

**Southwest Light Rail Transitway (SWLRT)
Community Advisory Committee Meeting
September 26, 2013
St. Louis Park Recreation Center
3700 Monterey Drive
St. Louis Park, MN 55426
6:00 PM – 7:30 PM**

CAC Members and Alternates: Art Higinbotham, Asad Aliweyd, B. Aaron Parker, Bill James, Bob Aderhold, Bob Tift, David Greene, Donald Eyberg, Elizabeth Ryan, Jeanette Colby, Jennifer Munt, John Erickson, Kandi Arries, Kelly Nelson, Linnea Sodergren, Rolf Peterson, Steve Cramer, Vicki Moore, Vida Ditter, Claudia Johnston-Madison, Ed Ferlauto, Jami LaPray, Kathryn Kottke, Sue Brown, Timothy Brausen

Agency Staff and Guests: Craig Lamothe, Robin Caufman, Sam O’Connell, Sophia Ginis, Daren Nyquist, Dan Pfeiffer, Mark Fuhrmann, Kerri Pearce Ruch, Meg McMonigal, Tani Mahtani

1. Welcome and Introductions

Council Member Munt opens the meeting at 6:08 p.m. Agenda changed to move Project Development Update before the Hennepin County Works Update. The agenda approved as changed. Introductions of members followed. Approval of meeting minutes for June 6, June 27, and July 25 for discussion

Kathryn Kottke asked that the minutes for the July 25 meeting, page 15, number 21 be amended to read “Kathryn Kottke- what were the criteria for eliminating the four at-grade co-location options?” then “Jim Alexander- Minneapolis expressed a strong desire that co-location at-grade be removed from consideration”. Timothy Brausen indicated that he attended the July 25 meeting.

Jeanette Colby remarked she received the minutes yesterday afternoon and was not able to review them and I’m sure many people at the table who have other jobs and responsibilities did not have a chance to review them, so will vote no to approve the minutes.

Council Member Munt asked if the CAC accept the changes made tonight, and post as draft and we will approve next month. The motion passed.

2. Project Development Update

Craig Lamonthe (Deputy Project Director) reviewed the ridership refresh, why ridership forecasts change, and future ridership forecasts.

Bill James asked if the physical characteristics and operational characteristics on the alignment with Mitchell at the end of the line and Eden Prairie comp plan alignment. Craig Lamothe responded the refresh is same as LPA with only two changes; consolidated park & ride from 15 stations to 10 stations,

and an updated feeder bus network. John Erickson asked if based on the park & ride experience of Hiawatha is it pretty reliable about the accuracy of the forecasts. Craig Lamothe state the regional travel demand model is good for certain things, getting down to a station by station assessment of park & rides is not necessarily one of the things it is good at. Subsequently, in 2005, the council developed a park & ride demand model to look at the station by station need.

Jeanette Colby asked if ridership estimates by station for this new number or model. The analysis in DEIS in terms of new riders and trips replaced still good data, how is that dealt with. Craig Lamothe responded that the SPO has not released the station by station for the LPA refresh because we know that these will not be the numbers used because of all of the changes in the project. Because of all the changes in the variable data going into the model, it is very difficult to compare station by station numbers. The LPA refresh was an exercise to refresh the old numbers. The intent would be when we have the new project ridership numbers would be released.

Jeanette Colby asked if the SPO will stay with the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) numbers for now, the analysis about how many new riders to transit and how many vehicle trips will be replaced. Craig Lamothe responded the data that is in the (DEIS) matches the LPA. In the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) will have the numbers representing the new project. The official ridership number is the DEIS number until FTA approves our entry into engineering with new project scope.

Asad Aliweyd asked about the Eden Prairie Town Center Alignment has three options, has it been determined; Council Member Munt replied we will talk more about the Eden Prairie alignment a little later in the presentation. Council Member Munt stated that she thinks that the stronger ridership is really good news. It reflects is job growth, more residential development, and a stronger economy. Council Member Munt stated she went to Mayor Rybak's state of the city address, and what he said is having more transit is key to our continued quality of life because he said that during the last decade Minneapolis' population has been shrinking and it's been growing poorer and the way we are able to support the good quality of life, the parks, the schools, the good libraries with tax base is if we can bring 65,000 more people living in downtown. But they have to come without cars, because if they come with cars it becomes a parking lot. That's a testimonial to how important Southwest LRT Transit is. 65,000 more people can live in downtown Minneapolis if they have transit. We are learning the same thing on the Eden Prairie end of the line. When we looked at all of the business permits that were pulled in the year 2012, there were more permits pulled, more job growth, in Eden Prairie than there was in Minneapolis and St. Paul combined. We have a light rail line with two anchors and people wanting to go between those two places. To me, the increased ridership that reflects what the census told us, what the cities development plans told us, is just a testimonial to how important this light rail line is. This also addresses equity, it is about creating communities where everybody has the opportunity to thrive. It is about job growth, residential development and a stronger economy.

B. Aaron Parker stated when we dismantled the street car lines he was three years old, but remembers driving to Minneapolis past a sign that said the population was 465,000 people at some point in the single digits. And we are what, 397,000 now in the city. So what you're saying about the last ten years is correct this is a trend that has been occurring since 1954. This 17 or 18 percent increase in ridership numbers per day that you're talking about, what is the cost-benefit effect that, dollars wise, does that have some effect on investment that can be taken to the bank so to speak, in terms of politically or through the FTA review and what is that? Craig Lamothe replied from the numbers we see in the 17 or 14 percent increase attributed between the LPA and LPA refresh, holding cost constant, we would

become more cost effective because of those additional riders. Obviously the dollars on this project are going up to accommodate the project within the project as well as the other changes, so the cost benefit could be higher or lower, we haven't run what the new ridership numbers are for the new project.

Sam O'Connell shared the latest Corridor Management Committee actions since the Community Advisory Committee last met in July. Included items are; Eden Prairie alignment recommendation on September 4, removal from consideration of the Deep Bore LRT tunnel on September 4, and the recommendation of Operations and Maintenance Facility in Hopkins on September 11.

Asad Aliweyd asked which alignment around the Eden Prairie Town Center was recommended? Sam O'Connell replied the Eden Prairie Comp Plan Alignment to Southwest Station was recommended.

Vicki Moore asked if there is any study to see how many riders will get off the Southwest bus to go onto the LRT and will we need the 900 additional parking spots. Craig Lamothe replied the ridership models have been done which show that, they have a full ramp there now with about 900 spaces and they are full every day. In the models when we introduce LRT there with the bus, that the bus numbers will drop about 45 percent, however, it has recently been in the papers about Southwest Transit, which is an individual operator, has a resolution of support that if LRT is built we need our own separate ramp to serve that station. They are backing that up with a ridership survey they conducted which found that upwards of 80 percent would stay with them even with LRT there. Again, ridership model is one tool, survey is another, saying whose right is a difficult thing.

Jeanette Colby stated that it seems funny that we are spending a lot of public dollars competing with an existing service that people are happy with. Craig Lamothe replied there are benefits to being there together, Southwest Transit provides a local bus service in this area and would need to be the provider that feeds these stations. They make very good connections from this Station to other locations; a technical college, Eden Prairie mall, and other destination locations. Having that there with LRT you do have some synergies there that whether coming on rail to going to rail to get to those destinations.

Vicki Moore asked if Southwest Transit is providing the connectivity in the region from the LRT stations. Craig Lamothe replied that a bus concept plan is being jointly promoted by Metro Transit in the four other communities along this line and Southwest Transit which has jurisdiction locally to provide service to Eden Prairie, Chaska, and Chanhassen. So we will rely on them to feed the five stations in Eden Prairie.

Asad Aliweyd asked how far is the Town Center Station from the mall? Because as we've done workshops in the community we've heard that it should be as close as possible to the mall so people can go shop, and work there. Craig Lamothe replied it was about one mile pedestrian walk from the LPA location, both the Comp Plan and Single Tree alignment improved the walk time as compared to the LPA.

B. Aaron Parker asked is the recommended alignment at grade in the right-of-way or it seems to me that there's a little bit of a hill there, has SPO looked into cost and advantage of actually tunneling under. Craig Lamothe replied the station is at-grade. It rises topographically from Single Tree, staying at-grade we are able to come off structure so we are not crossing the train at-grade across Prairie Center Drive.

Bill James stated the city of Eden Prairie recommended the Comp Plan Alignment to the CMC, and we analyzed that along with Mark's team from a cost and feasibility of engineering perspective and agreed with their assessment and we voted that option forward on behalf of Eden Prairie. With one little detail

that Mitchell Station back to Southwest Station continues engineering work to determine how far that segment will go.

Council Member Munt shared the Comp Plan Alignment is getting the station closure to the town center development that the city envisions. What the city said is that the old alignment is along a frontage road which isn't walkable and this alignment creates a much better opportunity for development and for people to walk up, bike up, and ride up to the train.

Kelly Nelson asked if the long term plan for that area to be walkable, so the system is working with Eden Prairie to create a viable pedestrian crossing on Old Highway 212 and the mall and wondered if Eden Prairie is working on. Council Member Munt stated at the Community Works committee, Eden Prairie discussions there is very much a desire to do that. What we are finding is that people are doing mixed commutes. They want to walk up, bike up, ride up to a station. And they want to make sure that the environment is like that. The problem is that a lot of suburbs have been designed for the automobile and not designed for people. So when you introduce light rail into the mix you've got to do the connectivity. Eden Prairie mall didn't say we want people to walk to us from the train. The good thing is that you've got the station where the city is investing into that environment not where people are walking through a grand parking lot at a mall that didn't want to invest in connectivity.

Kelly Nelson asked if the Eden Prairie Center said that they discourage this, that we don't want people coming from the train. Council Member Munt responded that we heard that from Mall of America before construction of Hiawatha. What were hearing now is a whole lot of people getting off the train going shopping.

Kathryn Kottke shared that she read a this piece from Bruce Hasselbring who is a business owner from the Skunk Hollow area of St. Louis Park and he said that the Met Council has proposed the southern arm a 65 million dollar train ramp and bridge that instead of taking trains north will take trains south. So my question is, will the reroute, if there is a reroute, the southern arm has to be built, will the southern arm be built without the reroute. Craig Lamothe replied the CP Swap and southerly connector are in the shallow tunnel co-location scenario. So, we need to do it for the relocation scenario and for the co-location scenario we are keeping it in our base budget.

Kathryn Kottke asked why isn't that \$65 million dollars reflected in the cost of the Brunswick Central. Because right now it costs 190-200 million dollars but with that southern arm addition it would be \$255-\$265 million. Craig Lamothe replied the \$65 million dollars is part of the \$85-\$90 million dollar common freight rail costs line item, because it is assumed to be done in either one of those options that remain on the table. So it is in the common cost category.

Kathryn Kottke asked if that common cost will include building the berm, putting in new rail, the property takes, etc. Craig Lamothe replied the \$65 million dollars that includes the swap and southerly connector and it includes elements that are common to both freight options primarily west of Louisiana Avenue. Rebuilding the freight bridge over Minnehaha Creek, rebuilding freight bridge over Louisiana Avenue and other elements.

Kathryn Kottke asked if there are the two bridges over Highway 7 and sinking Highway 7 four feet? Craig Lamothe replied no, the elements referred to are part of the Brunswick Central costs. The southerly connector is part of the common freight rail costs because we are proposing to do it in either option.

What you have in each individual option is what is unique to that option and would otherwise not be done if the other option is selected.

Ed Ferlauto asked with regard to the shallow tunnel there are two items which are of concern to Calhoun Isles. It is our understanding that the footings for the tunnel would be within one foot of the garage. Calhoun Isles has been shown drawings with a three foot footing within one foot. What we request is that somebody has to go out there and dig to see whether it is one foot or three feet before you finalize plans for the tunnel. The second item we have concern with is the abandoned property which HCRRA asserts ownership of, we have documentation of easements that were negotiated with the Met Council for the sewer pipe replacement that shows that Calhoun Isles retains ownership of that parcel. I have a copy of an appraisal that indicates Calhoun Isles owns this property.

Council Member Munt asked SPO staff to get back to Ed once we talk with technical staff. Jeanette Colby state that would be good and asked that some questions are hard to answer in the moment and you needed to take some time to answer, if you think there will be a delay in answering can you be clear upfront with how long it will take to answer? Vicki Moore asked that whatever questions are asked here that the answer comes to the rest of us as well.

SPO response to Calhoun Isles Condo Association sent to Ed Ferlauto following this meeting on October 3, 2013:

Dear Ed,

Thank you for being a steward of the community's concerns. In response to the issues you raised at the September 26 CAC meeting, we would like to let you know that the document that you provided was an appraisal done for the Metropolitan Council. The appraisal was done to determine the value of permanent and temporary easements acquired across the Calhoun-Isles Condo parcel (PID 3202924430357) for the sewer pipe replacement project. As we currently understand, the easements that were acquired by the Metropolitan Council were on the north and east sides of the Calhoun-Isles Condo property (by 29th Street and the Midtown Greenway). A graphic is attached for your reference. There is no mention in the appraisal to the strip of land (PID 3202924340078) to the west of the Calhoun-Isles Condo property along the Kenilworth Corridor. The 10 foot swath of land on the Kenilworth Corridor that has been referenced was deeded by the State of Minnesota to the Hennepin County Regional Rail Authority (deed # 669-6611).

You also raised the concern that the parking lot of the Calhoun Isles Condos may have footings that extend one to three feet from the structure. With a shallow tunnel the sheet piling, which would be the outer limits of construction, would be approximately 2.8 feet from the Right of Way line that is adjacent to the parking structure. This measurement is at the narrowest point and is subject to design refinement. The parking structure itself is varying distances from the right of way line but at the closest point is 0.7 feet away.

Presuming that our Council directs the project office to proceed with the shallow LRT tunnel, we hope to continue working with the property owners at the Calhoun Isles Condos to confirm the exact placement of the parking lot structure's footing as we progress the design. We have done survey work in the corridor to establish Right of Way lines and corners of building structures. While we will not be coming to do additional survey along the foundation of the garage in the next couple weeks, we very much hope to continue working with the property owners to do ongoing survey work as we refine

design and develop full construction plans. This distance from an existing structure to new construction is very similar to buildings constructed in a compact urban environment, like you see at the development being constructed just west of the West Lake Station area by Doran Construction. We will be more than willing to help address any concerns as we further develop this project.

Jami LaPray stated that at the open houses in Minneapolis and St. Louis Park, we were told that the four of the six freight options were removed because of things like above grade structures, resident opposition, property takes, and high cost. And, during the July 25th CAC meeting every single St. Louis Park representative asked for the Brunswick Central to be taken off the list because it fit the criteria of all of the others that had been already taken off the list. Since then, I've talked to SPO staff and they also added that the September 2, 2011 letter was one of the reasons why the Brunswick Central was still on the list. She has read that letter 25 times and cannot find in that letter where it states that a St. Louis Park option must be left on the table until the very end and brought the letter with me because I want someone to point that passage out to me because the people of St. Louis Park need to know that the Brunswick Central isn't arbitrary and capricious. It needs to be, we need to have the same criteria applied to St. Louis Park that is being applied to Minneapolis and would like to once again to say that Brunswick Central needs to be off the table. And if not then some other co-location option needs to be on the table because if the shallow tunnel is chosen and the shallow tunnel fails for whatever reason, Brunswick Central must not be the next option. So if someone can show me in this where that is and if they can't I want to see something from the FTA that demands that St. Louis Park stays on the table until the bitter end. Mark Fuhrmann replied that he can provide the short answer. It is FTA's expectation, they told us this going into that September 2 letter, and as we meet and converse with them every month when they're on the ground or by telephone, that they wanted to see a full vetting of relocation and co-location option for the decision makers, the Met Council, to make that decision. So, that is what we've committed to FTA and that is what we continue to develop, those two options that you are very familiar with and hopefully in the near future, in the next couple weeks, we'll have a determination from Met Council.

Jami LaPray asked that another co-location option be put back on the table because the way this stands right now, if something happens, St. Louis Park is left in the lurch and that is unacceptable. And there needs to be something else on the table. Did the FTA say that it had to be down to two, she would like to see in writing where the FTA has demanded that, because we heard that from Hennepin County years ago that it was the reason why the reroute was part of anything because the FTA told them, well there was never anything in writing. She would like to see this in writing because otherwise it is just arbitrary. Kathryn Kottke stated she would like to request that too.

Mark Fuhrmann replied that as recently as ten days ago we had a conversation on the phone with FTA administrator about a couple different things with Southwest LRT and one of the lines of conversation we had with Peter Rogoff was regarding the freight rail question. He asked how it was going with it, and Chair Haigh and I reported that we were progressing towards a decision, that the deep bore tunnel had been put off the table for consideration, and here is the key take-away I heard from the administrator was that FTA will continue to monitor but FTA is not going to insert itself in that very important local decision. So all the guidance we have from FTA is they want the full vetting, full airing of relocation co-location option, they're not going to tell us which one, that is a local decision.

Jami LaPray stated she wants to see it in writing that it has to be a full airing because I was referred to the 2011 letter and if it's not in writing, otherwise it's just hearsay. She stated that she doesn't think SPO

is lying, but at the same time she needs to see it to believe it. Mark Fuhrmann replied that he is reporting what he has heard from FTA, the highest official in the land and that he has worked with FTA for 28 years on these projects and will say that they are very reticent to put in writing a position or a suggested position on these sorts of local decisions. They don't want to put themselves between the local decision makers on their views or their perspectives.

Jami LaPray stated that it's convenient to put words in their mouth Mark Fuhrmann stated no, that he is reporting what they said.

Steve Cramer stated that it is an unfair statement for to say what staff is reporting to us is hearsay or putting words in somebody's mouth, having served in public sector positions for many years and interacted with a lot of professionals and political people in Washington who across the board are reticent, as Mark suggested, to get involved in local decision making but want to understand what the full range of analysis and inspiration is. So as one person here, he stated what was stated to staff is unfair.

Jami LaPray state she has been lied to so many times by Hennepin County.

Tim Brausen suggested there be a full and public process vetting of the St. Louis Park option and it's been universal resistance from the citizens here and a number of people on the Corridor Management Committee and it gets raised and the idea of dropping it as an option gets raised and then the fall back position seems to be you got to have one alternative.

David Greene stated in his opinion, not ISIAH's position, asked why aren't we looking at all at-grade or relocating the bike trail, which is the least expensive option.

Vida Ditter stated she strongly supports of the move to St. Louis Park because that was her understanding. There are people against both options. The one thing she finds objectionable is to talk about it in terms of safety. Safety goes in both directions with that freight line, it goes next to the second, and there are 600,000 rides a year on the Kenilworth. That is an alternative transportation route. She wishes people referred to it that way instead of it's my back yard or it's my this that or the other, the rich people this that or the other. It is an alternative transportation that carries 600,000 rides a year. Those are people who would otherwise be using cars, cars that sit on the highways, cars that clog up the roads, cars that smell and everything into the air. I would think you would have some sense in that area for making sure that the Kenilworth and it's 600,000 safety, right now it's all off the road, and it's all at-grade and off the road. That's the alternative transportation, yes it is at-grade. The next question that mends up to it is one of the things that was in the Corridor Management, which was the company that was supposed to do the research, I thought they were told, one of the assignments was to look at moving the freight. Everybody agrees that is a horrendous option but they were to look at and see what would happen if they were to clear and come down at-grade building fences and pedestrian walkways across, she has not seen that at all, just because that company is no longer is going to be doing that study, we need to look at that to see what the cost would be in St. Louis Park if we went down to grade and put fencing much like we would do with the shallow tunnel. How much would that save in cost.

Mark Fuhrmann stated that he cannot give a direct answer to the cost estimate question for what we will call the Brunswick Central At-Grade option, that is how we refer to it at the project office, because as we developed that option with all the lines, curves and profiles on the map this last spring and

showed it to city staff and freight rail owners and operators, the freight rail companies rejected it due to safety concerns and grade concerns coming off the bridge down to grade near St. Louis Park football stadium and back up onto existing grades. The grades were too steep for the freight railroads to operate, so we did not develop a cost estimate.

Kandi Arries asked that the relocation requires the \$55 million southern arm at yesterday's CMC meeting, one of the potentials for cost saving with the co-location is to eliminate that \$65 million dollar southern arm. Now could it be possible that the relocation has this hard fixed price tag and the co-location has flexible therefore the best process would be to decide if those cost item reductions are decided, are chosen, if that southern arm is decided to be taken off prior to the freight being discussed. Mark Fuhrmann re-framed the question, so in the event of co-location can the policy makers still take away the southern connection that was the question, if I understood that correctly. Kandi Arries replied yes, it was listed on one of your lists for potential price reductions. Mark Fuhrmann stated the scope reduction and cost reduction, and that discussion and deliberation, hopefully this coming two weeks, that question will have to be discussed and decided in concert with each other, so I don't know if it's going to be relocation or co-location but in the scenario you gave, under a co-location decision then there's a second part of that decision for the policy makers to do the southerly connection or to not do the southerly connection. That is a second decision point for the policy makers in the event of co-location.

Kandi Arries asked is this being discussed in the same dialogue or is freight going to be discussed in one dialogue and then moved on to a different subject, then is the interrelated issue going to be addressed. Mark Fuhrmann replied the staff recommendation, which is not yet put to paper, we're still working through what that is going to look like, we would speak to those as an integrated whole depending on whether the recommendation is relocation or co-location. And that recommendation that we present to CMC next week, per plan, will speak to those.

Claudia Johnston-Madison added a comment about the FTA not wanting to influence the local decision, it seems to her that they are doing that, because they're indicating to SPO and the Chair that they want a co-location and a relocation option on the table and I would venture to say they're absolutely influencing this decision.

Elizabeth Ryan shared that she was so impressed with our last meeting, that you get people who have been working on this for more than ten years, ten years or more, and the letter that was read by the Kenilworth people and the understanding that was reached between St. Louis Park people and thought we can get good results at that meeting and understand in the auspice that happened after this. Elizabeth indicated she had been one of the people that requested the agenda be switched so we could talk first about this out of respect for all the work and the concern people have. The hope was that we would reach more understanding about what happened and where we are now and where we are going. She expresses that as a member of this group she wants an understanding, but the public officials that are here, it's just that, we won't challenge anyone's integrity again. She expressed it's the Chairs' job is to ensure that doesn't happen and if it does to address that immediately. She has been a public official, and have been at board meetings with Mark Fuhrmann, and stated he is the most dedicated person she has ever worked with. The question she asked is the shallow tunnel better than or worse than at-grade, because she knows there was the response to the shallow tunnel was going to be destructive to the green environment, is that from a Kenilworth perspective, a better option than at-grade train and light rail, rather than a shallow tunnel.

Vida Ditter asked about the southern part, are there places where it is too narrow to allow both at-grade, even if you do away with the trail to allow things to move back and forth or the shallow tunnel.

B. Aaron Parker stated he is more concerned about ensuring that we optimize and maximize affordable housing that is able to be built along the railroad line here, but is curious about the financial calculations are you working only with capital costs or are you also considering maintenance costs on this tunnel over the long term considering the soil conditions and the fact of where the water table is and I'm just wondering, you know there is, it seems to me there is a certain monetary consideration for maintenance on a tunnel like that.

Mark Fuhrmann responded we have experience, nine plus years, running our Hiawatha Blue Line tunnel underneath the airport and what I can report and in summary is it does cost more to maintain a subway station, the cost of maintenance for tunnels versus at-grade are not that different and the primary reason for that is in a tunnel, its great in January, there is no snow removal or anything like that sort and the track is pretty much the same whether it is inside in the tunnel or outside in terms of track maintenance, the retaining clip maintenance, needs regular attention. We haven't found a real material maintenance cost difference for track in a tunnel versus outside because there is a material maintenance difference for a subway station versus an at-grade station.

B. Aaron Parker asked if there is no below grade station. Mark Fuhrmann replied under the shallow tunnel option there is not a subway station. B. Aaron Parker asked about under the airport, that's sandy soil except where you're actually cutting through rock. Mar Fuhrmann replied it was a combination of glacial alluvial material and sand stone. B. Aaron Parker asked what you'd be going through here is actually organic material. Mark Fuhrmann replied for the shallow cut tunnel largely that is the case. We'd come from above down thirty feet for the track depth. B. Aaron Parker asked how stabile is that going to be long range. Mark Fuhrmann replied we would engineer it in a way, we did this for the Green Line underneath the Anacostia River in DC, speaking from experience, you stabilize the soils on the perimeter, and we'll do that with sheet piling for construction and then design the walls and the floor and the roof to maintain the integrity of the tunnel. B. Aaron Parker asked if SPO is not concerned. Mark Fuhrmann replied we are not.

Vicki Moore stated the Harrison neighborhood association, we don't have any position on relocation or co-location. Our position is that once a recommendation is made, we are ready to come together and support that recommendation so that the line moves forward period. Her question, mostly to the people of St. Louis Park,; there is the school, the freight tracks and the football field, which came first?

Jami LaPray stated the playground was there and is still there, the tracks would be going through the school playground. Vicki Moore asked were the tracks there, when did the tracks come. Jami LaPray replied they don't exist yet. Vicki Moore asked the tracks right now between the school and the football stadium, when were they there. Kathryn Kottke replied by the high school it's not relevant because that's not on the reroute plan, they're going to build brand new tracks. The train companies can't go through because it's too dangerous and they're going to derail because of the S-curve and that was our contention from the beginning. Vicki Moore asked what was all the discussion at the meeting in St. Louis Park about schools and kids needing to cross. That's what she needs to explain to her neighbors.

Jeanette Colby thanked CAC members for the discussion and suggested Kathryn and Vicki talk offline.

Rolf Peterson asked if Met Council decides to move ahead with the shallow cut tunnel and you enter engineering and somewhere there is a problem. For some reason it doesn't work, I don't know you find plutonium, whatever the reason is, what is the process at that point? Do you automatically go back to the last good plan? Jeanette Colby asked what happens if suddenly you don't have enough funding to do that tunnel? Rolf Peterson stated you wouldn't have the money to do the reroute either. Well just following up on that fear, and quite frankly it's my fear also, is that, but I think the unintended consequences of, if the tunnel can't happen, what is the next plan?

Council Member Munt replied a bait and switch can't happen. If there was that significant of a change to the project, it would require us to go back through municipal consent and work things out. So if the unexpected should happen and you can't afford a tunnel, you can't do a tunnel, whatever, then it would need to go back through the cities and our goal through municipal consent is to work out issues in the cities.

Mark Fuhrmann stated the Madame Chair is correct, if there is a major change to the hypothetical situation you outlined where we encounter plutonium, cesium or something of a radioactive nature that forces us to drop the shallow tunnel, hypothetical, we have to come back and develop what options are available to mitigate the deposit of radioactive cesium or get a different solution for light rail. That is going to take us back to where Chair Munt mentioned, to identify what those options are, I don't believe there is any foregone conclusion that that's option A relocation or option E, G, or F that we looked at earlier in the spring. And in that case, absolutely, we have to submit it back to municipal consent.

Vida Ditter asked about the University with the tunnel, I thought you had to go at ground because you couldn't build a tunnel. Mark Fuhrmann stated the municipal consent approval in the city of Minneapolis and Hennepin County for Green Line Light Rail through the University of Minnesota was at-grade on Washington Avenue. The municipal consent proposal and approval was Washington Avenue at-grade. And that is what's going to open up next summer, Washington Avenue at-grade. It was never a bait and switch.

Kandi Arries stated if SPO answered the second part of the question, do you go back to all the routes that were originally studied or do you go back to the second most studied. Mark Fuhrmann replied we don't know, we are going to go back to looking at, hypothetically, to deal with the radioactive deposit underneath Kenilworth corridor, to fix that isolated situation.

Rolf Peterson as what if we find gold. Mark Fuhrmann replied then the project staff gets a share. But we're going to have to do the evaluation and can't speculate here tonight what that's going to look like.

John Erickson said he was curious as to how the outfit out of Pueblo getting far in the process, takes the time to come here, and go to a meeting, and says they are conflicted. Mark Fuhrmann replied our conversations, staff to staff, SPO to TTCI went well, a number of times before they landed on Monday night was here is what we would envision your scope to look at, a couple, three alignments, and we'll give you a tour when you're here and we'll develop the path and the schedule for your evaluation. And never once, when we outlined that, did they raise the prospect of conflict. As we got three or four hours into the meeting on Tuesday, they asked to talk amongst themselves and the railroads for a couple minutes and when they called us back into the room they said had a conflict of interest.

Kathryn Kottke addressed comments made and agrees that we need to treat each other professionally. There also needs to be some recognition that those of us in St. Louis Park are very, very frustrated about

a bad process. We came out of the project management team of Hennepin County and we were lied to and I think it's very fair to characterize it that way. We were treated very badly, we were asking questions and the person, the woman who was running the show, refused to answer our questions and just said yes. I just want to comment, this for us is a new process, it is hard to get out of that mindset but we do feel that we're not getting heard. We're afraid of not being heard. There is a gentleman from my community, his name is Frank Friedman [sp?] and he wanted to say something tonight and feel obligated to pass this on. There's a group called ground zero coalition and Frank Friedman [sp?] is part of this group and he would like to offer to Minneapolis, our neighbors, that if you do get co-location and if you do lose the trees you were told you would lose, this group would like to offer their services, to come and help you replant some of those trees and it won't be buckthorn, it will be good trees. We wanted to extend that offer of friendship to you.

Jeanette Colby stated that is kind of Frank but would think that would be in the project budget.

David Greene responded that he's been working with a number of these officials and they don't lie. He has heard the three sides say "I've been lied to" and it's just not true. Information becomes available as the engineering proceeds and the decisions have to be made. Nobody is lying and just needed to say that.

Jeanette Colby stated Jami's and Kathryn's frustration is something that's been felt by a lot of people, not just in St. Louis Park but also in Minneapolis. She thinks there are some process issues that have just been mucked. Whether it was deliberate she doesn't think anybody wants to hurt anyone in anyway. In Minneapolis, back in the alternatives analysis, it said the freight rail line needed to be moved to make way for the LRT. That was the basis for the whole project and it went forward, St. Louis Park has said they don't feel they got to have their input on that. Now all of a sudden in Minneapolis, we're saying kind of looks like a bait and switch. She stated she doesn't know if it wasn't intentional, but there are a lot of process issues. Then when small things happen like when something's not right in or someone says something inappropriate or we get reports that Susan Haigh is down at city hall meeting one on one with council people putting pressure on them, then all of us get upset and concerned about the process. We feel whether we are actually lied to or not and agree with you that we are being lied to, there are process issues that cause these feelings to happen and it's our homes, it's our lives, it's our transportation to work. She would like to implore the project office to do what they can to get things in writing when it's possible, make things as clear as possible, and if you don't know something make that clear, when you do know something share it. She understands communication is expensive and time consuming and difficult but it really is critical given the history of this project and the bad feelings that have accumulated.

Vicki Moore stated her neighborhood has had to deal with the Federal Rail Authority and the FTA and there are times when we have felt that we were running into this door, having this door slammed and fortunately we resolved our issues. We came to believe was, correct me if I'm wrong, those two federal agencies don't talk to each other very well. And then there is a whole set of laws and rules and regulations that say the staff from heavy rail don't cooperate with the staff from light rail, and we here on the local level are left with this confusion dealing with people who are withholding information from us, and not giving us information when they have to stay within the scope of the rules and regulations that they operate under. We don't think they usually withhold information and have said this in a number of different forums, the feds really need to fix it. If rail is going to be together whether it is

heavy or light, the two federal agencies have to figure out how to communicate with each other in a much better way so my neighbors aren't fighting with each other.

Council Member Munt stated she has a decision to make on October 9th and has been here with Jeanette chairing this committee since appointed to the Met Council. She has been to community meeting after community meeting, responded to every email received and responded to every phone call I've gotten. What she is hearing has been clear, people in St. Louis Park said don't reroute this train through our community in a way that divides us. What she's heard from Minneapolis is we will not co-locate everything at-grade because it doesn't work. What that says that the Council needs to figure out a way to make a tunnel work and appreciates SPO staff going sleepless nights trying to provide the decision makers with all the information that they feel they need in order to come to a decision about what's best. What she appreciates in this project is that we all have treated each other with respect and that we have always tried to get solutions that will move this project forward. She stated she understands better than anybody is we need to do this with people and not do it to people, because the folks around this table are our future riders and I want to build something that meets your needs. So that's how she's going to make my decision and I want to thank all of our staff who are in this room for working so hard not to sway a decision but to provide all the decision makers with everything they've asked for in order to make the decision. So for example, we heard from folks, tell us this won't hurt the lakes. We go and we find that information. When the elected officials say, tell us we haven't overlooked a decision we made about an alignment, we got that information. It wasn't that Mark Fuhrmann was trying to steer a decision in one way or that Sam was trying to do that, they were trying to help the decision makers make the decision and we're going to do our damndest to do that at the Corridor Management Committee, and at the Met Council on October 9th. What she hopes to report to the Corridor Management Committee is basically what she has shared with you right now; what she's heard is let's figure out how we can make a tunnel work.

Jeanette Colby stated if we are going to talk about that we have a lot more talking to do. Council Member Munt state that's a discussion folks that I think needs to happen. If we are going to do a tunnel, how will we make the tunnel work. Jeanette Colby stated that should that be decided before the Council makes a decision. Shouldn't you have a plan and some specifics about how you'd make it work before you make a decision that it's going to work. Jeanette Colby stated the community does not have a lot of confidence and trust in the process. When you do make a decision a lot of people are going to be very upset, if you get out there and say here's our decision before you know what, how you're going to make it work.

Art Higinbotham stated he came from a Kenilworth litigation fund raising meeting and if everyone put in as much as he did, \$250,000 raised tonight. He hopes St. Louis Park is prepared to do the same in case the Met Council decision comes down to relocate the freight rail. There is a whole step process that attorney Tom Johnson outlined for us tonight where the municipal consent and the response back and forth can take up to a year; we need to get together to come to solutions to satisfy both St. Louis Park and Minneapolis. Deep tunnel came off the table, which would have been a mutually satisfying solution. The cost estimates provided by Mark Fuhrmann was three times what the same length tunnel at the airport cost. In my lengthy dispatches with him, I could not get him to agree realistically that they could not have inflated by that much over a nine year since the tunnel was constructed.

Jeanette Colby stated she thinks we need to trust what, we just talked about Mark's integrity and I believe we need to trust Mark's numbers. He's worked really hard on this.

Art Higinbotham stated Mark told him that he is following FTA guidelines, that is fine but in making the decision at the Met Council level we need to see what actually that would cost. And I appeal that be the basis for the decision. Likely, on the ridership, when the ridership was increased from thirty thousand to thirty-four to thirty-six thousand it was an increase over a very questionable base. Because Katie Walker did not share the details of base, the numbers went up by fifteen percent even though the population within half a mile along this line, based on the 2010 census went down from 276,000 to 262,000. Those are the commuters that will ride the train, not soccer moms that are taking their kids to a soccer game. So we need realism.

Jeanette Colby shared this is more about trusting the process and trusting the data. There is a basis for not doing that in both St. Louis Park and Minneapolis. We need to wrap up.

Council Member Munt closed the meeting. Hennepin County Works Update was not covered during the meeting. Next CAC meeting is Thursday, November 7, 6:00 PM – 8:30 PM, at the Southwest Project Office.