

**Meeting of the Southwest Corridor Management Committee  
October 9, 2013**

Members Present	Susan Haigh, Chair	Jan Callison	James Hovland
	Brian Lamb	Lisa Weik	Terry Schneider
	Cheryl Youakim	Gail Dorfman	Peter Wagenius
	Peter McLaughlin	Jake Spano	Scott McBride
	Bill James	Jim Brimeyer	Mayor Rybak
	Nancy Tyra-Lukens		
Members Absent	Jeff Jacobs	Kathy Nelson	Keith Bogut

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Susan Haigh called the October 9, 2013 meeting of the Southwest Corridor Management Committee to order at 9:06am at the St. Louis Park Recreation Center.

Chair Haigh said we started out with 25 separate technical issues on this project and now we are down to making a decision on the last remaining technical issue and adopting our final project budget and scope. Our commitment is to develop and build an excellent project that will provide great customer service to the transit riders, help foster economic development and growth in your local communities and around the station areas, and be well integrated into the rest of our transit system. Our goal is to finish engineering of this project by the end of 2014, get our Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) signed in 2015, and begin construction in 2018.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chair Haigh presented the October 2, 2013, Southwest Corridor Management Committee meeting minutes for approval. No comments or discussion on the minutes and the motion for approval was granted.

**3. PROJECT SCOPE AND BUDGET RESOLUTION**

Mr. Jim Alexander presented some aerial maps of technical issue #21, Freight Rail.

Commissioner Gayle Dorfman moved the main motion of the whole resolution, to put it on the table and Mayor James Hovland second the motion.

Commissioner Dorfman made a motion to add a clause that linear trails will be designed and reconstructed to work in a supportive and integrated fashion with the SWLRT. Mayor Hovland second the motion. Mayor R.T. Rybak asked for clarification. Commissioner Dorfman wants to be sure the bike trail is protected and commit to keeping it essentially where it is. The final resolution was revised to say, **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the existing linear trails will be redesigned and reconstructed to work in a supportive and integrated fashion with Southwest LRT and that maintains to the extent possible the current character and alignment of the Kenilworth and all other existing trails. The motion carried.

Mayor Nancy Tyra-Lukens said she has concerns with using the Southwest station as the terminus. Due to the lack of engineering that has been done on that location as a terminus, Mayor Tyra-Lukens feels the need for a fall back and has concerns about the process. She said using Southwest station as the terminus has not been vetted by the staff, TPAC, BAC, or CAC for review, prior to recommendation by the SPO. There are a lot of circulation issues along the site, the local streets, and internal to the site that have not been accounted for with this more than doubling the estimated parking on that location. There are soil issues there and we are very concerned about the traffic impact in that area. We are concerned about costs, it would pretty much take up that entire site, and all the businesses in that area are asking to be taken. If they do need to be taken, that would increase the cost quite a bit. An additional lane of traffic would be required in both directions on Eden Prairie Center Drive, which is against the approved Comp Plan and would severely impact walkability in that area. All morning trips from Highways 212 and 5 would be coming down Eden Prairie Center Drive and not impact any other local streets. However, a lot of that traffic would come down Mitchell Road, which is the location that was originally intended as the terminus.

Mayor Tyra-Lukens feels that ending the line at Southwest Station has severe economic development impacts to the potential opportunities they could have had with the Mitchell Station. That would result in a loss of all the tax base taken out by the facility there. Ending the line at Southwest Station does not best serve riders or businesses. The City Center location, that we are willing to give to the project, is better served for the western part of our city. Points west, such as the Chanhassen and Chaska, people that choose to drive in and park, it is a much better location for that. Major employers are better served at the Mitchell Station location. There is already a 200 unit housing development near that location that is under construction. Eliminating the Mitchell Road Station is a big mistake. The Mitchell Road Station has 136 businesses and over 3,500 jobs within a half mile radius and 390 businesses and 8,300 jobs within a mile radius. This is more employment than the Southwest Station, Town Center, Golden Triangle, Shady Oak, Blake, Wooddale, Beltline, Westlake, 21<sup>st</sup> Street, and Penn, so well over half the stations on this line have less employment base than Mitchell Road. Light rail is not just about picking people up at their home, an important part is taking them to jobs and a huge amount of jobs will not be accessible as readily to LRT riders. We need a fall back if things do not work out with engineering at the Southwest Station.

Ms. Janet Jeremiah, Eden Prairie Community Development Director, said it is not their intent to increase the budget. We would like to look at a various number of options in regard to funding actual construction potentially in the future and we not asking for a construction add alternate at this time. All that we are asking for is to take it through to final design. We understand that the first level of reductions of contingency would cover the scope of this preservation. Mr. Fuhrmann said yes, there are other items on the betterment list such as the grade separated trails that we will continue to maintain. However, we are not advancing the design of those beyond preliminary engineering. Mr. Fuhrmann said there would be some modest cost implication for including the Mitchell Road environmental work and for the final design of the Mitchell Road extension.

Commissioner McLaughlin proposed that the staff come back to the SWCMC with a way to keep this option alive without changing the overall cost. Mayor Rybak said the federal government used to look at transit based on cost, but they now look at it as a cost benefit where this would potentially add cost, but it also loses ridership.

Mr. Brian Lamb said as it relates to technical issue #1, he understands and supports the need for additional analysis to look at traffic and development impacts, having a co-location at Southwest Station. When talking about the potential extension of Mitchell Road, it is an option should those technical issues prove to be unsupportable. We also need to keep on the table that also works with the existing budget the potential to relocate the Southwest bus service. The resolution language precludes this as an option.

Mayor Tyra-Lukens said Southwest Transit at this point is not interested in relocation and that is not on the table any longer. If that sentence is not left in the technical issue there may be great difficulty getting this through municipal consent in Eden Prairie.

Mayor Tyra-Lukens proposes an amendment to say, **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the CMC recommends that the Mitchell Station end of the line design continues through engineering and environmental process, if acceptable by the Federal Transit Administration. The SPO will design the SWLRT so as not to preclude a future LRT extension from Southwest Station to Mitchell Road. The motion carried.

Commissioner McLaughlin moved an amendment saying Met Council must not substantially change the current two-tunnel design of LRT at-grade in the Kenilworth Corridor without providing the city of Minneapolis and Hennepin County the same approval rights for the change as for the current design. Mayor Hovland second the motion.

Council Member Jake Spano asked if we would have to go back to get approval with any changes made along the line. Chair Haigh said any change in major design would change the project scope and budget and therefore retrigger the municipal consent process. Mayor Rybak said going back into municipal consent in the middle of construction would be a disaster. Commissioner Callison said the contingency release is intended to deal with some of these issues, so if something unforeseen happened, hopefully we would have enough contingency where we would not be going back and changing the scope of the project. Mayor Rybak said to think a couple years out and how important it is to get more people to these jobs in Eden Prairie. Promises made to people need to be delivered. The intent of this is if we have a two tunnel option on the table, we are not going to be back at this table trying to value engineer out a promise that was made. Commissioner McLaughlin opposes value engineering out a segment of the tunnel.

The amendment was revised to say, **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Met Council must not substantially change the current two-tunnel design of LRT in the Kenilworth corridor without providing the city of Minneapolis and Hennepin County the same approval rights for the change as for the current design as defined by Minnesota Statutes. The motion carried.

Commissioner Dorfman made a motion recommending the deletion of the resolving clause, **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the CMC recommends that the Council direct the SPO to discontinue all work related to freight rail relocation, effective immediately. Commissioner McLaughlin second the motion. Council Member Spano would like to keep this clause, as it is not in the best interest of the project and it was included to address concerns with the reroute. This clause says that we need to move forward with the design we have in front of us. Mr. Bill James said if we remove this clause, it would be a disaster for St. Louis Park and other cities along the line. If we take this resolution out, we are down to a single option for consideration and proposed that we leave this resolution in. Mayor Terry Schneider believes in keeping all our options open as long as possible, but our action is to get these options narrowed down to get an effective design in the final budget to move the project forward. Mayor Schneider supports leaving this resolution in. Mr. Fuhrmann said keeping this resolution in will make it very clear for the FTA, that the action of the SWCMC is a Shallow LRT tunnel and all other options that were considered are no longer in play. However, there will be work done on the common elements related to freight rail.

The clause was revised to say, **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the CMC recommends that the Council direct the SPO to discontinue any further work related to the freight-rail relocation out of the Kenilworth corridor. The motion carried.

Commissioner McLaughlin made a motion to the clause, HCRRA's conveyance of property interests for the light rail project must assure that HCRRA is relieved of all obligations, liabilities or risks for freight rail or light rail in the corridor. Mayor Tyra-Lukens seconded the motion. Chair Haigh said she understands HCRRA's

desire to limit their liability and transaction to negotiate the transfer of this property; however this is way beyond the scope of the SWCMC. This is a very complex legal transaction that they will take in the negotiations with MnDOT the railroads, and the project office. This is not appropriate to either the project budget or the scope.

Mayor Schneider proposed an amendment to say, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, Met Council and SPO will work with HCRRA and other parties to address the issues of risk and liability associated with the permanent presence of freight-rail and LRT in the corridor. The motion carried.

Chair Haigh asked for a SWCMC member to put the main motion with all the amendments on the floor. Mayor Hovland moved the motion. Council Member Spano second the motion.

Commissioner Dorfman gave a statement:

I had hoped that by the time we came to this point, to this recommendation today, that it would be easy, that every question would have been answered, that there would be consensus.

I have been involved with SW transit planning and the freight rail discussion longer than almost anyone in this room and I represent, as does Council Member Brimeyer, both communities that are impacted by the freight decision, so I hope you'll indulge me some historic reminiscing.

I was the Mayor of St. Louis Park when MnDOT requested that the freight move to the Kenilworth Corridor because of the Highway 55 project. I joined with Minneapolis and St. Louis Park legislators, city staff, and county officials to discuss both the interim Kenilworth plan and a permanent solution for freight. I served on the Freight Rail Task Force that engaged the public in these discussions and ultimately made recommendations to the St. Louis Park City Council. And I worked with legislators, city and county staff to help craft state legislation that provided the clean-up funds for the Golden site in St. Louis Park.

Now some have said that the history and promises don't matter. Some have offered differing views of the history and differing legal opinions. Some have said that the process was flawed from the start, that it was crazy to trust the railroads.

I believe that history, agreements and promises matter and that they should be honored as best we can. So, here's what I believe to be true on this freight issue based on both my involvement over the years and on various documents attesting to these facts:

- Hennepin County purchased the Kenilworth Corridor in 1984 for the purpose of transit.
- When MDOT moved the freight to Kenilworth in 1997, the understanding was that it was to be temporary, that it would be relocated, most likely to St. Louis Park along the MN&S line - as soon as the polluted Golden site was cleaned up.
- The 1997 state legislation that created the Environmental Response Fund says in the bill that the first priority for the use of these funds is to clean up the Golden site and to provide adequate right-of-way for a portion of the rail line, including making rail improvements, changing the curve of the track, eliminating a switching facility, and improving the land for economic development.
- When the City of St. Louis Park applied for the clean-up funds, their application said, "The City will own or control the southern portion of the site, as it is reserved for the future railroad interconnect."
- The railroad companies were also at the table from the start. The Kenilworth Trackage Rights Agreement signed between the railroad and Hennepin County says TC&W will vacate use of the Kenilworth corridor no later than 30 days after new connections are constructed along the MN&S and made operational. An early TC&W memo notes that there will be substantial public benefits from

construction of the two connections in St. Louis Park, and a Canadian Pacific letter in March of 1996 says constructing a new connecting track in St. Louis Park would create a workable and in some ways preferable alternate route. Even more recently, TC&W was still at the table talking relocation. Last year, TC&W officials told the county they'd discuss relocation as soon as Hennepin County replaced the old Kenilworth tracks, which we did at a cost of \$2m. And in a TC&W press release in January of this year, the President of TC&W refers to an earlier reroute design that had more moderate grade increases and gentler curves.

Maybe it was crazy to trust the railroads and maybe I was naïve, but I always believed the railroads were at the table negotiating in good faith. Now I'm not so sure.

- The St. Louis Park Railroad Task Force recommendations approved by the City Council in 2001, say that freight rail traffic should continue to travel through the Kenilworth Corridor until such time as a viable form of mass transit displaces it. But the recommendations also go on to say that if it is determined that the Kenilworth Corridor is the most feasible route for mass transit and that freight and mass transit cannot coexist in Kenilworth, freight traffic will be routed through St. Louis Park.

The City of St. Louis Park's position has long been premised on this question of the viability of co-location.

The media and others have asked why Hennepin County and MnDOT didn't push to relocate the freight much earlier. If we had done that, today's decision would have been easier, but we respected the City of St. Louis Park's desire to know first if Kenilworth was the best route for LRT.

As to light rail, we started looking into the viability of transit in the Southwest Metro in 1999. I remember the first meeting we held in St. Louis Park city hall that year where we talked about:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) process.

The importance of engaging residents and businesses from the start.

And how difficult a project like this can be and how long it can take to get it done.

And Charlie Meyer, the City Manager at that time, warned that there are always benefits and burdens of doing a big infrastructure project like this...that in the end, we'll all share in the benefits, but we need to make sure we share the burdens too.

In 2002, we formed the Southwest LRT Policy Advisory Committee (the PAC), a partnership of the cities, County, Met Council, chambers and others. The PAC moved through the FTA process, from the Feasibility Analysis, to the Alternatives Analysis, and to the Locally Preferred Alignment -- considering transit modes, alignments, community impacts and benefits -- all with due diligence, transparency, and continuous public input. More than 30 different alignments were comprehensively analyzed, including alignments raised by PAC members and by our consultants as well as other routes suggested by elected officials, staff and community members. The LRT mode was selected in 2007. The alignment (the LPA) was selected in 2009 and was approved in 2010 by all the cities, the county and the Met Council.

As we neared the LRT alignment decision, the County, Minneapolis, St. Louis Park and the railroads began studying freight rail alternatives. There were multiple freight rail studies done by expert consultants between 2008 and 2011, with differing conclusions. While one study recommended co-location as the most viable, all the studies said relocation onto the MN&S was viable and that other options being considered were not. That

included the Midtown Greenway, Highway 169, Chaska Cut-off and a Western Connection through Granite Falls. So those options were then dropped.

And one last point on history - the public has been involved in every aspect of this project from the start, both formally and informally. There were hundreds of residents from all along the corridor who provided input over the past decade, who served on the CAC and the BAC, testified at scoping meetings and public hearings, organized neighborhood meetings, called and emailed. But I want to particularly acknowledge four residents who have put in tremendous amounts of time over the past decade studying this project, informing and engaging others in ways that were respectful and mostly fair...Bill James, Jeanette Colby, Vida Ditter, and Art Higginbotham. And I want to thank the Business Chambers, particularly the Minneapolis Chamber and Twin West, for being strong partners, advocating for transit for our region and for SW LRT.

As to today's decision: The shallow tunnels – while much work has been done, we don't yet have complete information on the environmental impacts and mitigation measures.

I worry that the money won't be there, that there will be surprises along the way, that the bike trail will be moved or both LRT and freight will be left at-grade. That would not be fairly sharing the burdens. That would be asking Minneapolis to accept a host of negative impacts.

I am disappointed that a viable relocation solution is not before us, and I remain doubtful that Brunswick Central is the best we can do. Numerous experts over the years offered less intrusive alternatives, but those options all vanished somehow. We have time to consult with another freight expert and I believe we should.

And, by the way, selecting co-location provides no mechanism to correct the problems with freight rail that exist in St. Louis Park today. Those trains running on old tracks by the high school, where trains have been running since 1915, they're not going away and could well increase over time. No one's going to mitigate these impacts. Relocation would have.

But I believe that we have identified the right Southwest LRT alignment. It meets our purpose and needs statement – to improve access to jobs and community connections, to provide a cost-effective and efficient travel option that attracts new riders, and that supports public and private economic development.

We need a comprehensive transit system in the Twin Cities and Southwest is a critical part of that system. It would be irresponsible to walk away from it now. Besides, I don't think my kids would ever forgive me and that's really what it's all about – the next generation.

So, I'm going to support this Resolution today, but I still have questions and concerns, as I've indicated, and I expect more analysis and more answers before this comes to the County Board for a formal vote.

Council Member Cheryl Youakim gave a statement:

Thank you to the SWCMC members for understanding Hopkins concerns and the location of the OMF and to the project office for continuing to work with our city staff to find ways to replace tax base loss and expect a memorandum of understanding to be worked out before the municipal consent process is complete.

Mr. Bill James provided comments from the Business Advisory Committee (BAC). The BAC remains strong advocates of the SWLRT program and regarding the 100 year opportunity for significant economic development, job growth, and effective transit in the corridor. Both Minneapolis regional and St. Paul Chamber of Commerce has sent a letter supporting the Shallow Tunnel option, the Methodist Hospital route, and opportunity to revisit and add on to the Eden Prairie Mitchell extension in the future. The letter was also sent to the City of Minneapolis leadership.

Council Member Jake Spano gave a statement:

The Met Council staff presented a solution that addressed the freight rail issue and eliminated the taking of property in Minneapolis and St. Louis Park, in further establishing a permanent home for the trails in Kenilworth Corridor and replacing a lot of the landscaping in that area to enhance the beautification. Most significantly in front of us, places more than 200 LRT trains a day underground for the majority of the corridor instead of alongside trails and homes. The plan does this at a cost savings over the proposed reroute through St. Louis Park that was not only detrimental to our community, but raised issues with equity. Not everyone gets what they want, this entire region wins. This is a solution and it is the best alternative and option for recommendation and St. Louis Park supports this plan.

Commissioner Lisa Weik said the Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB) has had an informational and informal review on the project scope and costs, but that CTIB is not giving any approval of a specific grant amount or a final funding commitment to the project. Those votes have not yet been taken by CTIB.

Commissioner McLaughlin gave a statement:

This will be the third LRT line in the region, the fourth modern rail line in the region, the fifth modern transitway in the region and others are in the works. We are building a system. It was 1998, when the legislature gave the green light for \$40 million for Hiawatha and before that we were spinning our wheels. We can continue to create this great transit system, protect the trails and green space, and strengthen our economic competitiveness as a region. I will ask our cities to step back and take a hard look at this and how it works. I ask them to commit to supporting this \$1.5 Billion project in our region. This project will benefit the cities and the region.

Mayor Hovland gave a statement:

I think about the decisions we have to make in a relentlessly changing world and feel we have been working for the betterment of every community along this line and the region. We have worked hard to be sensitive to the communities, although there will be some impacts, I think five years from now if we choose the Kenilworth Corridor as the location for LRT, life will be pretty normal again. If we do not maintain that regional cooperation, communities may start to polarize and engage in activity that is not in the best interest for the region and could affect jobs and tax base. This process has been linear, logical, thoughtful, and inclusive and I am proud of this process and the guidance SWCMC and SPO has given to reach a point of recommendation to the Met Council. Meets budget and provides a benefit for people. I support this motion. It is not about getting from Eden Prairie to Minneapolis, it is about getting from Eden Prairie to St. Paul and all other cities in between. It will make our region grow and prosper and it is extraordinarily important we proceed with this project with a unified approach.

Mayor Tyra-Lukens gave a statement:

I have been working on this since 2002 and the wonderful thing about the SWCMC is that we have not lost sight of the fact that we are doing this for the residents of our region. We are working hard to improve their transportation options to get them to jobs, homes, doctor appointments, shopping, and facilities. I really respect the SWCMC for keeping that in mind foremost.

Mayor R.T. Rybak gave a statement:

As one of the strongest supporters of the Southwest Corridor LRT line in the state, this is a day I have looked forward to for many years. It is especially significant to be here with some of my fellow mayors: we have worked hard to pass transportation amendments, elect people who will fight for transit and make the case to everyone that our region needs to invest more in alternatives to congested freeways.

In every way possible, I want to be able to join you today in a unanimous alignment vote, but, sadly, I cannot do that. I will be voting “no” today, but intend it to a constructive no from someone who will stay at the table and continue to do what we can to get this line built right.

I have said that I would be willing to take a tough vote for my city if the key questions we had were answered, and if all other options had been exhausted. I am voting no because questions do remain and I do not feel we have completely exhausted alternatives.

The concerns that remain have been outlined in depth by me and my representative at this committee. As mayor of the City of Lakes, one of my and my city’s most important concerns is that with this project, we are proposing to build tunnels in the middle of a sensitive wetland without proper assurances that it will not impact the water in the Chain of Lakes, which surrounds this piece of land in almost all directions.

A second, extremely important remaining concern is whether promises made on mitigation can be kept. If tunnels are proposed, we cannot see that promise value-engineered away at a later date. I do not feel we have that assurance yet.

I also cannot yet tell my constituents that this alignment is necessary because all other options have been exhausted. We were promised three weeks ago that there would be one more hard look at options for relocating freight, but when the selected firm withdrew, there was not an attempt to find another. Making a commitment one week, then withdrawing it one week later, is not going to help build the trust we will need in my community, or any community along this line.

I fully understand that the staff and many of you on the committee have already concluded that there is no other way to get the railroads to explore options. I understand, but I disagree.

While the railroads clearly have significant rights, it sounds a lot to me and to my constituents what we were often told about our challenges with the airport. If we had accepted what we had been told in that case — that airports and the FAA can make and break promises without any recourse — we would never have fought for and won airplane-noise protection for about 10,000 homes in Minneapolis. I cannot say confidently that in this case we will get the railroads to be more flexible, but I do feel we owe it to those we represent to fight hard. This is important because I feel that Minneapolis and St. Louis Park are in untenable positions because the railroads have taken the untenable position that they would not negotiate. I know St. Louis Park well: my first job was as editor of the St. Louis Park *Sun*, and having spent a lot of time in the area that would be affected, I do not think it would be right to have an alignment with massive berms through the city. I do feel, however, that if the railroads were more flexible, we could have a better option on the table to put against Kenilworth. I have spoken with many of you on this committee and I am very convinced that this is a group of individuals with good motives. We simply see this situation differently.

I also want to say how much I respect those who have raised concerns about this alignment. There are those who have made irrational statements, but the overwhelming majority of those who have questioned this alignment have been transit advocates who want their questions answered and other options exhausted. Their name says it: they just want LRT Done Right.

We will now enter the municipal-approval process. I cannot predict how this will fare at Minneapolis City Hall but I will stay at the table, try to get our concerns fully addressed and our questions answered, and try to assure my constituents that we have exhausted other options. If so, am prepared to vote yes and be a strong champion. I just want to see LRT done right.

Commissioner Callison gave a statement:

When I hear LRT Done Right, I have to think LRT Not Done At All, because we are reaching the point where to move this project forward we have to face the difficult decisions that lie before us. Commissioner Dorfman provided a good history and everybody made the best decision they could at each step along the way. We have



worked hard as a group to deal with these issues. My personal preference would not be Shallow Tunnel, and then I did not think we would talk about a Shallow Tunnel in the north end. I thought that corridor is wide-open there is not a lot of residents that surely here we can do something else. We listened and continued to find a way to work this out and we slowly began to gravitate toward the idea that we were going to spend a lot of money to put that corridor back the way it is today. Today it has a bike and pedestrian path with freight and when this is done it we will have a region that is stronger, because we have recognized that we are more than just individual cities, that we are bound together and that we all will do well when we recognize the needs of everyone. At the hearings some time ago, the folks in north Minneapolis who came out and said to us we are excited about this and we want to get to jobs and educational opportunities. The development opportunities along this line and Minneapolis are important and I do not want to see us sacrifice that. We have wrestled with the railroad issue and began to recognize that our options are more limited than we want. This is good for the Minneapolis and the region. We need to move SWLRT forward.

Chair Haigh gave a statement:

I want to thank all the SWCMC members and SPO staff for their work and the many hours that the citizens have put in on this project. I assure the citizens that the work does continue and there will be many opportunities for citizen input. We will continue to have a lot of good work on the SWCMC as we move forward. This is really still the beginning of the process and appreciate people's desire to get to the end. As a reminder, it was a little over a year ago that the White House designated this project as a project of national significance. That is how important it is. The opportunity to have a federal partner invest \$750 million into this region to advance economic growth and development and connect people to jobs is an extraordinary opportunity. I appreciate that the policy makers are recommending the policy decision. We all care about the quality of the lakes and the opportunity for people to continue to use this wonderful bike and pedestrian quarter, which is an asset to the whole region. We all recognize the engineers have done a lot of good work to get us to point, but as policy leaders it is our opportunity to advance this project.

Chair Haigh called for support of the main motion. Mayor R.T. Rybak opposed with all others in favor. Chair Haigh and Council Member Jim Brimeyer did not vote. The main motion carried. This will now be advanced to the Met Council.

For next steps, there will be an open house on October 10, 2013 that will be held at the Kenwood Community Center. A Transportation Committee meeting will be held on October, 14, 2013, where testimony will be taken. Then, the full Council meeting will be on October 16, 2013. Also, the cities and county will hold open houses as part of the municipal consent process.

The meeting adjourned at 11:27am.

Respectfully submitted,  
Lynne Hahne, Recording Secretary