



Meeting Title: SWLRT Section 106 Consultation

Date: 4/30/14 **Time:** 10:00 am **Duration:** 3.0 hrs

Location: Southwest LRT Project Office , Conference Room A
6465 Wayzata Boulevard, Suite 500
St Louis Park, MN 55426

Meeting called by: Dennis Gimmestad, MnDOT Cultural Resources Unit (CRU)

Attendees: SHPO: Sarah Beimers, Natascha Wiener
Eden Prairie: Lori Creamer
Minnetonka: Elise Durbin
Hopkins: Nancy Anderson, Kristen Elverum
St. Louis Park: Meg McMonigal, Emily Goellner
Minneapolis: Brian Schaffer, Jack Byers
MPRB: Jennifer Ringold
KIAA: Jeanette Colby
Three Rivers: Bill Walker
HC: Katie Walker
SPO: Nani Jacobson, Ryan Kronzer, Paul Danielson, Leon Skiles, Tom Harrington,
Sophia Ginis, Dan Pfeiffer, Sam O'Connell, Jenny Bring, Greg Mathis
MnDOT: Liz Abel, Dennis Gimmestad

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

----- Part 1 (10-11:30 am)----- Review Historic Properties – Corridor-Wide	
1.	Welcome & Introductions
2.	Section 106 Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of consulting parties • Timeline • Survey Recap
3.	Review of Affected Historic Properties (<i>Reference Potential Effects Table in 4/18/15 Section 106 Package Received in Mail</i>) St. Louis Park

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meg McMonigal had concerns with the placement of a signal bungalow. The bungalow will be in railroad right of way but work was still in progress on design and location. Meg requested that it not be placed in a single-family residential area but moved to a nearby commercial area. Meg also expressed a concern about protecting the Peavey-Haglin Elevator (a National Historic Landmark) from impacts caused by vibration during construction and asked whether a pre-construction assessment of the elevator’s condition will be done to provide a baseline for measuring impacts. Decision was to keep following this up – construction design may be able to ensure that there will be no impacts. <p>Action: Continue consultation on Peavey-Haglin Grain Elevator</p> <p>Cedar Lake Parkway</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jennifer Ringold (MPRB) wanted to know if arms will be added to the railroad crossing (currently, the crossing has posts equipped with flashing lights and cross-bucks). Paul Danielson (SPO) responded that this would need to be worked out with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). The area is currently designated a quiet zone and will remain a quiet zone. Jennifer asked whether an increase in freight traffic would change the quiet zone status. Paul responded that the FRA looks at any increase in accidents to determine this not just an increase in traffic. Nani added that freight trains may have to use their horn during work hours while construction is in progress. Jennifer then asked whether the proposed stop bar location would allow the first car in line to make a left turn onto Burnham Road. Paul responded that the design hasn’t gotten that far yet, but the configuration of the intersection will remain basically the same.
4.	Next Steps

Lunch – Provided by SPO

----- Part 2 (12-1:00 pm) -----
Kenilworth Channel/Lagoon Crossing

1.	Introduction
2.	Historic Documentation
3.	<p>Existing Conditions & Design Approach</p> <p>Discussion after PowerPoint presentation by SPO staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jeannette Colby (KIAA) stated that the “wild” nature of this area was an important characteristic that should be retained. • Sarah Beimers (SHPO) asked whether there was much in the area prior to the WPA installation of shoreline reinforcement (retaining walls and wood pilings). Did WPA work follow a planned design? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Greg Mathis (SPO) responded that there was nothing prior to the WPA work but he hadn’t looked in depth to see whether there was actually a set of plans used by the WPA.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jennifer Ringold reminded the meeting attendees that the Grand Rounds is not just the parkways and transportation features. These things are features within a park landscape. There are not many channels within the Grand Rounds system and this one is unique. • A City of Minneapolis staff person noted that experiential quality needs to be considered, particularly noise. Also, there is no catenary system now where one will be added. The concept drawings don't depict this but rather just an envelope. • Jennifer Ringold sees these more as Section 4(f) rather than Section 106 issues. • Dennis Gimmetstad stated that auditory effects are considered under Section 106 also. • Jennifer Ringold asked how much of Section 106 considers auditory impacts on the recreational experience? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sarah Beimers responded that it really gets back to "use." Section 106 considers whether a user's experience would be affected to the point that the property would no longer be used. • Dennis Gimmetstad asked the group, in designing the crossing, how much inspiration do we take from the design competition held historically, or should design go off in another direction? • Natascha Wiener (SHPO) asked how have designs been implemented over time—is there a list of the things Cleveland and Wirth wanted to do but didn't get done? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jennifer Ringold responded that we consider their vision as the system evolves. • Natascha Wiener commented that this is a unique portion of the Grand Rounds and a very different section of the channel in that it's not as formal or urban. It's an intimate, wild, more rustic area. Maybe consider lighter construction, however, lighter construction requires more members and people are focusing on having fewer members. Natascha suggested considering a finer, more diffuse structure, perhaps with more wood bents or post-tensioned concrete? Steel can be made very thin although it ages a certain way. Maybe consider an efficient, utilitarian design in a new form. • Nani Jacobson noted we have thought about several different options to update the trestle. Maybe the next step is to provide some visual representation of ideas. • Several noted and agreed that dark colors would blend into the landscape better. • Sarah noted it would be interesting to know how Wirth viewed this segment of the Grand Rounds – as formal or rustic and whether the WPA built on his vision. • Brian Schaffer (Mpls. HPC) commented that we have to also look at how the bridge interacts with shore features too, not just focus totally on the bridge.
4.	<p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nani Jacobson concluded meeting by thanking everyone and noting that the consultation had raised some good ideas to inform concepts that will be developed and discussed when the group reconvenes. <p>Action: Develop bridge design concepts</p>

ACTION ITEMS:	PERSON RESPONSIBLE:	DEADLINE:
1 Continue consultation on Peavey-Haglin Grain Elevator	SPO	Ongoing
2 Develop Bridge Design Concepts for KW Crossing	SPO	Fall 2014