

**Southwest Light Rail Transitway (SWLRT)
Community Advisory Committee Meeting
November 7, 2013
Southwest Project Office
6465 Wayzata Blvd, Suite 500
St. Louis Park, MN 55426
6:00 PM – 8:30 PM**

CAC Members and Alternates: Ann Beuch, Art Higinbotham, Asad Aliweyd, Barry Schade, Bob Aderhold, Bob Tift, David Greene, Donald Eyberg, Jeanette Colby, Jennifer Munt, John Erickson, Kandi Arries, Kelly Nelson, Linnea Sodergren, Meg Forney, Neil Trembley, Rolf Peterson, Tom Jenny, Vicki Moore, Claudia Johnston-Madison, Ed Ferlauto, Jami LaPray, Kathryn Kottke, Kathy Cobb, Lisa Walker, Timothy Brausen

Agency Staff and Guests: Craig Lamothe, Robin Kaufman, Sam O'Connell, Sophia Ginis, Daren Nyquist, Dan Pfeiffer, Kathryn Hansen, Tani Mahtani, Kevin Locke, Brian Willette, Katie Walker, Thatcher Imboden, Alan Cupp, LaShella Sims, Jeff Strate

1. Welcome and Introductions

Council member Munt opened the meeting. Meeting minutes approved from June 6, June 27, July 25, and September 26 meetings.

2. Transit Oriented Development (TOD) and Joint Development (JD)

Craig Lamothe presented an overview of Transit Oriented Development and the Metropolitan Council's TOD initiative. Kathryn Hansen provided an overview of Joint Development; the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) definition, criteria, what activities are eligible for FTA funding, and examples of Joint Development in the region.

Jeanette Colby asked if the policy is a Southwest Project Office or the whole Met Council? Craig Lamothe answered the whole Met Council.

David Greene asked if the advisory panel, which identifies partners and developers, are there any community positions on this panel. Craig Lamothe answered that it is still a work in progress, and further definition of membership, when it will convene has not been determined. I would guess we're going to try and make it as encompassing as we possibly can within a manageable framework.

Council Member Jennifer Munt stated that the whole idea about TOD is about what the community wants and that the whole underlying presumption about this is that when neighbors get involved in planning their station area that we're there in order to help. She stated, for example, when Anne and the folks at Blake Road had developers approach and say we're really interested in doing something here. It will be the opportunity at the project office to pull Craig, Kathryn and everybody in to say can we rethink where we're positioning the station, can we rethink how we are doing this. And the whole idea is

that the promise of a light rail station is envisioned by a community and that is helpful to developers because then the developers know that there is a vision about what the community wants. They know they aren't forcing something down people's throats. From my perspective, I was a huge proponent of doing the TOD function inside of Metro Transit because, the buck stops with Metro Transit because they're building the light rail line at the project office. And they're the ones who can make sure that development is a before thought not an afterthought. When I worked on the Hiawatha project, I worked on that project for seven years and we did development afterwards and there were so many opportunities that were missed. And there were some opportunities that we seized, for example, if we had followed what the Mall of America and the engineers said, we would have had a station, in order to get to the train you would have had to climb stairs, cross a skyway over lanes and lanes of traffic and you'd land in a parking lot way across the street. That is not rider friendly. And we were able to bring in a guy, GB Arrington, who made sure development happened well in Portland, and when he took a look he said you guys will just kick yourselves if you build it this way. You can have a seamless connection between the light rail station and the Mall of America so that the moment people get off the train they're right into the mall, into the warm entry way. And we were able to rethink it and do it right. That's the idea here, if we're able to the buck stops in the TOD office, then Craig is able say we can still be on time, still be on budget, and still do this right and help you think this through. So if it's a developer that comes, if it's a community that comes, if it's a city or county that comes, we're able to make all of that happen as a before thought not an afterthought. And I think Anne is going to see the benefits based on what your Corridors of Opportunity envisioning happening at your station.

Jeanette Colby asked is the policy related exclusively to transitway projects, are there bus related projects in the pipeline? Craig Lamothe answered it is focused not only on the transitways, rail and bus rapid transit, but all of the transit properties Metro Transit holds throughout the region. It could be an express bus park and ride, it could be other places; wherever you are leveraging off of property or off the capital asset.

Barry Schade asked are highway projects put to the same type of scrutiny in terms of their development impact? Craig Lamothe answered not that he's aware of.

Barry Schade commented that his thought was this demonstrates an anticipated economic benefit for transit but highways we just sort of blindly push on. Craig Lamothe responded that although not being a highway builder he couldn't be able to speak definitively to that, but the FTA is looking for this type of project to do TOD. It is now part of how they evaluate rail projects through the New Starts program. Prior to it, FTA didn't really speak to that or rate/score projects on TOD. Now they do and when SWLRT goes in for the new assessment next year, the project will submit a request to enter the next phase of the project; FTA will be looking for TOD.

Asad Aliweyd asked if the public and private partnerships are non-profits included. Kathryn Hansen replied yes, that would be part of the private. Non-profit entities would be considered a private partner with a public entity.

Barry Schade asked if JD costs become project costs? Part of the 1.5 Billion? Kathryn Hansen replied yes, that is correct. If a budget for a joint development project is ten million dollars, five million would be paid for by the FTA and the other five million would be paid for 30% by CTIB (Counties Transit Improvement Board), 10% State, 10% HCRRA (Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority). There can be additional costs above the ten million dollars to make this happen and that might be covered by a

private entity. But the joint development portion of the project is paid for by the project, it is part of the projects scope and budget.

Council Member Jennifer Munt asked Asad if he is interested in having child care at stations Asad Aliweyd replied yes, New American Academy has entrepreneurship training in child care, restaurants, and ethnic foods along the line. Kathryn Hansen added that one category of JD use is child care and medical uses that are very specific categories that the FTA says they would pay for the shell of a building. So the shell of a daycare center could be financed through the joint development program. So they are very specific about those kinds of things that you can think of that there is more of a social good there and that use. It is also complementary use to the transit rider.

Jeanette Colby asked if there would be different obligations in terms of revenue contribution to the project whether it was a non-profit social kind of good organization? Kathryn Hansen replied absolutely.

Jeanette Colby asked t he FTA funded the shell of the building and LaCrosse put out the RFP, so they funded the build out? Craig Lamothe replied t he developer paid for the build out. FTA will pay for the walls and essentially the sheet rock on the interior main walls but will not subdivide the interior space.

Jeanette Colby stated the developer has that 99-year lease to operate the building. Craig Lamothe stated it comes as a risk to developers but because of all the costs the developer would normally encounter it is worth doing it. For example, if you went out there today not all the retail space is leased out however the transit agency is generating ongoing annual revenue payment from the developer for all that space regardless of whether it is rented out. That is part of the deal.

Council Member Jennifer Munt asked how is it working for people to live above a bus hub. Craig Lamothe replied his understanding is that those were all leased out before they had them completely built. They're all affordable housing; I believe there are 90 units. Kathryn Hansen shared that its 70 rental units on the upper three floors, 34,000 square feet of retail, and the transit station on the ground floor and the second floor has 28,000 square feet of office and parking on the second floor and third floors and the fourth, fifth, and sixth floor are all housing.

Vicki Moore stated she is really I surprised I didn't see Van White on here. The 22 acres surrounding the station are publicly owned, we have a development plan, it's part of the comp plan, it's been rezoned, we have a developer Ryan Companies. If you met with city and county people, who isn't representing us? Kathryn Hansen replied the City of Minneapolis had individuals that have been involved in the project all along through the IRT process and the TSAAP process. Those are SPO's main points of contact. Each one of these station areas have joint development opportunities, have public-private partnership opportunities, have TOD opportunities. What we identified here were those stations that we felt could actually realize something between now and 2017/2018. Ryan development is very involved in the Van White station so you have a very involved developer there; you have a very involved city, extensive comp plan/station area plan. What this project did for Van White was to make sure there was accessibility to the community in terms of the circulation aspect of it, but did not identify right now a specific use that could be completed within the confines of the timeframe of this project. I think that Ryan development would tell you kind of the same thing.

Vicki Moore stated that is not necessarily true. Ryan told the community there is people that are interested in going right now but what is holding it up is quite frankly is SPO. Craig Lamothe stated Van White Station, as well as many of these other stations; SPO believes have TOD opportunities around

them. Joint development is such a small subset of the circle that Kathryn started off with on the first slide. There are a couple things at play here, one of the key pieces, and you say it on the criteria FTA has, joint development has got to generate a revenue stream for the transit agency and that normally is revolved around the property. So take Van White for example, the project is purchasing no property at that location, so we don't have the ability to leverage off of the property. And then normally it is the capital investment of a park and ride that is being leveraged off of. Generating a revenue stream is one of the key ways it makes it into a joint development category. The other piece here, as it relates to the tiers, is with the project is a hyper-quick timeframe. Because one of the strings attached with the feds participating in it, it's got to be put into the environmental process, which means it has to be in the FEIS. Which means we need to have somebody onboard to do this within a matter of months from now. That's why we have the tier 1 and tier 2, usually the tier 2 are because we can't go that quick, whether or not there's a common vision lined up, whether or not there's a willing property owner, or a variety of reasons that the opportunity is there but we can't fit it in with a very tight turn around. To be honest, we're starting behind the curve on joint development on this project because the rule changes just went into effect in April; ideally, future projects are talking about this in the AA [Alternatives Analysis] phase and already have a lot of the ground work laid ahead of time versus reacting to it as we are here.

Vicki Moore stated she can't believe the stations are any further along than the other stations, since somehow been eliminated after working on this for two decades, how can we get back into Tier 1? There are parking lots in the Ryan development, it's not called a park and ride because the City of Minneapolis has an ordinance against park and ride but the office buildings are going to have parking associated with those buildings. It has bike trails associated with those buildings. As I was listening to the criteria I thought we really fit this and I was really shocked quite frankly when I turned the page and didn't see us on the tier 1 list.

Kathryn Hansen replied there are 17 stations and there's only four identified here, and I think Eden Prairie might think the same thing. There was a lot of discussion and talk and I think we need to sit down and talk to you about the process. Vicki Moore stated she will sit down and talk to represented us at these meetings.

Jeanette Colby asked if it was the CPED department the SPO worked with? Kathryn Hansen replied yes. Jeanette Colby asked the name of the staff person. Kathryn Hansen replied Beth Elliott and Dave Frank. Jeanette Colby asked if JD projects are projects the FTA is willing to invest in, so at what point does one of these projects move from Tier 2 to Tier 1? How would they get there? Kathryn Hansen replied when the cities have developer interest, so that's an indication that the market is ripe. The city has visions and has contacts with these individuals and there's a lot of interest in securing something, that's typically when it would move from a Tier 2 to a Tier 1. Now this is a system for the Southwest LRT New Starts project, there are going to be opportunities along this alignment for 20-30 years. So we see Tier 2 opportunities as actually work with us and the TOD office, as that gets up and running, and we work together to make sure the entire transitway is built out to the extent it can be built out with TOD. So, Tier 2 will be working very closely with the TOD office mostly as the market ripens at the various stations.

Craig Lamothe added this about not spreading the peanut butter to thin. We are not going to have joint development opportunities at every station, we need to look at the opportunities that we can move forward with that get the best return on the dollar, it would be nice to be able to do something at every station but the reality is we don't have the capacity to do that. But again, the Tier 2, there's a lot of

potential there, Shady Oak is in that category where we are going to control after the fact, what under a past project like Hiawatha would be 15 acres of remnant parcel. That's also a different perspective here; we don't believe we have any remnant parcels on this project. We don't intend to have a fire sale on the remnant parcels like Hiawatha did. Rather what we're planning to do is hold on to the parcels and working with the local partners to see how can get development in that benefits the local community and also the transit agency leveraging off of the federal asset. In that case, at Shady Oak, the feds have an interest in those 15 acres of land. We may have the ability to leverage off of that and do joint development at a later time.

David Greene asked what stations are in Tier 2? Craig Lamothe replied Shady Oak, Louisiana, and Golden Triangle. David Greene stated that it seems to him it's about who has the money to get things done and to me it sounds like Tier 1 gets the money and Tier 2 and 3 you're out of luck because you're not in the DEIS or FEIS. Kathryn Hansen replied she wouldn't say that, we would say Met Council / MetroTransit is creating a new division here which is the TOD office, well equipped to do TOD and joint development along all of our transitway corridors including BRT and so we're just a little slice of this opportunity here.

David Greene asked on this project, joint development by definition is meeting FTA law because they're putting up money. Kathryn Hansen replied it is part of the definition of the Southwest LRT project. David Greene asked that because the statement about these has to be in the FEIS to be joint development it is only Tier 1. Kathryn Hansen replied out of this pot, there are other pots to pay for TOD. David Greene stated from his experience and observation, the city of Minneapolis frankly doesn't care very much about North Minneapolis. Jeanette Colby asked if we could not make statements like that.

David Greene stated at least on this project, on the Bassett Creek project, so I think there is a great concern about what representation was made in those meetings and are people actually pushing for, you want to talk about impact, the Bassett Creek Valley is a game changer. So it's absolutely shocking to me that Van White wouldn't even be in Tier 2 let alone Tier 1.

Neil Trembley stated he's looking at page ten joint development project goals create an economic benefit and enhance public transportation. I don't know if that is a hierarchy or not, but creates an economic benefit, I just don't know if any place along that line where there is a more need for economic benefit and where people have worked for years to develop a plan. Now I don't know, perhaps Royalston, perhaps Blake, and perhaps West Lake has plans in place, I'm not sure. But it seems to me like, I thought that was part of what this whole thing was about, was not to create a revenue stream for transit but to economically benefit the areas and Minneapolis is one of those areas. I want to say one more thing and this is outside of your scope, but when we sat here two months ago and we went through all the changes, maybe it was three months ago, went through all the changes and where all the dollars will line up, all of the dollars with the exception of the freight rail, which is to be a whole different issue, all of the dollars where it went up were out in the west side. Out west and actually if I remember right there was a cost savings once you got into the city, correct me if I'm wrong, so its, it seems like that's not the situation and that this is not looked at, could be looked at a little different way whether or not there is a revenue stream there for transit.

Craig Lamothe explained the criteria are not weighted. I will tell you that the hardest one to meet is the revenue stream piece and that is very important to FTA. Now the issue of achieving economic development and redevelopment along the line, there are other ways and other tools to do that. Joint development is just one aspect of it and we have to meet all four criteria, and generating a revenue stream to the transit agency is probably the most difficult of the four to meet under the FTA guidance.

SO if we didn't get rid of the park and ride at Penn Station which is what the city desired and the community desired, not having a parking lot on the bluff, we could have leveraged off of the park and ride and potentially done a joint development on the bluff. That would have been a potential there because we would have had controlling property in the park and ride there and we could have leveraged that to generate a revenue stream.

Neil Trembley asked if there a way to see how SPO consider the categories, we have sometimes seen you know this is a strength this is a weakness. I think it would be helpful to find out really truly why is it that Van White Station is not considered even in Tier 2 much less Tier 1 because it may impact how we look at the whole thing.

Vicki Moore stated that Bryn Mawr and Harrison have been strong supporters of Southwest LRT and this alignment for years. But when I go back to my neighborhood and go over this material, I think you've lost us.

Tim Brausen stated TOD goal number three is advance equity by improving multimodal access to opportunity for all. That station seems to be the greatest opportunity to achieve that goal. Where there politics here with Hennepin County wanting to store diesels in that area, the train storage facility for high speed rail, that type of thing

Katie Walker stated she was part of the joint development meetings that occurred and the issue of the proposed rail layover facility at Van White never came into the conversation or discussion. That was not something discussed at those meetings.

Council Member Jennifer Munt stated that as a Met Councilor, especially with respect to Neil, David, and Vicki this Met Council is extremely concerned about equity, in fact if you look at our Thrive 2040 plan process, one of the things we are gearing towards is investing in racially concentrated areas of poverty. And one of the things we see with light rail, it's not just about slapping down tracks and getting people from A to B, it's about making sure we are linking affordable housing with living wage jobs so that we can create opportunity rich communities where everyone has the opportunity to prosper. That is one of our key goals, for me the policy maker; this is the first time that I've seen these tiers. I've been part of the process that they've talked about development of the TOD focus, the TOD policy, I would not say that because Van White isn't on this list that we're walking away from it Vicki. We have many other pools of money that can assist, for example, we this year had established a transit oriented development fund through the Livable Communities Act and we've given that money in order to make those kinds of developments that you envision Vicki. This is not might not be the pot of money in order to make TOD happen and do know that I and the rest of the Met Council really care about equity and we want to put our resources there.

Vicki Moore stated she understands that, but I'm just being really direct, when I go back and share this with my neighbors, I'm really serious, I don't think they will support the project any longer.

Neil Trembley stated it would be nice to find out what the metrics are, because really honestly it would be nice to know if what they're saying is that there is just not the economic development, it's just not going to work there. I know we don't want to hear that but maybe that's, I don't know, that seems to be what they're saying.

Brian Willette asked if the stations are put in Tier 1 and there is a project at another station that meets the criteria could that be considered equal to what is in Tier 1? Kathryn Hansen replied the tier system is

specifically put together for the Southwest LRT New Starts application and funding. So this speaks specifically to that. In terms of other development opportunities, there are limitless opportunities at these stations and each one of this Met Council is interested in TOD in general. I'm speaking real specifically about a real specific FTA program. I think you'll find out that all the effort that's gone on the last two years by Met Council to put together this TOD policy and office and strategic action plan is really going to make a difference on all the alignments including BRT.

Brian Willette stated if there is a project that meets the criteria but not at one of these four stations it's not going to be considered under this program. Council Member Jennifer Munt stated the question this way, if a project that isn't on the list of four presented itself tomorrow and it was ripe and ready to go, could we add a fifth do we have the capacity to do five? Craig Lamothe replied yes. The SPO has a very short time to be able to turn that around. One of the next steps in the process is, we have a process within a process, normally these are easier to do projects because they're one off projects like the example that Kathryn did. This is part of the New Starts project and therefore has to confine with that timeline. We have to put together individual packages that state that we've met each of their criteria, they have a specific submittal they are requesting, we're planning on putting those four, we have between now and maybe Christmas to put those packages together and send those in to FTA. FTA needs to sign off on those before we make our next New Starts submittal in the spring and also proceed forward with the FEIS.

Bob Tift asked if for example whatever criteria you are using to make the decision on this, for some reason Van White wasn't put on the list because they felt that it might not be able to get it ready in time or that might not be able to get the FTA support to build there, if FTA decides against one of those stations, do you still accept the rest of them? Craig Lamothe replied the FTA could decide against all four of those stations and we would have no joint development with the New Starts project on this project. That's a distinct possibility. It's not to say that we won't continue to pursue joint development but it would be outside of the New Starts project.

Asad Aliweyd commented is that for this joint development project eligibility is to make sure that it will create economic benefit? So Van White station is in North Minneapolis and socio-economic areas. I think one of the principles of Southwest LRT project is to create opportunities these types of communities. Craig Lamothe stated Van White scores very well against the first two criteria that were on that slide. I think that the piece we're missing because we are not buying any property what so ever at Van White is I'm not sure how we would generate a revenue stream to qualify for the joint development program.

Vicki Moore asked if SPO has to buy property it is all publicly owned, so isn't it sort of. Craig Lamothe replied it has to be controlled by the federal interest, that's the difference. That's why we're not pursuing at Wooddale. There's a great property right off the platform at Wooddale that is half owned by the city and half owned by the county, that is not a joint development opportunity that is a very good TOD opportunity, but there is no way to generate a revenue stream from doing a joint development at Wooddale.

David Greene asked if retail was able to do that in LaCrosse why wouldn't retail do the same thing at Van White? Craig Lamothe replied the feds owned the property in LaCrosse, they leveraged off of, they bought the city block and that is how they leveraged and were able to ground lease to generate an ongoing revenue payment. Kathryn Hansen added it was the cities; we view the cities as the key element along the alignment. The cities control land use along the alignment. The cities put together

comprehensive plans, the cities have a city council, and the cities have planning commissions, so a lot is generated by the cities. We see ourselves as partners with the cities, first and foremost, to see if the FTA program of joint development might be of assistance in realizing the vision at that station and I think that's a pretty fundamental piece. The other piece is there has to be a transit element associated with that FTA joint development. What is the key transit element associated with that we define for the joint development for the FTA. Those are a couple key things that I think about in looking and the timing of this, can you actually realize that opportunity in the context of a very short timeframe.

Jeanette Colby asked what the timeframe is? Craig Lamothe replied Christmas. Vicki Moore asked if the city have to sign off of these plans your submitting by the end of December while there are still so many things up in the air, the city of Minneapolis? Craig Lamothe said the city has to support it, we will not submit packages that are not supported by the cities.

Meg Forney stated she delighted that we're in Tier 1 but we don't have a clue what type of plan is there, specifically something that's going to appear in 45 days. Jeanette Colby asked Meg and Kathy are on the West Calhoun Neighborhood Association board and they probably should have been involved in some of the discussions as well as Vicki. Kathy Cobb stated we are trying to figure out where something is being squeezed in. Meg Forney stated its fascinating to us, I agree Vicki's is a planned project and I understand you have criteria.

Tom Jenny stated if it wouldn't be possible to maybe come back in a future session and talk about other TOD funding opportunities exist beyond what you've called a very small slice so that hopefully we can come back and find some other mechanism to support all the local development. Vicki Moore stated it's a big project that's necessary; the issue is are we in this project or are we not in this project. Tom Jenny stated there are many opportunities we just need to find the right dance partner for TOD.

Donald Eyberg asked Chair Munt about the Hiawatha line, as he understanding that when they did that line that there were a number of neighborhoods in the city of Minneapolis that were against development around the various nodes or various stations and information I heard was that it had to do with transportation through the neighborhoods, parking in the neighborhoods, noise in the neighborhoods, people from outside the neighborhoods coming into the neighborhoods, et cetera. I think, regardless of the current administration, either state or local, when Hiawatha was done it was basically build the light rail and we're not going to have any real development, in fact a number of parcels were sold off for housing units, suburban type, and single family homes instead of apartment buildings or condos. Would you like to speak to that now or do you want to do it at another time.

Council Member Jennifer Munt replied before she came to work for the Hiawatha light rail project she was the executive director of the Nokomis East Neighborhood Association, which was the neighborhood around the vet's home and the Minnehaha/50th Street station, 46th and 38th by the Cardinal Bar. And the neighborhoods very much wanted development to happen around those stations. Their concern was about people parking at those stations and in the neighborhood so that they could ride the train, their concern was that it would become so overwhelmingly popular that they couldn't park anywhere near their home after light rail came. So we did a lot to address those concerns, but there is a lot of development that is now starting to happen along Hiawatha and the Twin Cities has been chosen for Rail-Volution next year because of the transit oriented development we can show people that's occurred along Hiawatha, that's occurred along Central Corridor and so people see that light rail is like a magnet for development. The neighborhoods were very much engaged in planning for their station areas so that development didn't happen to them it happened with them. So my neighborhood for

example, what we found was we didn't have life cycle housing in our community. When people got older and they couldn't maintain their own home there was nowhere for them to move within the neighborhood. Light rail has given them more life cycle housing in Nokomis East. We created promenades that connected Minnehaha Park with Lake Nokomis so that bicyclists and pedestrians could connect. It's allowed the neighborhoods to guide the development that happened. And our neighborhoods very much wanted that they weren't afraid of that, they felt like the station area planning the city, the county and Met Council worked on cooperatively. Katie and I, we went to meetings at night for three years solid helping communities guide the kind of development and people felt like they were in control of the changes that were coming to their neighborhoods. And that's the same kind of thing we hope to create around our stations here. And you've got to get over the fears, at that time people had never taken a train; they thought that if their kids stepped on the tracks as they crossed the light rail line that they'd be electrocuted. We were able to work with the neighborhoods, you know what we did, we had a truck that had the train horns on it and we would take the truck down Hiawatha so that the neighbors could hear what the train horns would sound like once the train was built. And we were able to find decibel levels that kept people safe and kept neighborhoods livable. We did a whole bunch of things so that people felt like they were helping to shape the changes that were coming to the neighborhood.

Jeanette Colby asked we take that into consideration when you're working on the rest of the work. I'm surprised to hear that none of the neighborhood associations had been involved in, at least being informed of what's going on especially in light of what Jennifer said about working with the neighborhoods. So it would be great as you move forward to do that. I know it takes more time and energy and so for. It seems like it makes a better project as Jennifer has been saying.

Vicki Moore stated the meetings that they were talking about are meetings we asked to attend but we were told that there was not room for us to be there. Jeanette Colby stated that's a pretty big problem.

Vicki Moore stated to make sure that we remember that we all asked as a group to be invited to those meetings but we were told that they were closed meetings and there wasn't enough space for us to even standup. Neil Trembley stated you've got a station there that people around the station don't want; you may want development on that scale that's kind of a flawed process. Jeanette Colby stated hey need to be involved in the discussion, that's point one. Point two is following up on what Neil said is that it sounds like you have some criteria that you've used to rank the projects, I'm sure it's a complex process working with the cities and so forth, but if you could share some of that information about how you decided which would be the best four projects for you and how you're looking at the Tier 2 projects that would be really helpful to the committee as well.

Asad Aliweyd stated the guidelines of this project are to make sure that the social economic to have access to jobs, economic development, and housing. So Van White station is one of the poorest neighborhoods of the fifteen stations so they should have this joint development. Jeanette Colby stated this was surprising information to a lot of us and we appreciate your sharing it. I think we kind of set you up when we jumped in on this discussion about the various projects, so if you have something you would like to say to conclude the presentation. Kathryn Hansen shared for the next CAC meeting we were going to go into more detail about joint development in terms of these specific stations and the opportunities. We can incorporate what you mentioned chair in terms of additional information and background.

3. Hennepin County Community Works- Transit Oriented Development

Katie Walker and Thatcher Imboden presented an overview of Hennepin County Community Works' transit oriented development program and the environmental response fund (ERF) program, home investment partnership program, and the affordable housing incentive financing (AHIS) program.

Jeanette Colby asked if the money that's available through Hennepin County is specifically for things like sidewalks, streetscapes, environmental site prep and that type of thing. It sounds like it's quite different from the money that's available through the FTA joint development type projects, do I understand that correctly? Thatcher Imboden replied yes, my understanding of joint development, and we're still trying to understand it as well, is that joint development could go as far as building a shell of a building but it could go towards site improvements and things that we can pay for. So, joint development comes in all forms, so we can't go as far as building the shell of a building but we can certainly partner, we've partnered with about 90 different partners, on creating development. In North Minneapolis we have the Commons at Penn, we have a number of different projects in North Minneapolis, Five Points, and the plaza there was funded through the TOD program. A number of different things along Penn Avenue

Jeanette Colby asked the money is mostly grants, it's not like the joint development money that we were talking about earlier that needs to create revenue streams. Thatcher Imboden replied the County does not have an interest, some sort of revenue coming back. We do have loans and grants. So were trying to have long term, the real kind of key money which is early when a development opens up, especially if it's affordable housing or things like that, the cash flow is the tightest in the first few years so we're trying to is if we give them a loan is offer that flexibility of a low interest or no interest loan for a certain amount of years then we can get the money back when they don't really need it anymore. So we can get it back out to the community.

4. Project Update and Next Steps

Jim Alexander presented a project update, which included the freight rail relocation analysis scope, water resources evaluation scope, Kenilworth Corridor landscaping/greenscaping analysis, and schedule update.

Freight Rail Relocation Analysis

Rolf Peterson asked about the UTU, what is unique about their plan on the southern end of that. You said something about showing them going through the substation, do they have a way of solving the reverse curves? Jim Alexander replied they do not near as he can tell. There's two letters that came out, I believe a letter on Friday and a clarification letter on Monday back in October that talked about how they were going to make that alignment through there. They didn't really engineer it, they were looking, near as I can tell, to utilize as much of the MN&S of today as possible. Rolf Peterson stated it seemed like they were more unique at the north end of it than the southern end. Jim Alexander replied except for going through the substation, where do you put the substation, you think you have a hard time with freight rail where that's going to go, substations are just as difficult.

Kathryn Kottke stated she has a comment and two questions. My comment is it seems like consistently this freight issue, which could potential stop this entire project is getting left last and I would like that not to happen anymore. And my two questions are; will the criteria for eliminating the at-grade co-location option ever be applied to the reroute options and I suspect the answer is no and I'm wondering why not? Jim Alexander replied a response to your first comment is that from my perspective freight rail

has really been front and center on this project. We've been trying to get this resolved, it's been one of the big three issues. Really we've been putting a lot of effort into this thing trying to get it resolved. The second piece is as I spoke earlier, we made a recommendation to move through the Kenilworth Corridor in a shallow LRT tunnel. And there are policy makers that have said project office you need to take a fresh look at relocate. So we've come up with a solution for how this would work and we've specifically been asked to look at relocate alternatives for that freight rail. So that's what our assignment is and that's where we're heading with this scope of work.

Kathryn Kottke asked if freight is relocated is there still going to be a shallow tunnel for LRT or is that then going to move to be at-grade. Jim Alexander replied we've always presumed at the project office that if we had freight elsewhere we would have LRT at-grade going through the Kenilworth Corridor.

Jeanette Colby stated the design that was originally was a trench underneath Cedar Lake Parkway, that was not a tunnel but that was what you first put out, the LRT going under Cedar Lake Parkway. Jim Alexander replied y, when we were looking at a relocation scenario; I have to get back to my summer timeframe. I believe the DEIS had a bridge for that configuration and we actually came up with a design that would have gone under, I really didn't consider that part of the tunnel through the whole corridor but that was part, that was an option we looked at, that both the trail and LRT could go under the parkway.

Jami LaPray asked Chair Munt, in terms of the Met Council's approach to this, first of all I have two questions, first of all if it is found that there is no reroute through St. Louis Park that is viable will you finally take us off the list, I have been with this project since the mid-90s and I was just wondering if you'd finally take us off the list this time around

Council Member Jennifer Munt stated she is one of seventeen Council Members so I can't speak for the full council but my understanding in the request for the delay is that we do three things, Minneapolis need assurance that there were no reroute alternatives that were overlooked, for example, some of those options that would allow the train to circumvent the Twin Cities, and to also take a look at the routes we had evaluated. If that shows that the shallow tunnels are the best bet then we have an obligation to do two other things. We need to make sure that the shallow tunnels will not harm our ground water or our lakes and they won't flood the nearby homes. And secondly that the landscaping will be redone with full public involvement. So that's my understanding of how we move forward. We've got folks taking a re-analysis of what we've done making sure we didn't overlook anything. That's my understanding of what happens during these 90 days, long story short, the idea is hire the consultants around Thanksgiving, they do their work in December, then they come back to us with their reports by mid-January, we bring that information here to this body.

Jami LaPray stated if nothing for St. Louis Park is found viable can we be off the list forever and not be bothered again with this reroute option. That's what I would like, will you propose that to the rest of the council, this is just going on to long its becoming ridiculous and my second question has to do with, is kind of a follow up of what Kathryn asked, if a reroute is found in St. Louis Park, will the criteria that has previously been used to eliminate other viable routes be applied to whatever if found is St. Louis Park because if that is not the case then the decision or a decision to go with the reroute is an arbitrary decision and that is unacceptable to the residents working with Safety in the Park to have to be treated differently than other viable reroutes

Council Member Jennifer Munt replied as a Met Council member want to make sure people can ride this train in 2018. I've heard, I've been to almost all of the community meetings and what I've heard from people, no matter which side of the issue your on its been the same thing, it's been find a solution that doesn't require the taking of homes or properties, find a solution that doesn't harm our environment, find a solution that is not necessarily the cheapest solution but rather the solution that gives us the potential for the most successful light rail line. That's what I'm looking for in the Met Council's solution. And this project is one of the top five in the entire nation; I don't want to lose the opportunity to bring back to Minnesota 750 million dollars of funding for a light rail line. I want to do this in a way that it is welcomed by the communities that we go through. My feeling as a Met Council member is we're trying to build transit for more livable communities. No matter where we go I want the community to own this light rail line and to want to ride it. I don't want to harm people with light rail and part of my frustration with this going on endlessly is that it has led to discussions about we want to turn lakes into swamps, you know we don't want to do that. We've had discussions about how it would be safer to through babies under the tracks, that's not why were planning a light rail line. I want to make sure that we choose an alignment that works well for the communities and that is embraced by the communities, that's why I want a solution sooner rather than later and I want to make sure people can ride a light rail line that they love by the fourth quarter of 2018.

Jami LaPray asked you will apply the criteria that has previously been applied to St. Louis Park so that we can be happy with the light rail line? Jeanette Colby stated she heard Jake Spano saying he was interested in that same thing yesterday at the Corridor Management meeting so I'm sure he'll represent you well in that.

Neil Trembley stated the position of the Cedar Lake Park Association who went to the a meeting at the Bryn Mawr Neighborhood Association and heard our Council Member reiterate the same position that we have, we were told that this that when the LRT came through the Kenilworth Corridor if it came through the Kenilworth Corridor that the freight rail would be rerouted. The LRT they, the combining of the LRT and the freight rail has been a disaster and there should be no reason why it is but it is that is the truth of it. But again we are firm and the city of Minneapolis has, at least at this point, there's been turn over so if you want to roll the dice go ahead, that the freight rail would be rerouted and with the exception of the Cedar Lake Parkway that the train would be at-grade and that continues to be our position and as far as I know it continues to be the Minneapolis position and that's why my understanding is things got changed, the decision that was going to made was put off.

Kandi Arries spoke about the engineering evaluations and scope of the work. I went to the CMC meeting yesterday and I find some of the language to be vague especially when you start talking about professional judgments and looking at significant obstacles to implementation and possible impacts to be taken into consideration. I find that language to be vague and I'd like to request the opportunity to put a list together of harder definitions and criteria to be added or to be taken into consideration. Jim Alexander replied that language so you know came up through discussions with city staff, both St. Louis Park and Minneapolis and Hennepin County was also at the table. And we are looking for a consultant to use, it really, we want someone who is an expert in the field and using their technical judgment looking at technical, looking at safety considerations, looking at operational considerations. And so we came up with that wording to try to identify things like maybe that substation is an obstacle, maybe berms are a significant obstacle. It was kept at that level, if you have some suggestions I would be glad to consider them but I would ask that you get them very soon maybe even, I don't want to rush things, but we're always on challenging timelines on this thing and I know that we've even been advised by Commissioner

Callison that maybe we're going to fast, but we're still trying to abide by what the policy makers have said by the 60-90 days. So if I could get comments by, through Sam, by tomorrow that would be most helpful. Kandi Arries stated she was just thinking that in the spirit of having the best report possible. Jim Alexander replied he's all for hearing what you have.

Water Resources Evaluation

Ed Ferlauto asked will this be done before the supplemental DEIS is issued and is there any coordination with DEIS? Jim Alexander replied this work will be done before the SDEIS is published. I have a schedule slide here that talks about that. This work is kind of a spot analysis of what our design is saying, what we'll do and what is the potential impact. So it is kind of a spot check of what impacts are there. Essentially what the city has requested. Ed Ferlauto asked when will municipal consent, is this between those two, between this and the SDEIS? Jim Alexander replied we have plans for municipal consent, if we get to a spot where there's no other relocate alternatives and we're back to the shallow LRT tunnels we're, the project office is going to, right now we're go back to our council where Council Member Munt resides and ask for concurrence for the project scope and budget like we had done back in October 16th or there about and look to distribute the municipal consent plans, presuming we get approval from the council, and so the consent plans would go out to the communities and that 75 day period would start for the municipal consent approval process.

John Erickson stated he had a conversation with the Park Board and they were going about the business of hiring their own consultant for the water issue, is that still going on and if it is are there going to be two independent people taking a look or is there going to be some joint discussions. Jim Alexander stated he's aware that, through discussions, we developed the scope of work for this piece; we actually had the park board. I would say the park board has been very magnanimous coming to the table because we all know what their resolution says, they're not fully onboard with that shallow tunnel, but as far as staff they're still coming to the table and talking to us and I really appreciate their doing that. They had acknowledged that they are looking to hire Barr[sp], maybe they've already hired them. That actually came up at the CMC yesterday where Commissioner McLaughlin asked whether they're going to be any coordination. I haven't had an opportunity to sit down with Bruce or Jennifer to talk that over and we'd be more than happy to coordinate. We will be asking them to come to the table when we're reviewing all this, we're going to show our cards if you will about what we're coming up with.

Jeanette Colby stated there are many people here who would like it to be completely independent. Jim Alexander explained what we're doing is independent but we're still going to share results to get input from technical staff and share results with this body and the BAC as well. There's still going to be independence, these consultants will be independent of all my consultants over here, we're doing that all separate of their work.

Kathryn Kottke asked is there a similar evaluation being done for the 4F land that the relocation will go over. I never here comment about that 4F land where you're going to join up with BNSF and I know in the DEIS the Army Corps of Engineers talked about it and recommended that the train get co-located with LRT because the 4F land in St. Louis Park is significant? Jim Alexander replied as he spoke earlier, the project office made a recommendation for the shallow tunnels for freight rail to stay within the Kenilworth Corridor. So what were exercised to do, what the city is requesting, they want another check to see, have another consultant look at and see what impacts are resulting for that. It has nothing to do with looking at different freight relocation, it assumes that there is a shallow tunnel and freight up

above and a trail above. And we're looking at the ground water and lake water impacts as a result of that activity.

Jeanette Colby stated she was entrusted to ask you about the scope of the water resources evaluation. Apparently there was a lot of dewatering done in order to build the bridge of the 394 years ago through Bryn Mawr and maybe some of you Bryn Mawr people would know this better than I do. But apparently some of the dewatering impacted the structure of homes so their foundations cracked. And given the proximity to the homes in the Corridor, could that be part of the scope. Jennifer talked about not flooding basements but we also don't want cracking foundations. Jim Alexander stated he agrees and we don't want that. My background is geotechnical engineering so I know a little about that. We are going, we're proposing to use a coffer dam, what is called a coffer dam approach. This is a similar approach if I'm going to build a bridge across a river I need to get an area where I can work in the dry, so I'm going to put sheet piles around that area then take the water out and have that sealed up, so I still have the river water out here but there's no water in here while I'm working. Our proposal is to do just that, to have it celled off so we're preventing ground water from coming in, because we have that concern with the townhomes and the condo silo folks. We don't want the settlement either, that's a huge risk, so we're looking to contain that water. What happened there, more than likely, is they were probably perimeter draining for the construction and that drew the water table down and the soils became weaker and probably caused that collapse, I'm not really familiar with that specific construction.

Jeanette Colby stated you're well aware; Jim Alexander replied our method of construction is to really contain, because there's concern, we don't want to be taking a lot of groundwater out. So in individual areas as we move along we'll have cells for the tunnel.

Jami LaPray stated that she know she can be hard on you but I really do think the work you do is very professional so take this the right way. What if they find that the shallow tunnels won't work and there is no other reroute option, what's the next step? Jim Alexander replied it's a very good question, I don't know if I am prepared to answer that at this moment. We're tasked with these three studies. I personally feel pretty confident with this groundwater piece because we have a competent engineering firm, we have the future permitter of this work, should we go with the shallow tunnel, and in any event their the watershed district and permits throughout the district. Their consultant has looked at this and said that it looks favorable. They're not going to come out and say yeah it looks great go ahead and go for it, but a spot check they don't see any red flags and please proceed. We would be proceeding with things at the table with them and talking about things as we progress design.

Kenilworth Corridor Landscaping/Greenscaping Analysis

Neil Trembley stated at the Bryn Mawr Neighborhood Association meeting two weeks ago Lisa Goodman stated that from what she could tell when that LRT comes out on the north end there is going to be a significant amount of infrastructure there in terms of support for when the tunnel comes out which I think would be part of the landscaping/greenscaping. Is there a way we could see what those entrances, the West Lake people might be interested in finding out what the entrances look like and what the exits in the north look like because I think that's kind of a big piece. Jim Alexander replied as far as those portals where you're coming out. Neil Trembley said you got to come up and you got to go down. Jim Alexander replied I think it would be good to have some visuals so you can see the process. Neil Trembley stated you have to do that at the tunnel right, you've to come up, I mean at the canal, and we'd like to see what those would look like. Jeanette Colby shared probably sooner rather than later,

before the municipal consent process if that's possible. Jim Alexander replied he will show a timeline of what we're proposing and see how that fits in to the schedule slide.

John Erickson stated he understands originally from a conversation I had with the office that in the process of construction and movement of the freight rail if it's still in there and we get to the point where we're building a shallow tunnel that it's going to be moved over to the east side of the corridor, temporarily, the freight. Jim Alexander replied that's incorrect, we actually have a series of slides we, it's even online, where it goes through that cell construction and the first step, I'm talking about between West Lake Street bridge and Cedar Lake Parkway, we have tracks here today and townhomes here, we're going to scoot the tracks over about three feet temporarily. And we're going to do our cell construction, get it all buttoned up and then the tracks are going to go back to pretty much where they are today on that stretch.

John Erickson stated that's his understanding to, my question I asked is a little different, my understanding is that when you put that over temporarily there may be vegetation that is affected because of the temporary nature not because of the permanent. Jim Alexander replied yes, and that will be identified through this process. That question has come up with others.

Schedule Update

Kathryn Kottke asked can the CMC public testimony not be in the middle of the day, not at 10 am. Can that be moved to into the evening so that people who work can attend? Sam O'Connell replied CMC also accommodates some of our business owners so folks can come. The Council meetings do start around 4 or 4:30, so we can make some accommodations to start a little later.

5. Member and Committee Reports/Public Forum

None given

6. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 8:30

Next Meeting: Thursday, December 5, 6:00 – 8:30 PM