

**Meeting of the Southwest Corridor Management Committee
February 5, 2013**

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Susan Haigh called the February 5, 2014 meeting of the Southwest Corridor Management Committee to order at 10:02am at Beth El Synagogue. Chair Haigh asked that committee members introduce themselves, since there are new members.

Chair Haigh made additions to the agenda at the conclusion of the reports:

TC&W response – Mr. Mark Wegner

Mr. Bill James – Update on BAC/CAC Meetings. Mr. James invited Mr. Will Roach to join him.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Haigh presented the December 4, 2013 Southwest Corridor Management Committee meeting minutes for approval. There were no comments or discussion on the minutes and the motion for approval was granted.

3. PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT UPDATE

Mr. Dan Kramer gave an update of the community meetings held in January and the plans for the community meetings that are taking place the week of February 10. We had two community meetings in early January. The objectives were 1) to inform the upcoming reports on water and freight rail – the consultants were present to hear comments and comments from those meetings were passed onto them, and 2) to continue to educate decision makers about community feelings about light rail. We had slightly different formats at each meeting. In Minneapolis we had a series of small table discussions organized around 8 different topics that included freight rail, water resources, greenscaping, tunnels, ridership and alignment. There were then report outs from each table. People also had the opportunity to submit individual comments. In St. Louis Park we treated it as an open community meeting format because there was one predominant issue, freight rail. People were able to share comments and concerns with the officials that were there. We had a good turnout at both meetings from decision makers from a wide variety of levels – Met Council members, local officials, state elected officials, and city officials. There was a high level of frustration in both communities about the topics being discussed and the process by which this has unfolded. There is a profound sense of distrust in both communities, although very little of pitting communities against each other. There was a serious sense of frustration at both meetings and perception that questions are not being answered – they will try to address that at the next round of meetings.

Mr. Kramer referred to the packet he sent CMC members with the top 10 comments or discussions in each community. In Minneapolis the top 3 issues were about the alignment and ridership, shallow tunnels and freight rail. In St. Louis Park it was about the decision making process – freight rail concerns about safety and Kenilworth alternatives. Post meeting we put all the comments, verbatim, on the Met Council website and subsequently the analysis of the comments organized by comment. Evaluations of the meetings were also posted on the website. We have two more meetings scheduled – the first is Monday, Feb. 10 in Minneapolis and the second is Wednesday, Feb. 12. Both will be at different locations, as a result of evaluations received – they will be bigger spaces with more parking. We also have different objectives and a different format for these meetings. The objectives are to share the two reports on water and freight rail and have time for questions and comments on them, and also allow time for questions and comments on other matters that may be of concern, especially those that came up at the previous meetings. To address the perception that questions are not being answered, we will have a panel made up of Met Council members and staff to answer questions. Consultants will also be there. We have designated times for each of the topic areas and an hour of general Q&A for both communities.

Chair Haigh suggested that we will probably need an additional CMC meeting in February to provide more information and hear what occurred at the Town Hall Meetings. We also probably need to extend the period of time that the public has to comment on the draft reports, likely to March 3. They will poll the CMC members to find out when they will get the best attendance in mid-February.

4. PROJECT UPDATE – DRAFT REPORTS

Mr. Jim Alexander said we have three studies that consultants have been working on. Independent consultants have been working on two of them and the project office has been working on the third, the tree inventory. This goes back to October where Governor Dayton and other policymakers said to take a pause and look at a couple of issues. The first is the water resources evaluation – if there is a shallow LRT tunnel in the project scope in the Kenilworth Corridor, then what impacts would there be to the lake waters and ground water in that area. The second issue is freight rail. He introduced Ms. Della Young with Burns & McDonnell who is doing the work for the water resources evaluation. They have created a draft report.

Water Resources Evaluation

Ms. Young gave a presentation on their findings for the shallow LRT tunnel. Burns & McDonnell is an engineering consulting firm that has been around for over 100 years. They have over 4,000 employees and with 70 in Bloomington, MN. Ms. Young showed a map of the corridor and discussed the tunnels proposed. They were hired to conduct an independent engineering evaluation and technical review of water resources in the Kenilworth Corridor. Specifically they were looking at the Basis of Design report completed by the project office. They looked at the communications between the project office and Minnehaha Creek Watershed District. They also looked at the Water Resources Monitoring Plan and the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. Ms. Young discussed the specific issues they were asked to address and gave an overview of the members of the project team. Ms. Young is the Project Manager. Mr. Jeff Thuma, Professional Geologist, was also present at the CMC meeting.

Ms. Young discussed the construction and operations for addressing water resources. She discussed the Water Resources Monitoring Report, which dealt with regulatory requirements for Minnehaha Creek Watershed District, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and the DNR. Burns & McDonnell compiled all this information. They attended meetings for the project, including a kick-off meeting and project meeting with the City of Minneapolis, the Park Board and their consultant, Barr Engineering Co. They attended two Town Hall meetings in Minneapolis and St. Louis Park. She discussed questions about their evaluation that arose from those meetings, looking at potential dewatering impacts specifically as it related to the 1800 West Lake apartment complex, whether or not there would be contamination concerns, how climate change is addressed with design storms, and lastly looking at some decision criteria. They conducted a charrette looking at the

different reports to evaluate specific data and the assumptions that were made and whether or not there was enough evidence to support those findings. Lastly, they documented their findings and those reports were released last week. As Mr. Alexander mentioned, these are draft reports and they are open to comments.

Ms. Young said the first thing looked at was the hydrogeology of the systems. In their review they saw that there was difficulty categorizing the groundwater patterns – their recommendation is adding additional monitoring station piezometers. She discussed the impacts to water level due to pumping or leakage rates. Because of the proposed method being used the groundwater is isolated from the tunnels. It does not include active dewatering like the 1800 West Lake system. The recommendation is to remove the term dewatering from the basis of design report because it presents some confusion. She discussed blockage of groundwater flow. With the proposed tunnel the expectation is that water would be able to get under and around it. She discussed the potential impacts to the Chain of Lakes water budget. There is only a small amount of water that would go into the sanitary sewer system. When that small amount of water comes out and goes into the sanitary sewer system it is lost from going to the Chain of Lakes or to groundwater. Recognizing that sanitary sewer and storm sewer systems are designed for a certain amount of flow, the recommendation is to do a comprehensive capacity analysis for that. She discussed whether there are potential impacts to groundwater flow between the two lakes – from what they could see, no, because the two lakes are equalized by the channel and there are no hydraulic drivers for groundwater flow across the corridor. As it relates to the leakage rate, the proposed construction method should adequately address what’s happening here and it’s reasonable. The recommendation is to clearly state assumptions and address some of the calculation errors we saw.

Ms. Young discussed the reasonability of the storm water infiltration design. The recommendation is that during summer events when we get more rain, have pre-treatment devices in place to pull out any grit or oil and to design the chamber for a bigger storm event.

Ms. Young discussed potential groundwater contamination with chloride – there is salt being used in that corridor and there needs to be care in where that water goes because if it goes into the infiltration chamber there is potential to contaminate groundwater. Also, a Phase I report identified some high risk areas for soil and groundwater contamination. The recommendation is to investigate snow and ice best practices so you don’t have the chloride issue and to conduct a Phase II investigation, which is the next step from the Phase I, to collect data to be able to determine where those potential contaminants are, if any.

Looking at the water resources monitoring program, the recommendation for the initial stage is very preliminary. Additional information would be necessary if we move to another phase. The recommendations would be for construction and sometime in the future while the project is in operation to determine key monitoring location, clearly defined parameters, monitor the infiltration chamber and sample and analyze groundwater in the area.

Ms. Young concluded by saying that as they conducted the Water Resources Evaluation for the shallow tunnel options, they did not identify any fatal flaws.

Chair Haigh asked for questions from the committee. Council Member Jake Spano referred to slide 35 where it says to revise the BODR and remove the term “dewatering” and asked for further explanation. Ms. Young replied that the recommendation is that because this is not an active dewatering situation, where most times you are lowering the water level so that water doesn’t have the potential to come into the area that you’re constructing in, since that’s not there, removing the term is important. In this situation, every time the term dewatering comes up people think about the 1800 West Lake situation and these are two totally different proposed methods.

Mayor Jim Hovland asked Ms. Young to describe how their results compare and contrast with the earlier results lead by the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District. Ms. Young replied that their results are in line with what the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District stated.

Freight Rail Relocation Analysis

Mr. Alexander said they have hired TranSystems and Mr. Jim Terry for the freight rail relocation alternatives analysis. This is an independent study and Mr. Terry has put together a draft report.

Mr. Terry presented a map and an overview of the railroads in the Twin Cities area and western Minnesota. The prime driver is Twin Cities & Western, which is basically three railroads. Mr. Terry described the route. They are a growing railroad and strategically placed. They have recently made some improvements with shuttle train loaders. He gave an overview of freight rail in Minnesota. 30% of the freight tonnage in Minnesota is moved by freight rail. 5% of the nation's freight goes through the Twin Cities – on a national level this is key. Freight rail is economical, safe and efficient. Twin Cities & Western is vital to the economic health of this area. Some changes that are occurring are that the loads are getting heavier, the trains are getting longer, and the locomotives are larger and heavier. The rail industry has had a renaissance in safety enhancements. The purpose of the study was to take a look at all of the reports that had been generated over the years. People were striving for a perfect solution – there is no perfect solution to this problem. TranSystems has 40 offices, 850 employees, and is headquartered in Kansas City. Of the 850 employees about 350 are engineers. Of those engineers, about 160 have railroad experience.

One of the things we need is not to impair the freight operations. The railroads are competitive at times and partners at times. We don't want to impair any of the commercial opportunities for the rail industries. We don't want to delay, if possible, the light rail project – we understand that it's very important to the economy of Hennepin County and the surrounding area. The routes must meet the industry standards and not unduly impact the surrounding communities.

Mr. Terry discussed the screening criteria for the routes. They looked at 9 options. Mr. Terry discussed the options that were eliminated. The Far Western Minnesota Connection (Appleton to Benson) would add about 200 miles to the route and so wouldn't be commercially viable. A similar route, the Western Minnesota Connection (Granite Falls to Willmar) also would add too much cost and make the railroad non-competitive. He discussed the Chaska Cutoff alternative which was ruled out. The Highway 169 Alignment to BNSF would be impractical to put back in service. He discussed the Midtown Corridor – they looked at a couple ways to see if they might make that work but the corridors and connections become difficult to do. They looked at the UTU Route – there would be the same problems as there are with the St. Louis Park northern alignment. He discussed the MN&S South Connection with UP. At the Town Hall meetings they heard from the citizens that safety, particularly the school, was the major issue. In the MN&S South Connection there are steep grades, 8° curves, plus the traffic count on some of the streets are huge. That route would help UP railroad but would put the rest of the railroads at a disadvantage because the TC&W would then have to haul cars an additional 12 miles to get them to the interchange points with the other railroads, so this route was eliminated.

There are 2 routes they think are viable. One is the Kenilworth, which works today but could use some improvements and upgrades. They also looked at the MN&S route in St. Louis Park. One of the chores was to look at the spaghetti bowl mixture of options that were developed over the years. Some were better than others. Some were just not railroad sound. There were some that won't be accepted by the community, such as the one through the football field, or that take a lot of housing. After coming back from the Town Hall meetings, they decided to take a clean sheet of paper and start over and see what they could do realistically. They came up with a different version for the MN&S route in St. Louis Park, the MN&S North. It does have a grade that's much less severe in the loaded direction. They also looked at doing some improvements to the railroad. Mr. Terry said he stated a cost of \$105M without property – he explained that he doesn't know the property values here and the Met Council has the ability to come up with those numbers more accurately. There are also issues

with the Iron Triangle with some property that might be needed to do some drainage or mitigation, and also the issue with the Golden Auto site. He is basing the \$105M cost on the railroad portion, a highway upgrade and some safety upgrades to the railroad. There is not a traffic study in this – he heartily recommends that it be done. The new alignment still goes by the school at the same place. There are about 7 homes that need to be acquired and about the same number of businesses. Mr. Terry discussed safety enhancements for the route. He discussed the costs and what is included or not included.

He discussed the Kenilworth Corridor, which works today. He would recommend some safety enhancements. He is looking only at freight rail. In Kenilworth there is more traffic than in the St. Louis Park area. There are 350 houses on that route which are within 300 feet. He has read that the costs are \$20M - \$300+M depending on what is done.

TC&W Response

Chair Haigh asked Mr. Mark Wegner of TC&W to provide comments. His comments were as follows: I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this group. We are all good people trying to find a way to make the Southwest Light Rail happen. I started at TC&W when it was formed in 1991. We operate from St. Paul out to Milbank, SD. We originally ran on the Midtown Corridor. It was the intention of the planners when TC&W was formed to eventually get us off the Midtown Corridor and at that time the Kenilworth Corridor was identified as the reroute when we were to be taken off the Midtown Corridor. Everybody understands that the intention was for that to be temporary and that we would be relocated out of the Kenilworth Corridor sometime in the future. In 1998 the future was going to be 4 years but nothing happened so we stayed on the Kenilworth. I became president of TC&W in 2007. One of my concerns was that the engineering to get us from our east-west route to the north-south route was going to be difficult because of the infrastructure constraints, particularly the grade differences, the superfund site, Xcel Energy, etc. and so we wanted to fully engage to figure out how we would make this happen. It was difficult, though, because as part of the Southwest project, originally the freight rail relocation was excluded from that because that might sink the project, so it was kind of done separately. None of the studies that came out were working. There were studies done in 2008, there was a different one in 2010. The 2010 one was a regression from the 2008 one and the 2010 one was the one that showed up in the 2012 DEIS. So we commented a lot on the DEIS 2012 relocation plan. Freight rail is like pulling a long chain – when you're pulling a chain the tendency of the tail is to follow where the head of the chain is going, not necessarily the track in which it got there.

In 1998 when we left the 29th Street Corridor and went onto Kenilworth the standard at that time was 54 car unit trains. The industry has changed dramatically since then, primarily driven by BNSF – they came up with the idea of a dedicated train with a dedicated locomotive and 110 cars. The premise is that one location loads the entire train, it's sent out lock stock and barrel to where it's unloaded and then the entire train is brought back to that origin or some other origin. What that does is it makes the asset turn go from 28 days to maybe 7 days. When each locomotive costs \$2.5M and each rail car costs \$100,000, the big railroads really want their assets to turn. So it's in that context that TC&W found themselves in the mid-2000s on the commercial side, that the rail lines around us were installing 110 car facilities and other competition was killing them. We noticed in 2003, 2004 and 2005 our business suffered. They were trucking from our facilities as much as 80-100 miles to these unit facilities. At that point a couple of our elevators got together and developed business plans to put up their own 110 car unit facilities. Both of them opened up a year ago November. They're both state of the art facilities. One is in Brownton, MN – I'm told it costs them \$30M. The other one is in Buffalo Lake, MN – they had an existing facility which they upgraded and it cost them about \$8-10M. Key to both of their investments is TC&W's ability to interchange with BNSF, Union Pacific and Canadian Pacific. It really paid off this last year when Minnesota had a good crop in 2012 and the rest of the country to our south had a very devastated crop, so our corn was being run through St. Paul through the southern and western U.S. with these unit trains. Because of that we have other elevators along our line that are looking to invest in facilities – I know of at least 3. They are all watching – what's going to happen to our future, how are we going to get into the Twin Cities, and will we be able to run those trains safely.

Mr. Wegner discussed their customers. We have 2 canneries, one in Glencoe and one in Arlington which produces canned beans, corn and peas which are shipped all over the nation. They employ many full time and seasonal migrant workers. We represent 2 ethanol plants – 1 in Winthrop and 1 in Granite Falls that employ many full time workers. We deliver their product, ethanol, in unit trains primarily to the New England area. The reason it goes to New England is that ethanol is blended with gasoline to help them meet their clean air standards. Our cooperative grain elevators are in (he listed towns in Minnesota and South Dakota). The trend has been to go with 110 car trains and now they are designing them for 120 car trains. What's driving this is the increased yields in corn and soybeans. A lot of it gets exported to the west coast or gulf coast as quickly as possible. We also represent LG Everist in Ortonville, MN. They are all aware of the competitive rail options that we offer - they are not captive to their large railroad.

In that context I offer this preliminary response to the TranSystems relocation suggestion that was made for our review at 4:00 PM last Thursday, the same day it was announced to everywhere else. We were shown the conceptual design about 2-1/2 weeks prior and we asked for the specific engineering specifications of it, which our engineers got a week ago last Thursday. They are analyzing it. I received a draft report last night. What that draft report basically says is that yes, the TranSystems report has alleviated some of the incoming grades to get up to the MN&S on both ends, but what it hasn't done, and this was in our DEIS comments, is there is still undulation, and that concerns us because the train stretches and bunches as it goes over those, which presents a safety hazard. And particularly with a long train, like an 80+ car train, yes, the distance between the reverse curves has increased and we acknowledge that, however in these long trains that will still pose an issue of the train wanting to come over the rail. Our objective has always been, come up with a safe re-route. When the Met Council took this over last January they had the DEIS plan which we said doesn't work. It took them a couple months to figure out why it doesn't work. They finally came to us and said, if that doesn't work, give us parameters of what will work. So we gave the Met Council the grade and curve information. They took what we gave them – this wasn't an overnight process but a back and forth process - and that led to the high berm option. Why was there a high berm option? Primarily to eliminate the undulation. That by no means is an improvement over our existing operation. When we go through St. Louis Park and into Minneapolis, we're going downhill all the way into downtown Minneapolis. As was mentioned by TransSystems, 80% of our freight is east-bound loaded, so that's significant. Even if we went onto the high berm option, we would be pulling those up that hill every day. However, in the spirit of working to get the Southwest Light Rail project done, we collaborated to come up with a plan that would work from a physics perspective. After last Thursday I felt a little chagrined. I'm grateful that in the newspaper article this morning it was acknowledged that it was a bit premature to say that "yes, a viable alternative has been found." That's to be determined. I asked our engineer last night, after getting his preliminary draft report, the question everybody will want to know - so if what we've been given by TranSystems doesn't work, is there a way to tweak it to make it work? We can't ignore the freight rail lifeline for all the businesses located in (Mr. Wegner listed counties in Minnesota and South Dakota). I want to see the Southwest Light Rail happen – I grew up here, I know the congestion around here, I drive through the Southwest all the time. We want to see it happen, but it has to work for both freight rail and light rail long term.

Mr. Wegner said he appreciates the opportunity to talk to the CMC and thanked Chair Haigh and the CMC.

Chair Haigh then opened the meeting up to discussion and questions from CMC members for Mr. Terry, Mr. Wegner and SPO staff.

Commissioner Matt Look asked Mr. Wegner about the promise of temporary location going through this corridor. Is there some documentation of this? Mr. Wegner replied that he hasn't found any. He wouldn't call it a promise, he would call it an intention. In 1998 we fully expected in 4 years we would get relocated. What was missing was a detailed engineering analysis. What he did find was in 1997 we asked somebody to look at

what it would take to get relocated, on a very preliminary basis. In that report it was noted that engineering will be very difficult. It never came up until the Southwest LRT process started.

Mayor Hovland asked Mr. Wegner if they have analyzed any re-routes beyond the 2-story berms that meet their criteria in being a safe re-route, and what are they? Mr. Wegner replied that TranSystems did a good job of laying out what some of the other safe ones are. A former rail corridor would probably be the next best thing – Midtown Greenway is one and the line adjacent to 169 is one, etc. Beyond that, they haven't found any practical alternative.

Mayor Hovland asked Mr. Terry, with respect to the concern that TC&W engineers have with regard to the undulation issue, reverse curves and the larger unit trains that are subject to these types of problems - early in your presentation you said the railroad industry is an extraordinarily safe industry and with respect to the MN&S North line, even though it passes close to the high school you consider it to be safe. In the universe of accidents that occur in the rail industry, what percent of the time do you have a derailment caused by a unit train starting to undulate because of the reverse curves not being sufficient? Mr. Terry replied that it's very rare. Some of the plans that were presented to Mr. Wegner and his group, he agrees they weren't workable and there wasn't enough tension between the curves. What they basically did is make as much of an improvement as they possibly could without community impacts. TC&W does rail design work for BNSF and Union Pacific and they encounter curves like this all the time. The rail industry has curves and grades like this – they are all within the design standards of the AREMA. We made it even more stringent by putting it in the BNSF standards. TranSystems will work together with TC&W to see if they can come up with something. Mayor Hovland asked Mr. Terry, with respect to the railroad industry, he said that it's a business that's increasing in volume and the trains are getting longer, will the data hold true nationally and be applied to Minnesota? With the 2 viable alternatives are either of those routes better situated to handle either increase volume or increase size of unit trains? Mr. Terry replied that there are some pretty good curves in Kenilworth, too. The two are probably comparable. The MN&S route is slightly longer but the two are similar.

Council Member Cheryl Youakim referred to Mr. Terry's report and extra trackage outside the immediate corridor and asked him to describe where it would be. Mr. Terry replied that a lot of this is double track railroad – they will store cars or switch cars in this area. If light rail uses the Kenilworth Corridor, whether TC&W stays in the Kenilworth Corridor or not, they need the room of the second track. According to his measurements there is 18,000 ft. of storage that TC&W will have to give up – for railroading consideration that needs to be replaced somewhere west of this area. Council Member Youakim asked Mr. Terry what specific area he is talking about. Mr. Terry replied that he isn't talking about a specific area. They don't have the details yet. The capacity needs to be west of Blake Road. Council Member Youakim asked where are they talking about staging trains or lining them up until the CTC system is working? Mr. Terry referred the question to Mr. Wegner – he responded that they didn't learn about the CTC until they met with Mr. Terry so it's a new element they aren't prepared to deal with. He said that hypothetically, they would be waiting eastbound somewhere west of 5th Street in Hopkins. Council Member Youakim asked to clarify that they are talking about stacking 110 unit trains in Hopkins and Minnetonka. Mr. Wegner, replied yes, with the CTC.

Chair Haigh said it's important for the CMC to realize that the report from TranSystems is a proposed alternative, so it doesn't have the same level of engineering as the Kenilworth Corridor. We know we need to do more work to answer this question and other questions.

Commissioner Peter McLaughlin asked Mr. Wegner if their safety concerns are based on the design not meeting the AREMA standards, or is he saying the AREMA standards are inadequate? Mr. Wegner said that if you segment it they meet the AREMA standards. However if you put them in the aggregate and put a 100 ton train on it, the dynamics need to be measured. Commissioner. McLaughlin asked if he is saying that the AREMA standards are inadequate. Mr. Wegner replied that they are a minimum safety standard.

Mayor Terry Schneider asked when they talk about undulations, are they talking about both horizontal and vertical or is one more concerning? Mr. Wegner replied that an engineer could answer that better. From a non-engineer standpoint he would say all of the above.

Council Member Youakim asked about switching and decoupling - are they talking about also doing that in the same area where they would be storing them? Mr. Wegner said that has been an issue since they started. Without knowing how this will land he can't answer that. He said that wherever side tracks are located, there will be switching.

Council Member Spano referred to Mr. Terry's report – it says on p. 20 that TC&W staff have reviewed this concept and concur the geometry's concept is acceptable. Is that accurate? Mr. Terry replied no, it is not accurate and that's on him. They put the wrong railroad down. Mr. Wegner has not concurred with it. Mr. Terry has written him a letter apologizing for that and telling him that it would come out of the draft. Council Member Spano said there are some things in Mr. Terry's report that are encouraging, including a pedestrian overpass that St. Louis Park has advocated for. One of the baseline conclusions is that the existing corridor in Kenilworth works as it is - Mr. Terry responded that it does from a freight rail perspective. Whether it works with light rail is not in his study. Council Member Spano referred to p. 21 of the report where it talks about the Xcel Energy power substation and says the building could be adapted to accommodate a bridge pier. He asked who gave them that understanding? Mr. Terry replied that he didn't have that understanding from a particular person at Xcel. Engineers at TranSystems reviewed this and he believes a meeting with Xcel is in the works. Council Member Spano said there are a number of permitting and engineering challenges in that space and Mr. Terry agreed.

Council Member Spano said that one of the dominant issues is cost – he said that what is in the PowerPoint is not necessarily what he read in the report in terms of what is included. He asked Mr. Terry to clarify how they arrived at those costs. Mr. Terry said that basically the numbers for the inter-guard rail are in the \$105M. The Met Council will apply what they know and come up with a cost.

Chair Haigh said that based on the questions that are being asked she would like to reinstate the Issue Resolution Team so that staff from the cities and county are all involved in understanding and being clear about this alternative. The second thing is that because this is an independent study, we have to go back and take what they have put together and make sure that our approach to doing costs for this project is comparable to what we have done for other parts of the project. The other issue is continuing to get some more specific feedback from TC&W. There are several things that need to happen for the CMC and she doesn't think we want to wait until the first week in March.

Commissioner Jan Callison asked Mr. Wegner if the Kenilworth Corridor could accommodate the larger trains – are there still undulation challenges? Mr. Wegner replied that because it's going downhill pretty much the whole way, it doesn't pose the same bunching issues that you have with going up down. The top of grade currently going east is Highway 100 and then we start going downhill from that point.

Mayor Hovland said that we have engineers for Minneapolis, St. Louis Park, the County, Met Council and TC&W working on this, and it would be helpful to have all the engineering analyses by each entity and the benefits or detriments of the re-routes in a consolidated document. He also suggested that this work should be done here and we should come back to the Met Council with a follow-up recommendation based on the subsequent expert reports provided. Chair Haigh said that to clarify, what we have today with the TranSystems alternative is a concept and not 30% level engineering. We won't get 30% level engineering in two weeks but we can get more information to make sure we're doing compares apples to apples costs and make sure that additional questions that need to be addressed with more engineering are available to the CMC. We want to continue to use the BAC, CAC and CMC in the process.

Mr. Peter Wagenius asked Mr. Terry about the need to potentially remove soils from the Golden Auto Site and how that might be factoring into costs. Mr. Wagenius' understanding is that between county funds, DEED funds and Met Council funds over \$12M of cleanup funds have been put into the Golden Auto site already. He is wondering what's left. Mr. Terry replied that it wasn't part of the freight rail that he looked at it. He has heard about it at community meetings but has not read that report – that's why he was excluding some of those types of costs from the \$105M. Mr. Wagenius said that one of the things he appreciated in Mr. Terry's report is that he said another measure of safety is the number of at-grade crossings. If the TC&W report were rerouted over MN&S North to BNSF with the concept he developed, all 4 of the crossings in Kenilworth, the 2 crossings in Skunk Hollow and 4 of the 6 crossings north of Bass Lake Spur would be eliminated, reducing the number of at-grade crossings from 27 to 17. It seems like that's an important piece of safety that we don't overlook. Another statement Mr. Wagenius appreciated is that we're not yet taking advantage of the best technology that is out there. The report stated that if we used all those in combination we could make this the safest stretch of track in the state. Mr. Wagenius asked if these technologies are already in use and is there any place where they are being used in combination. Mr. Terry replied that they are being used on the larger railroads.

Commissioner Gail Dorfman said they had heard that, particularly with the longer unit trains, most people are putting the locomotive at the front but also at the rear and asked Mr. Wegner if they are doing that. He replied that for some yes and for others no. Lately they have had issues with getting locomotives facing the wrong way for unit trains. If they do it with their own trains they have no way of getting the power back to the other side once they get to St. Paul.

Council Member Youakim thanked the staff for all the work they are doing and knows they can't get us to 30% engineering in 2 weeks. She asked if we will have that before the cities have to vote on Municipal Consent. Chair Haigh replied that when we go out for Municipal Consent with the Project Budget and Scope we would hope we will be close to that on the alternative that's recommended and selected. Council Member Youakim asked what that 30% engineering on this new plan would cost. Chair Haigh said they can't answer that today but hope when we come back in two weeks we will have more information.

Landscaping/Greenscaping Inventory

Mr. Alexander discussed the Landscaping report for the Kenilworth Corridor. The study was done internally by the Southwest Project Office. It looked at a tree inventory through the Kenilworth Corridor. We didn't think about any particular design but looked at what is out there today. This information would be used as we move into design. We identified existing vegetation. The study area is 44 acres and pretty much surrounded by the HCRRA right-of-way and also includes the BNSF right-of-way. The area is from West Lake Station to Penn Station. Of the 44 acres, 75% has some type of vegetation and approximately 25% does not. The 25% is freight track, the trails and paved surfaces. Mr. Alexander discussed a breakdown of the tree inventory.

Mr. Wagenius said inventory is the correct word – it doesn't answer the questions that have been asked by the City of Minneapolis comparing in greater detail how many trees are lost in co-location vs. relocation, which trees and what is replantable or not on top of the shallow tunnel.

Commissioner McLaughlin asked who is mowing the grasses and to what extent it's encroachment on right-of-way that's owned by somebody else. Mr. Alexander said they couldn't answer that today but they can ask around. Commissioner McLaughlin said it's an important distinction to look at.

Chair Haigh asked Mr. Bill James and Mr. Will Roach to give an update from the Joint BAC/CAC meeting on February 3. Mr. James said the independent consultants gave the same presentation they did today. Relative to both alternatives, the general consensus was that are too many unanswered questions to decide anything on a move forward plan by March. They reached that consensus based on the fact that this is a draft report and they didn't see how they could get to a level of understanding in the time left. Met Council and CMC need metrics to define exactly what's viable, similar to Mayor Hovland's request. Traffic studies must be included in all

scenarios. Relative to the TranSystems MN&S North concept, we need better cost estimates including property acquisition costs for both homes and businesses and safety improvements related to that issue. Concerns were raised about the freight re-route for children – for example the tracks are 35 ft. from the school parking lot, and not 125 ft. as was stated in the report. A number of the dimensions in the report need to be further analyzed at a more granular level. As far as input on the Kenilworth Corridor, cost estimates on any rail infrastructure or safety improvements must be included and detailed for review by the committees. Regarding shallow tunnels there was general support for recommendations by Burns McDonnell to protect the lakes' water quality and water level and to consider keeping filtration basins away from the channel.

Mr. Will Roach added that the CAC did have concerns about the re-route details and further analysis to compare the two options. Mr. Roach's perception is that both the CAC and BAC continue to support the Southwest Corridor LRT for regional job growth support, economic development and equity, construction jobs, affordable housing, transit oriented development including some great discussions about Van White, and also supporting the broader integrated transit for the region.

Council Member Spano said before we have Municipal Consent we need to have a level of detail and understanding. His concern is will this group have an opportunity to apply the same amount of rigor to that analysis as we have to the Kenilworth analysis. He raises that issue because if after all the details on cost come in it's comparable or less expensive than the shallow tunnel. Cost has never been the driver for this project. The best regional solution to a regional transit issue has always been our issue. That's why we voted 90 days ago to invest \$160M in Kenwood. If we are shifting our criteria for making that judgment to cost, there are other options that we know are less expensive through the Kenilworth that should also be on the table for discussion. He wants to be sure that before we go to Municipal Consent that we have that discussion.

Chair Haigh said that to clarify, there is a two-fold level of analysis we will have to go through as a CMC. One, after we get more information on this alternative concept we will have to make a recommendation on whether we should go forward to go into Preliminary Engineering on that concept. That would be something she would like to talk about here and ultimately it would be a recommendation and decision of the Council. If we do that, we will have to get into the same level of engineering as we have all along the project.

Commissioner McLaughlin said he disagrees that cost wasn't a factor. The difference between \$160M and \$200M was brought up repeatedly. Commissioner Spano said he didn't mean to infer that cost was never an issue – he was implying that cost wasn't the overriding directive from this group.

Commissioner Callison said that if we're talking about more time we need to have open minds – to have more time and have minds closed to solutions will not be helpful.

Mr. Wagenius said he agrees with the comments by Commissioners McLaughlin and Callison. On behalf of Mayor Betsy Hodges he was in the Kenwood neighborhood making it clear that we were down to a narrower set of choices largely based on costs. They know that he cast the vote by former Mayor R.T. Rybak to take the deep tunnel off the table and cost was the only consideration for taking the deep tunnel off the table. He is prepared to share that bad news.

Mayor Hovland complemented Chair Haigh and her staff. They have worked tirelessly and are relentless in their work effort. He appreciates her idea that we should be working quickly and accurately to get to the next state of decision making.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:03pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Deborah Loring, Recording Secretary