Southwest Light Rail Transitway (SWLRT)
Community Advisory Committee Meeting
May 24, 2016
Southwest Project Office
6465 Wayzata Blvd, Suite 500
St. Louis Park, MN 55426
6:00 PM – 7:30 PM

Meeting Summary

CAC Members/Alternates: Council Member Jennifer Munt (co-chair), Russ Adams (co-chair), Amanda Kappes, David Greene, Mathews Hollinshead, Brian Kirk, Lee Munnich, Andrew Pieper, Jody Strakosch.

Agency Staff and Guests: Nkongo Cigolo, Kersten Elverum (Hopkins), Sarah Ghandour, Sophia Ginis, Joan Hollick, Nani Jacobson, David Lindahl, James Mockovciak, Sam O’Connell.

1. Welcome and Review of Meeting Summary

Co-Chair Russ called the meeting to order at 6:05 PM.

2. Legislative Wrap-Up

Co-Chair Munt provided a summary of the 2016 legislative session outcome as it relates to the Southwest Light Rail Transit Project. Co-Chair Munt conveyed the Metropolitan Council’s Chair Adam Duininck dissatisfaction with the outcome of the 2016 legislative session that resulted in non-allocation of state funding for the SWLRT Project. Co-Chair Munt read Chair Duininck’s statement, which can be found at http://www.metrocouncil.org/About-Us/Who-We-Are/Council-Chair/Previous-Messages/May-2016.aspx.

Co-Chair Munt continued to give a summary of events leading to the non-allotments of SWLRT funds and explained that the transportation and bonding bills were proposed, but they did not meet the requirements that the Governor had set forth. An alternate funding source was included in the bill by the Senate to create the option for Hennepin County Regional Rail Authority (HCRRA) to pay for 20 percent of the local funding pie instead of 10 percent. However, the House adjourned before considering this provision. The governor said he would not call a special session unless a deal is reached before hand.

Questions/Answers

David Greene wondered whether the state regulations prevent counties from funding more than 10 percent local funding share. Legislative approval is necessary for this change to occur. Sam clarified that the Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB) can fund up to 30%.
Jody Strakosch wondered whether the project would not be built if state funding were not secured. Any local funds matching the local contribution is a qualifying local match.

Co-Chair Adams added that while alternatives were being considered Chair Duininck expressed that the right avenue was to go back to the state for 10 percent funding.

Lee Munnich pointed out that while the speaker of the house made a statement about no support for the project, he wanted to reiterate that people along the corridor by large support the project.

3. **FEIS Update**

Nani Jacobson gave a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) update; started by covering the previous studies done on the project at its inception and documented in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Proceeded to explain the design adjustments process implemented as a result of the Supplemental Impact Statement (SEIS).

**Questions/Answers**

Ms. Strakosch wondered whether the US Army Corps of Engineers had reviewed the ground water approach and impacts related to the project. The US Army Corps of Engineers reviewed wetlands impacts; no ground water impacts were identified as part of the project.

Mr. Munnich wondered what the purpose of ringing bells was. It is for safety.

Mr. Greene wondered how the lawsuit would play into the issuance of the Record of Decision (ROD). The judge has not yet made a ruling; the project will have to wait and see what comes out of it.

CO-Chair Munt thanked the team for responding to the comments and preparing the FEIS documents.

4. **Station Design Update**

Sarah Ghandour gave a station design update. Went over the proposed 16 foot-tall wickets (panels with graphic architectural elements for wayfinding) and 28 foot-tall pylons for each station except for the South West Station, which will not have either wayfinding architectural elements as the station is planned to be constructed in a parking ramp.

Co-Chair Adams inquired about the name of the advance design consultant team working on the panels. Julie Stone.

Members also wondered about the lifespan of the panels. They have a 15 year lifespan.

Members inquired whether there was any discussion to bring ethnic reliance into the panel design and to what degree the project worked with local communities to implement the current design. This is not public art; therefore, a public arts’ process was not put in place. However, the project worked with cities along the alignment for their input on the themes.
Mr. Munnich stated that he was not too excited about the Golden Triangle themes.

Mr. Greene stated that he would like to see discussions about local transit and how it connects to the Green line extension. Metro Transit will launch a sector study prior to line opening to assess current corridor connections and work on connection improvements.

5. **Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 7:40 PM. Next meeting scheduled for June 28, 2016, at 6 PM.