What we're trying to do, engineering wise, is basically take the track and level it out, put continuous welded rail back there, eliminate the need for blowing at 28<sup>th</sup> Street and 29<sup>th</sup> Street, the crossings by putting in that underpass in at 27<sup>th</sup> Street. So we are trying to mitigate some of the issues but yes you are right there will be more trains coming through there. There could be more even if we don't do this, you do understand that, ok.

#### **Verbal Comment 15**

Commenter: I just wanted to support the woman that just spoke. I do not live on the edge of the railroad tracks. I believe she lives on the west side of Highway 100, I live on the east side of Highway 100 and I too have been impacted on a regular, every single week, basis, not being able, being woken from sleep multiple times a night when the train comes through between 10:30 and 12:30 in the morning. This is a working community, we have a hospital in the area, a lot of people are healthcare employees and you don't want those people who are attending to you when you are ill in the hospital to have lack of sleep. So I would like you to always be considering the people that are maybe not at the tracks but also a distance from the tracks that are being impacted and woken up on a regular basis. This is not a new, this is not an existing frequency of trains that have been coming through there, this has changed in the last six months to a year. When I bought my house on this west side of Highway 100, I would hear

the whistle blowing at a nice convenient maybe 6 PM hour and thought isn't that quant. I don't mind listening to a train blow but when it's waking me up between 10:30 and 12:30 at night and I've got to be working as a nurse the next day that's going to impact the community.

Jim Terry: Let me answer her real quickly.

Ann Wiesner: I think people want to keep moving unless there is a specific question.

[Inaudible speaking]

**Verbal Comment 16**

Commenter: I live on the railroad but my question is actually related to the high school and the learning environment of our high school. And so I'm just curious, this just came on, I'm just curious with the frequency of trains and the length of the trains, the timing, how long would it take I guess for each train to cross within seventy feet of our high school and how many times a day would that happen within the school day? So how many minutes out of their school day are they affected by noise and vibration? Thank you.

Jim Alexander: Well I'm not going to have that calculation on how long, the longest train as we understand from Twin Cities & Western and what they run, they have a 113 car train. And as I understand the design concept would be 25 mile per hour, I frankly cannot do, I'm not going to be able to do the math right today, maybe Jim may have access in his head about how long that would take.

Jim Terry: Five to seven minutes.

[inaudible]

Jim Terry: Correct.

[inaudible]

Jim Terry: Right now there are two and the Twin Cities & Western runs about five a day, so that would be a total of seven. And they do run anytime.

Jim Alexander: Maybe I could speak to that, as we presented this issue last year, we talked about the Twin Cities & Western frequency and based on the information they had provided. They essentially have two trains per day that they run on their own and that's seven days a week and that's morning and night, going to St. Paul and coming back. Then on average, on average there's between five and six of these unit trains that go through at anytime of the day. So on average there is currently about twenty trains per week but we've been advised by TC&W as well as the other railroads that could be subject to change, but that was what we reported last year. If that helps.

**Verbal Comment 17**

Commenter: Thank you. Good evening, my name's Lynn Carper. I live in the northeastern part of the city adjacent to the Burlington Northern tracks. Mister Terry, I would like to address safety issues and I have a couple of questions around them. First of all, are you familiar with the most recent article in the magazine called Trains that came out in March that discusses both oil trains and the safety of tank cars?

Jim Terry: Not specifically that particular article.

Commenter: Well essentially what the article is saying is the AAR, the Association of American Railroads, feels that the current tank cars are deficient and they're proposing new standards for them so that when they do come off the rails they do not rupture, they do not leak, and they do not explode as easily as they do now. Each one of these tank cars that we are looking at has 25,000 gallons of ethanol in that which is equivalent to about the same capacity of about 2,000 automobiles. Each of these tank cars weigh approximately a quarter-million pounds. What we're looking at in the northern area is the establishment of an additional siding that comes off of the MN&S, you're familiar with that correct?

Jim Terry: That's correct.

Commenter: Did you account for the cost of that in your cost projections?

Jim Terry: Yes sir, I did.

Commenter: Now you are also familiar with the accident that occurred in Casselton, North Dakota at the end of December where a multiple cars of a tank train were struck by a passing BNSF train, where one of those cars came off and collided with a car that was parked at the siding. The point I'm going to be making is that you are going to be creating exactly the same circumstances for the BNSF with a new siding there with high speed trains passing parked oil trains there. If you lived within a hundred feet of this situation and knowing that at Casselton they evacuated a five mile radius, what would you want done to protect your home adjacent to these tracks?

Jim Terry: Well, I'm one of the guys that live within a hundred feet of an active railroad. I live within a hundred feet of Union Pacific's Sadiyah [SP] sub-division, thirty-five trains a day operate on it, so I would want the same safety issues handled, completed, that I've got on the track that runs by my house and that's some of the things I've suggested on the slide.

Commenter: I didn't see anything that was suggested for that type of a passing siding and I'm sure that your train existed before you moved in, this is something new that's coming to our neighborhood and we have an opportunity to provide the proper mitigation that you would feel safe with if you could have the ideal mitigation, I want to hear what that might be?

Jim Terry: To answer your question, you are correct, that was a double tracked railroad when I purchased the property a few years ago. It was not something that was added on, you are correct.

Commenter: So you still cannot state that there should be any additional mitigation that you feel would be appropriate there when you build a new situation that might be hazardous?

Jim Terry: Well I haven't, I don't know what mitigation that they're going to use specifically on that siding. I put a cost in there to represent that siding but as far as looking at the specifics on it I did not do that. I'll be glad to do that.

Commenter: So mitigation is not part of what you provide in your estimate?

Jim Terry: I don't believe, the definition of mitigation we won't go there, but I don't know it was in that ten million dollar figure. I just haven't broken that down enough to give you a good answer on that. Jim, do you know what was involved in that ten million dollar estimate?

Jim Alexander: Well Jim, I don't know if I can speak for your estimate.

Jim Terry: That was, I took that from another estimate that was already published in a study.

Commenter: To move down the tracks a bit, but still a safety issue, down the tracks to the high school area and now we're going to talk about the concept of grade reverse curves and the stringing propensity of a train wanting to straighten itself off on curves and on high grades. How thoroughly did you look at that and how concerned might you be that these deficient tank cars could come off the track adjacent to the schools and now we're looking at the situation very similar to the one at Lac [moderator interrupts].

Ann Wiesner: Sir, I'm going to ask you to wrap up.

Commenter: In Canada, where forty seven people died when a train came off adjacent to where they were.

Jim Terry: Alright, to try to answer your questions, we looked intensely at the grades, in fact that was the focus of our project, one of the main focuses. We were able to reduce the grades down to about half of what had been shown in a majority of these projects and got them down to very comfortable grades for a freight railroad. We were also able to lengthen the tangent, the straight track for a lack of a word to describe it, between the curves and reduce the length of the curves so that we were able to reduce the effort that you are trying to describe and we engineered it well beyond the AREMA standards through that area.

#### **Verbal Comment 18**

Commenter: Thank you. Thom Miller from Safety in the Park, and I just wanted to make one thing clear because there has already been a couple questions about TC&W. For those of you who don't know, at the CMC, the Corridor Management Committee meeting the president of TC&W has preliminarily rejected this plan, calling it unsafe because of the S-curves and the grade changes. So I just think that's something everybody should know at the beginning of this Q&A section. But my question is for Mr. Terry, Mr. Terry the 112 million dollar estimate that you've placed on the MN&S North plan, does that include the southern arm as well the arm that goes on to the MN&S south?

Jim Terry: Yes it does.

Commenter: Ok, so 112 million dollars is what TranSystems has estimated at this point for both of those sections of the track. The Met Council came up with an estimate of about 200 million dollars for the Brunswick Central Plan, which is the plan we all know which had the berms. The only difference between the two estimates or the two track plans is the berm that goes through or was planned to go through the Spanish Immersion Elementary School. So I have a hard time understanding when the Met Council started with 200 million dollars for the MN&S north then they added another 30 million to put on the MN&S south, the southern arm, we now have a total of 230 million, a huge gap between that and the 112 million dollars that TranSystems has estimated. Because there is no itemization on your report, I don't understand how there can be such a huge gap. So my question is, I understand that TranSystems makes a large part of its revenue on building bridges and ramps for freight railroads and I also

understand TranSystems did this study for about 50,000 dollars, which is a very low for any consultant for this sector of the economy. Is it possible that this 112 million dollar bid is actually a bid not an estimate so that TranSystems could place itself in bidding to get this work once the Met Council chooses this plan?

Jim Terry: The answer is no.

[inaudible]

Jim Terry: I don't know where the 200 or the 230 I think you were referred to, where that came from. I started with a clean sheet of paper, took my team's design and started it, counted spikes, bolts, rail, ties, bridges, bridge type lengths and to say that it's just a version of the Brunswick with the high berms, I would not describe it as that. We start back at almost to Blake Road, and if you're familiar with the railroad its dropping off as its going towards the east. Instead of coming half way down somewhere near Louisiana Street and starting back up to get up and over Highway 7, we kept the railroad basically level taking the grade up so we could take some of those issues out of there. I don't feel like a comparison with the elevated Brunswick Central corridor is comparable.

Chair Haigh: Jim can I, I just want to get this over to Mark a second to answer because we have additional cost estimates that we will need to do on this concept.

Mark Fuhrmann: I would only add that the Corridor Management Committee was very clear a week ago that they have asked staff at the project office to do that cost comparison, apples to apples, and so we have Mr. Terry's, the benefit of his cost build up that he was just itemizing but we will then add additional costs so that it will then be an apple to apple comparison of how we built out the prior costs that we shared last summer.

#### **Verbal Comment 19**

Commenter: I'm just, I'm curious, every time Hennepin County drafts one of these plans we have a whistle free zone by our high school and I'm wondering in what world is it a good idea to run a 20 kiloton freight train at 25 miles per hour past a bunch of hormone addled distracted teenagers and not warn them with a horn?

Jim Terry: One of the issues with a quiet zone is that if someone is trespassing on the railroad you do sound the horn.

[inaudible]

Jim Terry: No it's not completely, in an emergency you blow the whistle.

#### **Verbal Comment 20**

Commenter: Thank you, I'm Nancy Gores and I am Chair of the St. Louis Park School Board and like the Mayor, I am authorized for the first time as one person to speak for all of our Board because we feel strongly about this TranSystem option. I hesitate to call it a plan because you know how much more work needs to be done on it before you give it any serious credibility as a viable alternative. I want to welcome you to our high school, we love our high school. This is our one high school and we want to protect it. We love our students and we want to protect them and so I have a letter for you that details all our many concerns but I'm going to talk about two in particular; safety and educational impact. First

is the educational impacts, and I think it was eluded to by someone in the back. When you run a 113 car train by our high school eighty feet from a classroom you can't look at sound analysis that does averages, you have to look at the sound analysis when that train is going by and how long it takes that train to go by. I think Mr. Perry said six minutes, I think we are currently seeing seven trains a day potentially. As we know, once we give the railroad their rights they can do anything they want so be careful on our behalf. That adds up to a lot of educational time lost because when that train is running by the classroom education stops. There's no teaching, there's no learning. You multiple those minutes you come up with a lot of time lost over the course of a year. That is an educational impact that's just not acceptable. The other educational impact that I'm going to highlight is kind of the double whammy if this plan goes through. We have the light rail we want to do and that will have construction impacts and then if we do this there is a freight rail construction impact and our streets and our transportation system, our disruption and delays for our busing will go on I fear for years. Certainly, a very long time. Every added delay in transportation costs us money because we have to pay for that and when you have less efficient transportation the money tends to come out of the classroom. It comes out of fewer teachers and larger class sizes with an educational impact that is just not acceptable and if you do both it's a double whammy for us that is just not fair to our students. And then there's the safety concern. You've got, I'm glad you're here Mr. Perry because you saw how close that track really is to our high school, much closer than the numbers in this report. And you saw, since you're here today, you saw where our McDonald's is, you know where our stadium field is, you know we've got an elementary school not far away. To reroute more train traffic and longer train traffic here really increases the safety risks to our students and I'm not the only one concerned about that, the president of the TC&W has said that in the Star Tribune, his quote is in our letter to you, but, he talks about curves and less distance for the engineers to see, added safety risks, and added derailment risks. Not ok for our community, certainly, not ok for our students. So in summary, because I know you've got a lot of people here that want to talk, I've heard about you know the phrase, throw somebody under the bus, this plan, this concept, this premature idea raises so many safety concerns, educational concerns, that it is throwing our children under the train tracks. It is not ok to throw our kids under the train. This is an idea that we reject and we really hope that you recognize this as a bad idea, bad public policy, not what Minnesota stands for, and will pick an alternative that is better for everybody. Thank you.

#### **Verbal Comment 21**

Commenter: Hi, my name is Kathryn Kottke and I am a CAC member, I think it's Community Advisory Committee, I'm not really sure what the full name is. I want to talk about the safety enhancement slide and I don't have a question for Jim Terry but I have a comment if you could flip back to slide 57. I just don't find these to be enhancements. First of all the crossing closures, I understand you're closing four out of six crossings. You are redirecting traffic through our neighborhoods. We right now can barely fit one car through the streets because of the snow. The kind of traffic you're running through the neighborhoods is dangerous, potentially fatal. I also want to comment on the inside guard rails, the fencing, and the pedestrian bridge. I would like to comment that that's insulting. That is not a safety enhancement. If we have a derailment no guard rail, no level of iron wrought fencing, and no pedestrian bridge is going to protect our children. I also want to comment on a walking tour that Safety in the Park gave, one of the comments that a Minneapolis person asked us was why did you build the high school so close to the tracks. I think that was a legitimate question and I think the reason why we did it is because it's a passenger line, it's a very small train, it's not unsafe. My question to the Met Council is why would you reroute a freight train so close to our schools? That's it.

Chair Haigh: I want you to know that the decision to look at all of the reroute alternatives was done with the idea of making sure that we had examined every single possibility. We've not yet made a decision, we're here to hear what you have to say and I appreciate that.

[multiple inaudible speakers]

**Verbal Comment 22**

Commenter: Hi, I just want to offer one layperson's impression of this whole process. I've been thinking a lot about the idea of viability relative to this process. Viability can be a very effective weasel word and can be used quite effectively to promote an agenda other than one's, the public's interest. It's a word that says trust me dear citizen for I know better than you. Viability implies that wisdom, thoughtfulness, good council, and sober judgment have gone into a decision making process. Yet time and again we've seen simple cost-effective solutions to the freight issue dismissed without explanation. Not viable we're told while the costliest, most disruptive and dangerous alternatives are put forward again and again as being the only viable alternatives. By what standard of viability can the safety and quality of life of an entire city weigh less heavily than the placement of a section of bike trail? Citing viability without further explanation, without revealing the criteria used to reach a decision gives cover and legitimacy to decisions that cannot pass the smell test of decency and common sense. It's been clear for a long time that powerful interests want to force a reroute down our throats with little regard for the impact such an action will have on this community. For them the ghettoization of St. Louis Park is a foregone conclusion. All that's lacking is justification for the deed. I thank you for your time.

[inaudible]

Ann Wiesner: So the question again was, can you restate the question for me?

Commenter: In short the question is why is it that cheaper less effective options are constantly put forth while such as the bike trail, we can remove it, one option I'm curious about is why can't we run the train rather the light rail on a single track for a quarter mile rather than move the bike trail or the freight trains? I lived in San Diego on a freight rail line that did just that, or a light rail line that did just that and those trains ran on time every day, every hour. So I don't see how that option is untenable yet the proposed reroute here with its clear and obvious dangers is something that's constantly put forward again and again.

Chair Haigh: Let me begin first by, I wanted to answer, actually I'm going to ask Mark to answer the question about the single track first then I will answer the other question about the policy question, about why the bike trail is no longer being considered as an alternative.

Mark Fuhrmann: To the single LRT track idea. That was considered by Metro Transit and the project office last year and our assessment of that is that it does create unreliable service for light rail. We've looked at others, I've actually ridden the San Diego system one day and I'm familiar, but other systems that have tried that, such as Baltimore, which I'm very familiar with ultimately then double tracked that to provide the reliability for their riders. So operationally we did not consider that long term feasible.

Chair Haigh: And then if I can, the Corridor Management Committee including all of the elected officials who sit on that, looked at the alternative of the bike trail removal, realized there was property impacts for that, there were acquisition of homes for that [inaudible comments from audience]. I just want to try and explain to you what the thinking was at the time, this alternative of course was not on the table at

the time. And we made a decision that was really not a viable alternative that [inaudible comments from audience].

Ann Wiesner: Hang on, wait, wait, wait. I'm gonna ask you to wait to be recognized. [Audience members yelling]. So, I'm just gonna ask that we try to wait until your recognized. I know it's difficult but if we all just start standing up and yelling questions we're not going to get anywhere real quickly. So let's get back to the Chair and let you finish, please if we can try to refrain from interrupting each other that would be great.

Chair Haigh: I believe that the members of the Corridor Management Committee felt that the shallow tunnel was the better alternative in the Kenilworth Corridor because it allowed for the bike trail to stay. It did not require property takings and it really protected the resources of the lakes that are important to people who use the bike trail and the lakes. That is not to say that the issues you have raised are not important, they're very important and that's why we are here to hear what you have to say and to listen to your concerns.

### **Verbal Comment 23**

Commenter: My name is Jackie Olafson and I'm the director of STEP and I want you to know that STEP is one of the buildings that would be demolished if this happens and I want you to know what happens at STEP because it's more than a building it's a sacred place in this community where over 4000 people each year turn to STEP for food, clothing, transportation and above all a listening supportive professional presence by social workers who help them find rent assistance, find emergency assistance for their utility bills, help them find food support. We have over 200 volunteers, over 8000 donors. This is a small community with a big heart who cares about people and this building took 39 years to find and to actually pay for by the community. It belongs to the community, it is for the community and it represents the health of this community. So I urge you to listen to me with your hearts as well as with your heads and make a good decision for this community. Thank you.

### **Verbal Comment 24**

Commenter: Hi, my name is Meg McCormick, I'm a 28 year resident of St. Louis Park. I've been waiting patiently for about 15 years for the Met Council to come up with an objective comparison of co-location and relocation options. I've been patient, I've been respectful and I have not participated in some of the seemingly inflammatory language associated with this issue. I've stayed out of that because I've been waiting. I've been reasonable, I've been respectful and my perspective is a little bit different than some of my neighbors in that I believe, I truly believe, if there an objective comparison and I mean truly objective, and the analysis showed that the relocation option was better than the other options with objective criteria of safety, technical viability and yes I want a definition, environmental impact and cost I would support that. But you have not been able to show that. In fact I would be supportive of that relocation but you have failed. You have not been objective. Visual impact as stated as a response to Minneapolis and St. Louis Park questions is not objective criteria. Whether or not people like the option is not objective criteria. I'm done with you. I'm done waiting. I'm done being respectful. You have forced my hand. Your failure to be objective in your evaluation of all options based on safety, technical viability, environmental impact, and cost is in my opinion unethical. I will be filling a complaint with the Government Accountability Office, the Office of Budget and Management, and the Minnesota Ethical Practices Board because I believe your behavior has been unethical. You have caved to political pandering and you have failed to be objective in your criteria. The bike path, moving the bike path has got to be part of your final comparison. Thanks.



**Verbal Comment 25**

Commenter: My name is Janet Ostfield [sp] Viavotta [sp] why I'm married 23 years you'd think I'd remember my married name, Janet Vivotta [sp]. I've been a resident of St. Louis Park for the last 21 years and I don't live on the railroad tracks but I'm three blocks off the tracks. And I'm disappointed, I'm disappointed to be here again. Because after analyzing these routes for over 15 years, a new study has been commissioned and a solution has been found. Well, not really new, its slightly different but still permanently closes streets, requires the acquisition of several homes and businesses, divides our neighborhoods, and runs vicariously near the Spanish Immersion School and the St. Louis Park High School and closes our community food shelf. I'm disappointed because the new study by design took little consideration to the concept of co-location of freight and light rail even though this acceptable for most of the western portion of the proposed SWLRT route. I'm disappointed because the same criteria used to eliminate several co-location options in the Kenilworth Corridor are apparently not valid reasons to find this current new solution unacceptable. I'm disappointed because apparently biking and walking trails, which I use on a regular basis, daily basis in nicer weather, which could be easily moved are more important than the safety and sense of community of the residents of St. Louis Park. Not to mention that this is the least expensive choice. And I wonder if all facts and circumstances and costs regarding freight relocation had been included in the original proposal to the FTA would they have given the same green light for this project. I'm disappointed because if in fact our concerns fall on deaf ears and then to add insult to injury, it's been proposed that I will get to pay additional sales taxes to help pay for this new route. This impacts me both as a consumer and as a business owner. I'm disappointed because a minimum cost of 1.2 billion dollars, being one of the most expensive in the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area, and I quote from yesterday's paper, Sue, chairman, you were quoted, that you don't favor looking for another route, quote unquote for light rail. Isn't it more important to make a good decision, something residents and citizens will applaud as a valuable way to spend our hard earned tax dollars, something that really moves our city into the forefront of public transportation, that makes our city desirable. I'm disappointed because although the trend is to convert rails to recreational use, the Kenilworth Corridor is a freight corridor and it's an appropriate place for this kind of freight train to be considered. The MN&S spur on the other hand was built as a passenger train route, it has many at-grade crossings, runs between residential backyards and within 80 yards of our high school. Even now with the current freight traffic, teachers at the school need to stop teaching when a train passes. These trains are approximately 20 cars in length and pass 2-3 times a day. The proposed trains will be 100 plus cars in length and pass 4-6 times per day at potential more than twice the speed of current trains. How disruptive will that be? Would you want your child going to a school where that was the status quo forever? Make the right choice, keep freight in a freight corridor, if there can't be any agreement on the light rail, continue to make the right choice and find a new route. Don't spend our tax dollars and jeopardize our standard of living at the same time. We need to make smart decisions. This impacts decisions of transportation for the City of Minneapolis and the entire seven county metro area. We don't have the resources of New York City, we can't afford to make this kind of error in judgment. I would rather go back to the drawing board than this kind of monumental mistake.

**Verbal Comment 26**

Commenter: I just wanted to have a little bit more of a conversation and I want to go back to that bike trail and why we're not moving it. So your first answer was about the CMC and how they did not support moving forward with some of those other alternatives. Really, I think a more honest way to say that is the CMC passed a resolution that moved the shallow tunnel forward but also in that same resolution it was voted 15 to 1 to take the reroute off the table. I have not seen any resolution, any vote, really any discussion about taking, elevating the bike trail or moving the bike trail off the table, so can you maybe kind of restate what you meant about the CMC supporting taking those alternatives off of the table.

Chair Haigh: I guess the question that you're asking is, is currently is the relocation of the bike trail on the table? It is not because of the recommendation by the CMC to adopt the shallow tunnel as an alternative, the alternative that was recommended to us at the Council. As we continue with this work, what we're doing is really trying to find a viable alternative for LRT in this corridor so that it is something all of the cities along the corridor have passed resolutions to accept LRT in this corridor. So we have this one last issue we are trying resolve of the many issues that we have resolved on this project and that really is: what do we do with the freight rail? Do we keep it in the current Kenilworth Corridor in its current alignment or do we look at this relocation alternative? That's really the policy question before us. That's why we're here tonight to hear what you have to say about it.

Commenter: Ok, maybe I didn't phrase the question correctly but the question was, or maybe the statement and I want you to explain it to me is the CMC passed a resolution to take the reroute off the table, to stop studying it. The CMC never passed anything that said to take the bike trail or elevating the bike trail or moving the bike trail off the table. So can you explain to me again why are we continually studying the reroute when there was a resolution passed by the CMC to stop studying it but we're not studying these other alternatives?

Chair Haigh: I don't know if, I feel like I keep trying to answer that question and maybe you don't like the answer that I'm giving you but it is, it was an alternative that the CMC did not feel was the best alternative, they felt that the shallow tunnel was the best alternative.

Commenter: But they passed a resolution to take the reroute off the table so why is it not important that they did that?

Ann Wiesner: So are you asking the question?

Commenter: I just want a real answer.

Ann Wiesner: So can I just, just to gain clarity here, are you asking if the CMC passed a resolution saying we should no longer continue to consider the reroute why is it still on the table? Is that the question? Ok.

Chair Haigh: The reason it's on the table as I've stated earlier, is to respond to a request from legislators and local elected officials, the governor's asked, the governor asked us, asked me as his appointee to go back and do this additional work and that's what we're doing.

Commenter: Did the governor just ask to study the reroute or did he ask you to take a look at everything?

Chair Haigh: What we were asked to do is what we've done, which is to do the additional water resources work, to engage a freight rail expert to look at the freight rail alternatives. There was no request for us to look again at the bike trail issue.

Adam Duininck: I'll try to jump in to answer it a little bit more thoroughly, it's the same point, but there were multiple groups of elected officials, city, county, state legislators all involved in looking at the scope we're going to re-examine. It wasn't just folks from Minneapolis, it wasn't just folks from St. Louis Park, it was a big broad group and it involved staff teams from all the local units of government too.

[barely audible]- St. Louis Park too?

Adam Duininck: Yes, of course

**Verbal Comment 27**

Commenter: Yes, can I ask my question and by the way I went to this high school. I have two kids in this high school. We live right on the border of Minneapolis and St. Louis Park about a block and a half from where the line is. We use the trails, kids went to Park Spanish Immersion, can kind of see both sides of this in terms of Minneapolis and St. Louis Park. But I think the important question isn't how we, isn't how decisions were made. My question is, is there any way that moving or elevating the bike trail can be put back on the agenda and if so, what would that take?

Chair Haigh: I guess really it would be people on the Corridor Management Committee suggesting that that was an alternative we should consider again. Perhaps that will come up. I don't know that it will.

**Verbal Comment 28**

Commenter: Well we certainly heard a lot of nonsense from on high haven't we? So let's ask the real experts about the effect of a reroute through St. Louis Park. Let's ask the community of St. Louis Park, do you want a reroute through your community?

[multiple audience answer's: no]

Commenter: Let's hear it again, do you want a reroute through your community?

[multiple audience answer's: no]

Commenter: Then let's speak with one voice, won't you join with me, hell no get out we don't want no reroute, hell no get out we don't want no reroute, come on, hell no get out we don't want no reroute.

Ann Wiesner: I'm going to ask.

Commenter: Hell no get out.

Ann Wiesner: I'm just going to ask that we move on so people can have an opportunity to speak.

Commenter: Hey I can use my three minutes, you tried to engineer this to your advantage and I'm not letting you have it.

Ann Wiesner: So...

Commenter: You have pushed us around for over four years, do not dare to call us uncivil.

Ann Wiesner: I'm not calling you uncivil. I'm just suggesting that we try to use as much of this time as possible.

Commenter: So then let's get some real answers and give me my three minutes, I didn't even use my three minutes.

Ann Wiesner: If people want to.

Commenter: My question was to the people of St. Louis Park. Supposedly you want our opinion. I think you got your answer.

**Verbal Comment 29**

Commenter: Hi, I promise I do have a question. I live on Library Lane, I can see the train tracks now pretty close to the high school. Moved here about three and a half years ago because it was safe community, I was a single woman purchasing my first home. Loved it, great commute time, it's been an amazing, I have, like, the best neighbors a person could ask for. So now that I hear all this happening and I look at this helpful chart on page sixteen with circles and colors, I see Kenilworth has quite a few of these white circles that means strongly supports goals, whereas some of the other ones do not have white colors. So, since I'm only a lawyer, not a chart interpreter, can you explain to me why the conclusion of the report states there really are no preferable routes when we heard in the presentation today that there is really nothing stopping Kenilworth and there's a whole bunch of white circles? So why am I continuing to hear the same conversation, because literally the only argument I've heard in favor of or against I guess having it stay in Kenilworth is that there was an agreement maybe fifteen years ago, I don't know I was too young to know that, that they were promised the trains would leave? And I've been asking for a different answer for that question so maybe you can actually give me one today as to why again we're not just hopping on board this Kenilworth option and saving all of our precious time and your time and moving on with progress?

Chair Haigh: Well thank you, again I just want to emphasize that yes the Corridor Management Committee recommended to the Council that the co-location of the freight rail in the Kenilworth area is an alternative that is viable, and it is a recommended alternative. So, yes we are considering that. We have this step that we need to go through to gather this input to really understand this other alternative then we will have to ultimately make a decision.

Jennifer Munt: Folks I would like to add one piece. I'm Jennifer Munt, I Co-Chair of our Community Advisory Committee and I want to explain what we're doing here. What you heard tonight is an independent consultants report. Now the Met Council needs to take a look at that report, cost it out, understand the impacts, what we're hearing loud and clear from you tonight is that there are huge safety concerns regarding the reroute through St. Louis Park. We need to hear the community input. We need our technical staff to take a look at what Jim Terry is recommending. And then make a decision based on that. I know you've had a lot of meetings, a gentleman at our last meeting came to me with the receipts of all the babysitters he had hired. We get it that people are exhausted by the process but what we need to do is hear your input before Jim Terry's draft report becomes a final report. And I also want to tell you that our decision isn't just made with aerial photographs. All of my Met Council colleagues have toured the different alignments, we understand this in terms of people. You've got representatives, both Minneapolis and St. Louis Park do, on our Community Advisory Committee. We've worked together as a group that's tried to find a solution because people on both sides of this issue feel passionately about it and what they've told us is, we love our communities and we want you to protect them. I'm looking for a solution that helps us do that. We've taken tours as a Community Advisory Committee with Safety in the Park, with folks along the Kenilworth trail. We understand this on the ground. The gentleman, the great organizer who led the chant, I stood in his yard to understand what it means living as close to the freight trains as he does. We understand this from a human perspective, we want to understand it from a dollars and cents perspective and we want to apply criteria that will allow

us to choose the best decision because we understand we're building a light rail line that's going to stand the test of time and we're making a decision today that will affect generations to come.

**Verbal Comment 30**

Commenter: I'm looking at the handouts from tonight. And the first one, responses to community questions from the Minneapolis Town Hall Community Meeting on January seventh, on the back page, question ten and the last two sentences, the safety of transit customers and the residents of surrounding areas is the Metropolitan Council's top priority, all design and engineering decisions on the Southwest LRT project are made with safety in mind. On the first page of the responses to the St. Louis Park meeting on January ninth under number two, in the middle, during discussions of LRT in the Kenilworth Corridor the community expressed its preference for design alternatives that did not require the acquisition of homes and also supported keeping bike trails in the corridor. So it sounds like the community input was given a lot of weight and I think it's fair to say the St. Louis Park community preference given our Mayor was here representing the entire City Council and our School Board President was here representing the entire school community that the St. Louis Park community preference is to not have a reroute. So why is rerouting still on the table but moving bike trails is not on the table?

Ann Wiesner: So I think, I think we continue to circle around that question.

[inaudible audience members]

Ann Wiesner: I'm going to let you all respond if you'd like to, but what I'm hearing the answer is, the Met Council has been asked to look once more at these options and they were not asked to look again at moving the bike trail.

[inaudible audience members]

Ann Wiesner: I think the process for that is to have the Community Advisory Council make that recommendation, is that correct?

Chair Haigh: I think that the issue that is probably behind the question that you're asking is, the City of Minneapolis, from what we have heard on the Corridor Management Committee, is not in favor of the reroute of the bike trail, ok.

[inaudible audience members]

Chair Haigh: Ok, I'm just telling you the reality, and so the shallow tunnel alternative provides for the co-location of the freight rail in the corridor. The reroute of the bike trail provides for LRT at-grade with the freight rail in the corridor and I don't think that is an option that Minneapolis had indicated that is there top option.

**Verbal Comment 31**

Commenter: So I would like to review a few points that I think illustrate the absurdity of the reroute still being on the table here. And this is from the Met Council website. The reroute would confiscate at least forty-six private homes and businesses, it would cost over two hundred million dollars compare that to co-location moving bike trails or elevating bike trails, which would cost thirty-five to fifty million. That's just a hundred and fifty million less. Zero confiscations of private property or businesses. To echo what

the lady in the middle just said, if you look at number two, and the top of page two, number two it says the design concept for elevated trails was one of the possible technical solutions presented by Southwest LRT design staff, objections to this concept included visual impacts and difficulties getting on and off the bike trail. So you can design a train that has all kinds of s-curves, dangerous ups and downs undulations but you can't design a bike trail with on and off ramps. And because of that we eliminated it that's ridiculous. So, understand to your point the CMC should be here and I know you're tired of hearing about the bike trails, they should be here then. The litmus test for the elimination of elevated trails was it's visually.

Chair Haigh: I just wanted to say that I believe there are members of the CMC that are here tonight.

Commenter: They should be up front. And respond to that. Ok. I'm just about done here. So the thresholds for dismissing a bike path option are very easily met while reroute options despite the fact that they compromise the safety of the school children and build rails where they don't exist now is impossibly, impossible to meet it seems. And the bike trails need to be back on and you know what we could improve the bike trails. The Minneapolis Park Board owns the property on Cedar Lake including now where private homes enjoy Cedar Lake all to their own enjoyment on the east side. The Park Board should put the trails right there. Interestingly enough the former Park Board President is one of those private homeowners as is a current Park Board Member. It's time to put a bike trail right there.

#### **Verbal Comment 32**

Commenter: [inaudible] I'm a railroad engineering expert. I've have been consulting for fifteen years, I also spent fifteen years designing locomotives, so I know a little bit about what I'm talking about. My question is for Mr. Terry, he said earlier that eight thousand foot train, twenty-five miles per hour, five to seven minutes, that's very nice and I like the speed, I want to know how long it takes to stop that train and if a car is stuck at Dakota Avenue, where the engineer would have to start applying the brakes to stop the twenty thousand ton, one hundred thirteen car train to not cause an accident at Dakota?

Jim Terry: Obviously the shuttle train to stop an accident like that would be very, it'd be very difficult there's no doubt about that. That's why I'm a proponent of fencing the right-of-way to keep the kids off the railroad track. What you're pointing out Tom is probably correct. If that is the speed that the railroad is operating, a loaded freight train is difficult to stop. No doubt about it. It's tougher to stop a hundred car loaded freight train than it is a fifteen car train that CP's running today. That is some of the reasons why safety is so important to this thing and the criteria.

Commenter: [inaudible] Trains can stop in a hundred feet. They can stop what they can see. They stop when they go to McDonald's for lunch, the locomotive engineers. That's the real problem and I don't, I think one of the reasons that Jim and Mark have looked at different route, people might not like berms but their trying to get away from the blind curves and that's what one of the real problems is. And I think where you're kind of missing the boat is it's not that eight thousand foot trains can go twenty-five miles an hour and only take six to seven minutes. You talked earlier also about quiet zones and I've investigated a lot of accidents that were in quiet zones and I've heard a lot of horns. There's a lot of reasons why engineers blow their horns and an engineer and a conductor are similar to pilots on an airplane, they can travel exactly as fast as they think they should and they can blow their horns if they think they should and I think the problem is you're going to end up with the real engineers, the locomotive engineers from TC&W, slowing their trains down going through here and they'll have them going six to eight miles an hour because they're going to want to be able to stop those trains. Now you get into a situation where you got twenty to twenty-two minutes of stopping that's going to be a

problem for ambulances and other things and now you're going to have a real problem that some of the other people talked about, education, you're talking about twenty to twenty-two minutes. I've done all the calculations. I wrote a thirty page report for the DEIS. I don't see much difference in your design over the DEIS and my report still stands.

**Verbal Comment 33**

Commenter: I'm going to refer also to some response community questions. And thank you for bringing it up, it says during discussions of LRT in Kenilworth, Kenilworth community, which I'm assuming is Minneapolis members expressed preference for design alternatives that did not require the acquisition of homes. I understand that some alternatives were taken off the board because they required the taking of homes. And I asked this at the previous two meetings and I haven't gotten what I think is a good answer. If that is the criteria that is acceptable in Minneapolis should that same criteria be applied here? Those were alternatives taken off because they required the taking of homes so they were taken off. This looks like you're going to be taking homes so by the same criteria should this not also be taken off?

Chair Haigh: I think that the issue you're raising is exactly the type of community impact the Corridor Management Committee will consider. They'll look at the number of property takings, they'll look at the proximity to the school, they'll look at the impact on safety in the community. We've not done that for this alternative yet. This is in a preliminary stage. I'm sorry if that makes people frustrated but this concept that has been developed is, still needs to go through that community impact and safety analysis process that the Community Advisory Committee will do, we haven't done that yet. This process, today, is helping to inform that. So I just don't want you to think it's not going to happen. Your input into that is what will help us inform that decision making at the Community Advisory Committee.

Commenter: Let me repeat my question, why is the criteria different?

Chair Haigh: It isn't different. We haven't gotten to that assessment yet. The property takings, whether it is in St. Louis Park or in Minneapolis, and the alternatives will be evaluated and the impact of it, just like we did with the other alternatives. So don't think that it won't count because it will count. I think it's a very important issue.

**Verbal Comment 34**

Commenter: Thank you for letting me speak. This may be a little disjointed because I didn't write anything down, however, I think I share a lot of people's frustrations here. I mean, my main problem is when I first heard about this I reached out to the first elected official I could find, which happened to be our County Commissioner, whose running for re-election, who told me flat out county commissioners have no say on what happens with this, which later I found out to be a little bit untrue. Now we're back here talking about rerouting again. You know I've lived in St. Louis Park a long time, we moved out and came back so we can raise our family, would have a safe community. It's even to the point where my kids go to the same daycare that I went to and because I wanted them to have the same experiences that I had. However, we're talking about putting freight rail either through their walking path to school, next to potentially their elementary school or next to the high school. You know, I trust the engineers here to try to come up with something safe, however at this point I don't trust the Met Council to come up with a safe decision for people here in St. Louis Park and I hate to say it but I feel like it's because my home is not worth as much as the homes in Kenwood. And to that point, because I don't trust your timeline, I don't trust your decision making on this, unfortunately we've called it quits on St. Louis Park

and we will be moving because we were either going to move up or move out and this whole process has solidified us to move out.

**Verbal Comment 35**

Commenter: What potentially could be hauled on these trains that are going to be coming through our neighborhood?

Jim Alexander: If I understood the question, what is going to be hauled on the trains, is that correct? Yes, on the freight trains? We understand that Twin Cities & Western, if you're talking about the TC&W trains, they currently haul grain, they haul ethanol, they haul coal, and other products, but those are the three main that we understand they carry.

**Verbal Comment 36**

Commenter: Thank you, I'm Susan and I live on Library Lane. I have good news because if I'm connecting the dots. Somebody here said that the train, freight option, was taken off the table because it necessitated the removal of homes. Well this new thing that he's talking about, that Mr. Terry is talking about means some homes will be removed. So applying that logic, we're off the hook? Right, am I right?

[inaudible audience members]

Ann Wiesner: So I think, I think what I am hearing them say is that the analysis that that previous route went through resulted in them taking it off the table because of the requirement that it would mean taking property. This new option has not gone through that process yet. And so that will be a consideration as this new idea, this new concept goes through that same analysis. Is that accurate, is that an accurate characterization?

[inaudible audience members]

Ann Wiesner: So I think, I'm going to go back to recognizing speakers but I think the reason again that we are here talking about this particular concept is because the Met Council was.

[inaudible audience members]

Gary Cunningham: So my name is Gary Cunningham and I represent Minneapolis both south central Minneapolis, downtown Minneapolis, north Minneapolis and Robbinsdale on the Council. And I just want to say that I have not made any determination. I'm listening to all sides of this issue and as this comes before us we want to have full information before we take a vote on what we decide around what we do. So we are not, we're not at a point of making a, I'm just telling you from my perspective as somebody that represents Minneapolis that I'm trying to look at this from all points of view. Trying to look at it from how it affects the region as a whole, as well as how it affects you and what you're doing. So this information that you're giving us is important information at the same time no decisions have been made from my point of view about how we're going to go forward with this. So, I just want to put that on the table so people know this is a deliberation that's going on here not a conclusion.

[inaudible audience members]

Ann Wiesner: Ok, Tom, I really, there are people that have been waiting, really want us to.



[inaudible audience members]

**Verbal Comment 37**

Commenter: Now I get to put my hand down and the blood will come back. You're actually doing an amazing job, so props to you. So I think ample time has been given to all the negatives, I'm genuinely curious about what the Met Council feels would be the compelling points for our City Council to give Municipal Consent? And I appreciate that's somewhat speculative at this point but genuinely like in three or four bullet points what do you think would compel them to give Municipal Consent because obviously it's a threat to withhold it so what would compel it?

Chair Haigh: I just don't really want to speak for the St. Louis Park City Council, I think that's a decision for them to make and for them to tell us.

Adam Duinick: I'll give the one positive I know about why we're doing the studies in the first place, which is to find a solution that moves the project forward. As frustrating as this night has been, as frustrating as the last two months have been, when we started down this process of looking at the freight study, the water study, and the vegetation study, the whole premise of it was everybody along the line from St. Louis Park into Minneapolis, city, county, and Met Council said you know there's challenges in this project, there's no perfect solution but the best outcome is still a project. And I hope that is still the case, I believe that the best outcome is still a project happening and so if there's a viable way to do it in St. Louis Park we'll find out as we move the concept into an apples to apples comparison. We'll do the same exercise in the shallow tunnels.

Jennifer Munt: Ann can I just chime in on that last question? Folks I'm going to be real honest with you. There's five cities along this light rail line. Each city has its own hopes and dreams and wants and needs and it's almost like putting together a Rubik cube. To find a solution, a scope and a budget that works for all five cities. We're really trying to make this work and in terms of this being political, it's political to that extent. But because some people have more money or perceived to have more influence that does not mean that they have more influence over my vote and my decision. The reason I'm here tonight is to listen to everybody who is impacted by this. Here everyone has a voice and everybody's voice should be respected and taken into consideration when we make this decision.

**Verbal Comment 38**

Commenter: Thank you, my name is Louis Tresika [sp], I'm a lifelong resident of St. Louis Park. I'm not going to tell you how long that life has been. But before I ask my question, I really have a question for you Mr. Terry. I just wanted to say I hope the Met Council members will understand that the level of anger and frustration in this room is directly related to things that came before your more recent involvement. That there was a foundation of not getting answers for years, I'm not talking about months since last July, years, and I hope you will take that into consideration as you understand and evaluate the passion that's here. So Mr. Terry back to work for you, here's my question, I am a professional organizer by my trade so I love your charts, I love charts and graphs, I was looking at your tier two screening chart in the draft and I see that by use of your full moon, new moon, and half moon kind of process here that the two options, the option you are offering and the Kenilworth Corridor. When we look across the board under the tier two screen of options of engineering, safety and community that those two options are the only ones that had a couple of new moons and half moons meaning they were strongly supporting the goal or supports the goal. Now stay with me, if I understand correctly the goal is if we are looking at community, that particular metric or that particular element, you're saying

that the proposed route must not unduly impact the surrounding community? That's the goal, am I understanding that correctly?

Jim Terry: Go ahead, that's correct.

Commenter: That's correct, ok. So here's what I'm trying to understand, under the impact your metrics are property acquisition, and traffic impact in particular, road closures and road travel criteria, so when you discounted the MN&S south line you said that it was very problematic south of St. Louis Park because of curves, at-grade crossings and so for. But yet that does exist in your option as well. So here's my question, what kinds of numbers went into it strongly supports, it partially supports or it does not support? In other words, how many road closures, how many homes, what are the numbers of those specific things to measure for community impact so we can understand why certain things were blocked out as not meeting the goal at all and some were partially meeting the goal?

Jim Terry: Fair question. Let me take them one at a time if I can. And if I miss some let her have the mic back. Starting with homes, there were about 350 going south out of here that fell within that 150 foot either side of the main line issue. The curves going south and the grades going south are more sharper curves, more reverse curves, the grades are tougher for a freight train going south than they were coming north. So those problems were much more. Traffic wise there were a number of more crossings and if you go by the daily traffic counts there were like five or six times as many vehicles as...

Commenter: I'm not asking you in comparison. I'm asking you was it? 349? That would have meant it would only have been a partial impact and at 350 it became a full impact that it could not be done? Is it five road closures that are ok but ten are enough? Is it five at-grade crossings that are ok but at ten it's not? I want to know the criteria numbers that you used in order to make that evaluation for it strongly supports the goal, it supports the goal or it does not support the goal.

Jim Terry: Alright, for St. Louis Park north, the MN&S north route it looked like there were seven homes that were affected and roughly the same number of businesses depending on how you count parking lots and other things here. When you went south to engineer the curves out that I was describing the numbers went almost to a hundred. So did I put a specific number in there no, but when it was like seven to a hundred that was pretty evident that was a huge community disruption. I know to the seven people that live in the houses I'm talking about that it is going to be big disruption, don't get me wrong.

Commenter: What about for your option, this new alternative, then again how does that compare to Kenilworth and where is the line in the sand?

Jim Terry: Well, as I said to you, Kenilworth works fine for the freight railroad.

Commenter: I'm trying to understand, I'm not saying the overall decision. I'm looking at this one thing.

Jim Terry: My understanding is there are really no home, if I'm hearing things right, that are being taken in Kenilworth.

Commenter: Ok, so what is the, because in Kenilworth your saying with community that reroute option only supports the goal and what I read from your report wasn't anything in that number for community on page seventeen, it doesn't seem to indicate anything. In particular the saying is this many at-grade

crossings or this many, so how did you get to that partial as opposed to fully supporting the goal when you looked at the Kenilworth?

Jim Terry: If there were no impacts I would say.

Commenter: So why on community does it not say strongly supports the goal?

Jim Terry: On the Kenilworth, cause there were the issues that I heard at the open house we held in Minneapolis.

Commenter: Ok, so the issues you're stating here were, they express flexibility with co-locating freight, light rail and the trail? They said others were open to options for moving the trail, elevating or so for. I'm not seeing anything here that says that you weren't and by the way you, there's a supposition that you have in this statement that says since the Kenilworth Corridor was the only supposed to be used for freight service temporarily, that I mean assumes a fact. I would really encourage you to look at that change that.

Jim Terry: Ok, that's why we're having this conversation.

Commenter: So, you're not really giving any specific things like it is if you look at the MN&S south with as many homes as it was.

Ann Wiesner: So it sounds to me like one of the feedback, one of the pieces of feedback you'd like to give before this report becomes final was to clarify what the ranges look like?

Commenter: The specific numbers.

Jim Terry: That's fair enough.

### **Verbal Comment 39**

Commenter: Ok, I would like to share, I have never shared before and I want to stand up and share. You said you wanted to hear from us. My husband and I have moved into St. Louis Park eight years ago, we love it here, we're not planning on moving. We live in a townhouse development on twenty-seventh and Alabama and we have the MNS, MN&S, I can never pronounce it, that is up on the hill and it runs what a couple times a day and we have got townhouse, our garages are cracking. The foundations are splitting because of this little MNS, MN&S train that is coming through and my concern and I want people to know this, you said you wanted to hear from us, their now moving this heavy industrial train several feet closer to the townhouse association. It is going to be right behind our garages, ok, right now we have people that come into the community they walk their dogs on this walking trail, I hear, maybe this has changed but before I talked to an engineer, their building nine foot berms here on this walking trail and what protection do I have as a homeowner? What protection do I have, I don't have a basement, my foundation sits right on the dirt and if my house cracks what protection do I have? That's what I want to know and I want to speak up because I would like to continue to live here, I really love St. Louis Park and I love our community, thank you.

Commenter: [inaudible]: Your property is being taken with this plan.

Commenter: No, no honey, not my property.

Commenter: [inaudible]: For the road.

Commenter: This is the first I'm hearing of this.

[inaudible]

Commenter: This is the first I'm hearing of it. I don't know.

Jim Terry: I think I know where the townhouse.

Commenter: The townhouse southwest, twenty-seventh and Alabama.

Jim Terry: And we don't affect those townhouses.

Ann Wiesner: I'm sorry ma'am, I'm really, I'm trying to get to folks that haven't had an opportunity to speak yet.

Commenter: I know you're running low on time, nothing has been talked about as far as vibration and the impact on homes in our community, then I please urge you to look at this.

#### **Verbal Comment 40**

Commenter: I'm Dick Parsons and I'm on the board of STEP as the chair and I want to raise an issue with STEP, which is the St. Louis Park Emergency Program, and as Jackie Olafson the Executive Director pointed out. We serve four thousand people each year in our community and that includes twenty-five percent of the school age kids in St. Louis Park. So it took the board eight years to find a suitable building and the reason it took so long is not just the money. The problem in St. Louis Park is there aren't a lot of buildings that we could utilize on one floor, handicap accessible, that are about nine thousand square feet. There just aren't a lot. So the challenges we had was to find suitably sized building. One that was on the market. People don't like to give you buildings. You've got to go buy them and they have to be on the market. It had to be affordable, we bought the STEP building in March of 2010, pretty much at one of the depths of the recession and there weren't any deals in St. Louis Park for the building. The reason why is, most of those owners are not heavily capitalized, there not that expensive of a building. And they're going to wait it out, they know STEP has to buy a building in St. Louis Park, we can't go buy one in Hopkins or in Golden Valley or in Minneapolis, it has to be in St. Louis Park. The other issue is that the building has to be centrally located, a lot of STEP's clients walk to the food shelf and the services there. So being centrally located and close to a number of apartments was part of our decision. The fifth thing is that we had to have adequate parking, another issue in St. Louis Park and STEP is like a retail establishment with a lot of people coming through, so by code we needed about nineteen parking spaces. And the last thing is it needed to be convenient to the bus line, again a lot of our clients come via bus and leave via bus. So 6812 West Lake Street is right in the territory they're going to take out and my concern in St. Louis Park would be there aren't that many buildings for us to go look for and purchase. So as I look to you, if you go through with this plan is that there is enough mitigation for an organization like STEP, that has such a high value in the community, to continue to be able to operate. Any questions?

#### **Verbal Comment 41**

Commenter: There's five cities that need to give consent, St. Louis Park is not going to consent to this, ok. We're done, you've won and I think that's great. Really the issue is dead. St. Louis Park has to consent to this alternative and you're not going to do it are you? So what we're talking about now is a light rail system, are we going to do it or not? Minneapolis has got big issues with Kenilworth but let's look at a broader question, do we need light rail or are there alternatives? I've put together what I think is a very good alternative. It uses the same route that we are talking about but we use Metro Mobility sized buses instead of light rail. I've run the numbers, I have an MBA from Carlson, top ten percent. It takes about two hundred trains coming through on the current southwest plan. I'm talking about twenty-four hundred runs a day. It's a jobs program, seven hundred people, part-time drivers, seventeen dollars an hour. So your question has got to be Bob you're out of your mind because of economies of scale right, ten times as many drivers. Well I've run the numbers, it turns out if you use Metro Mobility sized vehicles costs about thirty-five million for the whole system. Costs about thirty-three million according to the plan for the light rail, it's about a wash. But if you've got these sized vehicles there's a couple advantages. First of all you can get much more service, you get two minutes three minutes instead of ten minutes, you can have multiple routes, you can have an express route running from Eden Prairie to downtown, you can have a shuttle route running from Shady Oak Road to Eden Prairie dropping people off. There's a lot of options we can look at. So here's my point, we need to look at what our transit options are in this state and light rail isn't the only one. Now let's take a look at what the Met Council's role is, the Met Council is not elected, it's not mentioned in the state constitution. It was originally formed to coordinate between different communities. You have tax and revenue sharing, it's been a lot of benefit in a lot of ways, but you know you hear we haven't made the decision, the Met Council hasn't made the decision. Well I got news for you Met Council you're not an elected body the legislature is. We need to revisit this whole question at a much more fundamental level and take a look at what are real transit options are going forward. Now let me mention on other thing, how many of you have heard automated driving mentioned. It's coming, we don't know when it's coming, might be ten years might be twenty years. But at some point we're going to look at driving the same way we look at elevator operators. How many people have ridden in an elevator with an elevator operator?

Ann Wiesner: Sir, I'm going to have to ask you to wrap up.

Commenter: Ok, so I'm going to wrap up. I'm going to be over at the legislature proposing this alternative I've laid out and I'm going to be standing here at the end of the meeting tonight if anybody wants to talk to me about this. Thank you.

#### **Verbal Comment 42**

Commenter: Hi, my name's Maureen Smith[sp] and I've lived in St. Louis Park for twelve years and my question goes back to the earlier comments related to moving the bike trail. There seems to be a lot of frustration in our community about the transparency to why that option was removed as a viable option and I realize it is not being considered in the scope of what's being re-evaluated right now, but we strongly feel based on all the criteria, that it should be added back. It doesn't involve the disruption that the freight reroute does and there's lots of options about it that make it more viable than the freight reroute. And I was hoping this answers the community questions would give us some more understanding to that and the first several paragraphs address the tunnels and they only mention, even though the question is about moving the bike trail as well, it is very carefully crafted response that does not address the question of why that isn't on the table as an option. So, the only thing mentioned here is the visual impact which obviously is very subjective and our community is having a difficult time understanding. The second thing is difficulty getting on and off the trail especially in an emergencies and

I would like to ask if the committee would reconsider exploring a plan for emergency response to bike emergencies, emergency response plan for bike emergencies on an elevated trail and report back on what the cost to implement such a cost would be compared to freight reroute.

Ann Wiesner: So is there a question you want?

Commenter: Can we request, is there?

Chair Haigh: I heard your request and thank you very much and we'll include that in the record as we look at the community input and decide what the next steps are.

Commenter: Also, I should add to that, is there a way to ask for more transparency around the criteria to remove the bike trail relocation as a viable option? I don't feel like our community has received a response as to what criteria was, that decision was based on.

Chair Haigh: We'll see if we can get some more information out to you and we'll go back and look at that record about what we did. I'm sorry I just don't have that all at the top of my fingertips right now.

Commenter: The response here doesn't, it has a community question then doesn't answer the question. Why are the shallow tunnels the proposed option for Kenilworth Corridor and why isn't elevating or moving bike trails still being considered? The only thing mentioned about moving bike trails is visual impacts and access during emergencies on bikes. Is that the only criteria cause I'm looking at the scope that this reroute is being subjected to, the criteria we're being asked to look at, and those are the only two criteria I've been given for bike route. Is there more that was taken into account or was there more factors?

Chair Haigh: I'm going to ask my staff experts down here to see if there, as I recall there were issues with property takings with the bike trail?

[inaudible audience member]

Chair Haigh: We can only answer one question at a time so maybe we can just ask Mark to respond.

Mark Fuhrmann: Well I would first start out to say that staff presented those eight options, six co-location and two relocation in June, cost them in July, then the Corridor Management Committee spent August, September, and October debating what was on the table and what was off the table. To your specific question about criteria, staff shared with CMC and there was good deliberation on that about access, both for the bikers should there be an elevated trail and for emergency in the scenario of an elevated trail. Staff also report to CMC that in a relocated trail option there were nine additional at-grade crossings for that bicycle trail taking it out of Kenilworth and four additional driveway crossings that would be conflicted with a relocated bicycle trail.

[inaudible audience members]

Mark Fuhrmann: Well sir, we met weekly last summer and fall and those are two important discussion items staff presented to the CMC that was part of their deliberation.

[inaudible audience members]

Mark Fuhrmann: I'm reporting to you the summary level that the CMC discussed. We have minutes of those CMC meetings that are posted on the website that are eight ten pages long and there's more detail that I can recall verbatim this evening.

[inaudible audience member]

Ann Wiesner: I'm going to, we're coming up on time, I'm gonna have to say we can take one more comment or question from the gentleman here then we're going to have to wrap up. There are still ways for you to weigh in and ask questions and provide questions we'll get to in just a minute.

**Verbal Comment 43**

Commenter: Hi. My name is David Yaks[sp], I've spoken a couple times before in the previous meetings and this has been a long night so I'm going to try to be really brief. I've got three kids in PSI, which is the school, the Spanish Immersion School, which is just across the tracks and someday they will be at this high school. I think I just want to say why, you've, there's a little bit of a buzz saw that I think the Met Council's running into here. It started last summer and I think I want to just articulate why that is. This is a community that not only cares about each other but really sees a bright future down the road and how do I know that, because last fall we had a, we passed a, what do you call it, a referendum for increasing technology and so forth in the schools. This community has something like seventy-five to eighty percent of the homes don't have kids. Now you go around the metropolitan area, I guarantee you most communities would give their right arm to have that kind of support. And why would this community do that, why would people that don't have kids in their homes vote for a referendum, three referendums, why? Because there's a vision for the future and the children are a part of that future, education is a very incremental part of that future. Just in a word, it's our brand. So when you talk about rerouting this freight train through St. Louis Park it's messing with our brand and that's important stuff. I want you to realize that's a core element of this discussion so when we get off on why haven't we looked at an elevated bike path and why are certain things weighted this way, at its core its we really care about this community and we just want things to be on an equitable visible level because we care about where the future is headed. Thank you.