

# SWLRT CAC

## ISSUES AND OUTCOMES

### CROSSWALK WITH DEIS

*26 October 2012*

<b>1</b>	<b>Entire Corridor .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Issue: Bike/pedestrian trail.....	1
1.2	Issue: Access to trail .....	2
1.3	Issue: Safety and Crime (?) .....	3
1.4	Issue: Visual and auditory appeal.....	3
1.5	Issue: Construction and Ongoing Impacts.....	7
1.6	Issue: Co-location of Freight Rail.....	8
<b>2</b>	<b>Northwest Corner of Lake Calhoun Area .....</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1	Issue: Access to parks and trails .....	10
2.2	Issue: Loss of Greenspace.....	11
2.3	Issue: Parking.....	11
<b>3</b>	<b>Trail access at Abbott Avenue S. (by new Lake Street Station) ...</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1	Issue: Access to parks and trails .....	11
<b>4</b>	<b>Park Siding Park .....</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1	Issue: Connectivity and accessibility .....	12
4.2	Issue: Safety.....	12
4.3	Issue: Visual appeal .....	13
4.4	Issue: Noise and vibrations.....	13
<b>5</b>	<b>Cedar Lake Parkway and Grand Rounds.....</b>	<b>14</b>
5.1	Issue: Flow and safety on Grand Rounds .....	14
5.2	Issue: Grand Rounds (seeking historic designation).....	15
5.3	Issue: Noise.....	17
5.4	Issue: Visual appeal .....	17
5.5	Issue: Air quality .....	17
<b>6</b>	<b>Kenilworth Channel, bridge.....</b>	<b>18</b>
6.1	Issue: Connectivity and recreational use.....	18
6.2	Issue: Aesthetics, tranquility .....	20
6.3	Issue: Safety.....	20

<b>7</b>	<b>Intersection with 21st Street .....</b>	<b>21</b>
7.1	Issue: Park access and neighborhood connectivity .....	21
7.2	Issue: Safety .....	21
7.3	Issue: Aesthetics, tranquility .....	22
7.4	Issue: Traffic and Parking Congestion .....	22
<b>8</b>	<b>Cedar Lake Trail Junction.....</b>	<b>23</b>
8.1	Issue: Safety .....	23
8.2	Issue: Usage and Access.....	23
8.3	Issue: Connectivity, flow .....	24
8.4	Issue: Environmental protection.....	24
8.5	Issue: Visual and auditory appeal .....	24
<b>9</b>	<b>Bryn Mawr Meadows Park .....</b>	<b>25</b>
9.1	Issue: Connectivity .....	25
9.2	Issue: Safety .....	25
9.3	Issue: Visual appeal.....	26
<b>10</b>	<b>Spring Lake Trail Junction .....</b>	<b>26</b>
10.1	Issue: Safety .....	26
10.2	Issue: Flow.....	26
10.3	Issue: Coordination with Future Development.....	27
<b>11</b>	<b>Linden Avenue (by asphalt and concrete recycling plant) .....</b>	<b>27</b>
11.1	Issue: Environmental protection.....	27
11.2	Issue: Safety .....	28
11.3	Issue: Coordination with Future Development.....	28

**KEY:**

- *Yellow italics*: Question or issue from CAC to MPRB staff
- *(Italics in parentheses)*: Statement or question from CAC member to full CAC, generated during DEIS review process
- *[Gray italics in brackets]*: Question or issue from Jennifer or Anne to CAC members

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
<b>1 Entire Corridor</b>	
<b>1.1 Issue: Bike/pedestrian trail</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.1.1.2 Demographic Forecast Assumptions: The data used during the Southwest Transitway Alternatives Analysis (AA) process were based on the demographic and land use forecasts developed by Metropolitan Council in 2005 as part of its 2030 Regional Development Framework and subsequently revised in 2006 for some selected communities prior to applying it to the AA. (ERROR admitted by Met Council in the 2030 Regional Development Framework Land Use Forecast Question) [Need further discussion of meaning and implications for CAC's work]</li> <li>Table 6.2-4. 2030 Daily Person Trips by Mode LRT Alternatives; see table results (Decrease in auto trips less than 1% - is the construction of LRT about ridership or development. So question is: is intent to develop park lands?) [Need further discussion of meaning and implications for CAC's work]</li> </ul>
<b>1.1.1 Outcome:</b> A bike/pedestrian trail will exist along the corridor by maintaining the existing trail alignment and park-like character of the trails.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.2.2.6 Neighborhoods and community cohesion, page 3-58: "The implementation of LRT service would not sever roadway or driveway connection or remove the existing multiple-use trail adjacent to the proposed guideway alignment of Segment A..." (This statement supports the MPRB desired outcome.)</li> <li>10.5.3.1 Improved Multimodal Environment pg 10-18: Transitway project will improve the existing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure along the alignment, and improve the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists through implemented design guidelines. All pedestrian facilities will be designed in accordance with current design standards and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements to ensure access and mobility for all.</li> </ul>
<b>1.1.2 Outcome:</b> All trail users can safely use the trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10.5.3.1 Improved Multimodal Environment pg 10-18: Transitway project will improve the existing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure along the alignment, and improve the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists through implemented design guidelines. All pedestrian facilities will be designed in accordance with current design standards and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements to ensure access and mobility for all.</li> </ul>
<b>1.1.3 Outcome:</b> The trail is designed to meet the needs of current and projected users. <Tie to current MPRB guidelines and standards, including separating bikes and pedestrians and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9.6.6.3 Anticipated cumulative impacts (p. 9/23) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With or without the Southwest Transitway project, urbanization and population densification in general will increase the use of parks within</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
<p><i>specific widths for each, as well as design speeds.&gt;</i></p>	<p>the Southwest Transitway study area and the region. More demand on parks and recreation facilities is unavoidable. ... The Southwest Transitway's proposed stations...will be part of this trend. ...the existing parks are likely to become more crowded and intensely used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>(This will happen as a result of more people living in the area as well as the ease with which people can travel to the area-- this is a positive impact, no mitigation needed, aside from this being another reason to avoid decreasing trail widths)</i></li> <li>• 10.5.3.1 LRT 3A (LPA) pg 10-18; Positive Effects on Environmental Justice Populations; Increased Transit Service and Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LRT 3A (LPA) will provide benefits to environmental justice populations with an increase in the level of transit service and improved service reliability, with more frequent service and greater transit capacity for riders. Transit access to downtown Minneapolis job opportunities, job centers along the corridor, including the Opus office park and Golden Triangle areas, the University of Minnesota, and regional shopping centers will be significantly improved for environmental justice populations.</li> <li>• <i>(Increase Park accessibility for minority and low income residents. Advocate for inclusion of Penn Station of any stations eliminated be it 21<sup>st</sup> because Penn services this demographics.)</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>1.2 Issue: Access to trail</b></p>	
<p>1.2.1 <b>Outcome:</b> There will be adequate access to the trail from both sides of the LRT track, and access points will be reasonable walking distance apart</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9.6.26.2 Other Transportation Effect, Anticipated indirect effects (p. 9/38): <i>(paraphrase):</i> the stations themselves will be destinations for bikes and peds because the trains will offer them greater mobility over longer distances, so MPRB trails that go by stations may see increased use by people going to/from the stations <i>(this is a positive impact, no mitigation needed, aside from this being another reason to avoid decreasing trail widths)</i></li> <li>• 9.6.9.3 Environmental Justice, Anticipated cumulative impacts (p. 9/26) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>(The DEIS identifies that reasonably foreseeable future actions in the form of future development could result in gentrification by driving up property value, taxes, and rents. The DEIS suggests that local governments and the Met Council seek to guide public and private investments accordingly as</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
	<p><i>part of mitigation referring to Chapter 10, where the word “gentrification” did not appear.)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>(There are two impacts related to MPRB constituents, 1: improved access via transit to park facilities by non-car-owners who are often lower income—a positive impact; 2: decreased access over time to LRT stations and therefore LRT-served destinations, including parks, by low income populations due to gentrification around station areas—a negative impact. The MPRB may want to consider commenting on cooperative rail line marketing to reach potential users of the parks along the line, and to encourage planners to guide new residential developments at/near stations so as to include some percentage of affordable housing.)</i></li> <li><i>6.2.3 pg 6-47: Along each alignment, temporary disruptions to the roadway may be caused by the construction of an at-grade roadway crossing, the construction of a bridge above the roadway (grade separation), or the construction of a tunnel under the roadway. This includes the construction of bridges over I-494, TH 62, and TH 212 in Segment 3, and the construction of a bridge over Excelsior Boulevard in Segment 4. <i>Where on Excelsior? [How does this relate to either Segment A or the CAC’s charge?]</i></i></li> </ul>
<p><b>1.3 Issue: Safety and Crime (?)</b></p>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to better define “safety” along corridor once DEIS is released, including emergency vehicle access to beaches and parks, and trail/park users responding to LRT and crossing impediments with risky behaviors</li> <li>• Concern that access points for emergency vehicles will be compromised by LRT development and operation.</li> <li>• Policing entities in corridor must coordinate to protect park/trail users from criminal activity</li> </ul>	
<p><b>1.4 Issue: Visual and auditory appeal</b></p>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about commercial development in this location that changes its “up north” feel in an attempt to take advantage of</li> </ul>	

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
<p>the higher usage created by the LRT.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about additional noise in the area</li> <li>• Need a vision for the park that includes the rural character of this part of the city.</li> <li>• Concern about vibration.</li> </ul>	
<p>1.4.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Minimize the visual impact of the LRT and related infrastructure on the users of the corridor trail and neighboring park lands</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.6 Visual Quality and Aesthetics: Federal regulations require visual impacts to be addressed for Section 106 (see Section 3.4 and Appendix H for further discussion of visual effects on historic properties) and Section 4(f) properties. There is no specific federal or state visual regulatory requirement that applies to properties that are not listed or eligible for listing on the National Register, or parkland. The interim use trails located on HCRRA property are not considered Section 4(f) properties.</li> <li>• 3.6.3.3 (3-115) Although the segment is located in an existing transportation corridor (Kenilworth Regional Trail), the project would introduce new visual elements—the fixed guideway, including track, catenary poles, and wires—into the area.</li> </ul>
<p>1.4.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Minimize the impacts of vibration on the park user’s experience and/or wildlife habitat during and after construction. <i>[We should probably split this and the next one so they are more distinct – separate: vibration on user’s experience; impact on wildlife and habitat; trail serenity for users]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.1 page 7-2: For parks, recreation areas, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges, a <i>de minimis</i> impact is one that will not adversely affect the features, attributes, or activities qualifying the property for protection under Section 4(f).</li> <li>• 4 Environmental Effects, 4.8 Vibration: There are 124 potential vibration impacts in Segment A [LRT 1A and LRT 3A (LPA)]. Vibration impacts in this segment would be caused by geologic conditions and increased train speeds. Geologic conditions adjacent to Segment A are predominantly characterized as having a high potential for efficient vibration propagation west of Van White Station. East of Van White Station ground adjacent to the rail line is likely to have normal propagation characteristics.</li> <li>• 4.8.6 Mitigation: Detailed vibration analyses will be conducted during the Final EIS in coordination with Preliminary Engineering. The Detailed Vibration Assessment may include performing vibration propagation measurements. These detailed assessments during the Final EIS/preliminary engineering phase have more potential to reduce project-related effects than assessments of mitigation options at the conceptual engineering phase of the project. Potential mitigation measures may include maintenance, planning and design</li> </ul>

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
<p>1.4.3 <b>Outcome:</b> Maintain the natural wildlife habitat and serenity of the trail.</p>	<p>of special trackwork, vehicle specifications, and special track support systems such as resilient fasteners, ballast mats, resiliently supported ties, and floating slabs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.1 page 7-2: For parks, recreation areas, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges, a <i>de minimis</i> impact is one that will not adversely affect the features, attributes, or activities qualifying the property for protection under Section 4(f).</li> <li>• 9.6.16.3 Noise (p. 9-31) “The transitway project will add a new source of noise.”</li> <li>• 9.6.16.4 Mitigation re Noise (p. 9-31) “The project will not mitigate indirect effects or cumulative impacts.”</li> <li>• <i>(MPRB may not need to comment on “indirect” or “cumulative” noise impacts, as these have to do with additional developments over time as opposed to the trains themselves. Direct impacts from the trains may be addressed in other sections.)</i>9.6.7.4 Mitigation re: Visual Quality and Aesthetic (p. 9-25) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Mitigation for direct effects of the transit lines and its stations’ aesthetics will be addressed during Preliminary Engineering and Final Design, which will include discussions with affected communities, resource agencies, and stakeholders.”</li> <li>• <i>(MPRB may want to recommend that the stations that are surrounding by or adjacent to park land have a visual character compatible with natural surroundings, such as nature themed art and views of the park areas, minimizing light pollution at night, and power poles structures and electrical boxes be either as transparent or artful as possible, especially at the 21<sup>st</sup> Street and Penn Ave stations. )</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• 4 Environmental Effects, 4.7 Noise <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• .. The project team performed a Detailed Noise Assessment in accordance with FTA guidelines to assess project-related airborne noise. Analysis results identified the potential noise impacts throughout the project corridor. Noise from bells, horns, wheel squeal, and wheel-rail interaction (wayside noise) contribute to the projected noise impacts. Noise Analysis results determined that all of the proposed project alternatives have potential to cause noise impacts according to the FTA definition.</li> <li>• Table 4.7-1. Summary of Noise-Sensitive Land Uses: number of parcels</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES**

**DEIS CONTENT**

- and units affected
- Table 4.7-2. Sound Exposure Levels used in the Noise Analysis
  - 4.7.3.5 Assessment .... Each representative receptor was assessed for project-related noise and it is compared to the existing noise level. LRT 3A (LPA) and LRT 3A-1 (co-location alternative) include the fewest number of moderate and severe impacts overall.
  - 4.7.3.5 Assessment .....Under Build Alternatives LRT 1A and LRT 3A (LPA) existing TC&W traffic on the Kenilworth Corridor would be relocated to the MN&S Spur. (Freight rail traffic on the spur would be the existing traffic in the Kenilworth corridor with no change in train activity, consist, etc. This makes the analysis consistent with the noise studies for the Kenilworth Corridor.) Due to the relocation noise levels associated with freight rail traffic are anticipated to decrease along portions of Segment 4. Airborne-noise impacts associated with Segment A, with the freight relocation, were calculated based on existing noise exposure, including existing TC&W freight rail traffic and account for the decrease in sound level which would occur due to the absence of freight pass-by events.
    - Category 1: There are no noise impacts to Category 1 land uses in this segment.
    - Category 2: There are a total of 73 Moderate Noise Impacts and 183 Severe Noise Impacts to Category 2 land uses in this segment. The estimated number of impacted residential units is 85 Moderate and 406 Severe. Many of the impacts are due to low existing ambient noise levels combined with proximity of residential neighborhoods to the alignment and high anticipated speeds of operation. Some impacts are due to low existing ambient noise levels combined with light rail vehicle-mounted audible warning signal (bell) use at the 21st Street Station and the nearby 21st Street at-grade crossing.
    - Category 3: There is one moderate impact to a Category 3 land use. The impact is due to very low ambient background noise levels found in the walking-trails of the Cedar Lake portion of the Minneapolis Chain of Lakes Regional Park combined with close proximity to the tracks and bell use at grade crossings and crosswalks. This may not apply to the entire Cedar Lake portion of the park, especially in areas where park-goers themselves create higher noise levels, and in areas

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
	<p>of the park farther from the tracks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.7.6 Long-Term Mitigation: Whether mitigation is warranted is based on the severity of potential impacts. Project noise levels that result in a “Severe Impact” to a receptor pose a compelling need for mitigation. Most of the severe impacts are due to warning signals such as horns and bells near at-grade crossings, crosswalks, and stations. Use of these warning signals is required for safe operation of the LRT system, but, this does not exclude mitigation options for these impacts. Project noise levels which result in a “Moderate Impact” are also largely due to horn and bell use, but typically are farther away than those receptors with a finding of Severe Impact. Most mitigation measures to address the Severe Impacts will also reduce or completely eliminate Moderate Impact findings at many receptors.</li> </ul>
<p><b>1.5 Issue: Construction and Ongoing Impacts</b>  <i>[These should probably be reorganized so that this section addresses ONLY construction-related items and the others move to more specific parts of this doc]</i></p>	
<p>1.5.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Water quality is protected during construction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>[Needs a DEIS reference]</i></li> </ul>
<p>1.5.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Trails stay open during construction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.3.3.1 pg 6-60: Short-term construction effects to bicyclists and pedestrians are also anticipated in all Build Alternatives. In Segments 1, 4, A, and C, some disruptions to the existing regional trails are anticipated during construction. The extent to which the trails would be available for use throughout the process of relocation will be determined during Preliminary Engineering. Disruptions to the existing sidewalk network are anticipated in all Build Alternatives.</li> </ul>
<p>1.5.3 <b>Outcome:</b> Any flora that is lost to construction or LRT use is replaced with flora that is in accordance with MPRB plans, with monitoring through a plant survey and replacement for 5 years after construction is complete.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.5.4 Temporary and Long-Term Effects, Segment A [LRT 1A and, LRT 3A (LPA)]; Temporary direct impacts, page 3-94: “The conceptual engineering completed for the project identifies approximately 0.016 acre of potential temporary impact to land from Park Siding for grading associated with future trail reconstruction.”</li> </ul>
<p>1.5.4 <b>Outcome:</b> All design options will take full advantage of as well as take great care with the water table (per Met Council, the water table is 27 feet below the surface where Depot Avenue junctions with the trail)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>[Move]</i></li> </ul>



<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
1.5.5 <b>Outcome:</b> Soils and slopes are stabilized during construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
1.5.6 <b>Outcome:</b> Water table is protected during construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
<b>1.6 Issue: Co-location of Freight Rail</b>	<p><i>[Probably need to translate this entire subsection into a few key points and broadly link to the DEIS]</i></p>
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grave concern that the potential co-location of the freight rail along with the LRT and trail in the corridor would result in extremely damaging impacts throughout the corridor, with exponential impacts</li> </ul>	
1.6.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Bicycle and walking trail users have a positive experience, especially with regard to trail access, noise, and safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
1.6.2 <b>Outcome:</b> At all points along the corridor, and especially at the narrowest locations, sufficient space remains for trails and trail users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
1.6.3 <b>Outcome:</b> Park land along the corridor is preserved as such	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.1 page 7-2: For parks, recreation areas, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges, a <i>de minimis</i> impact is one that will not adversely affect the features, attributes, or activities qualifying the property for protection under Section 4(f).</li> </ul>
1.6.4 <b>Outcome:</b> The below- and above-grade LRT alternatives under consideration especially for locations such as the intersection with Cedar Lake Parkway are not “derailed” by the freight rail’s low slope requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
1.6.5 <b>Outcome:</b> A minimum number of properties are taken as part of corridor development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
1.6.6 <b>Outcome:</b> All trail connections are maintained	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 Environmental Effects (Air Toxics), 4.6.1.3 Traffic Analysis: The traffic analysis completed for this Draft EIS indicates that several intersections are anticipated to degrade to level of service (LOS) D, E, or F because of LRT at-grade crossings. LRT stations, specifically those with park and ride facilities, will cause localized increases in traffic along the adjacent roadways. For these intersections and locations near LRT stations, MSAT emissions can be expected to temporarily increase. As noted in the above paragraph, however,</li> </ul>

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
	<p>FHWA estimates that an overall reduction in MSATs will occur by 2050, so whatever increases occur at these locations are expected to be offset in the future, regardless of the alternative chosen. (emphasis added; MSAT = mobile source air toxic) <i>[If there won't be an "air quality" item for the entire corridor, this should be deleted]</i></p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.1.3 Existing Conditions, 4.1.3.4 Groundwater Resources: Shallow groundwater: (Figure 4.1-11): Concern exists for the areas near Lake Calhoun, the channel between Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles, and the low areas beginning near the 21st Street station and extending through the areas near the Penn and Van White stations to I-94. <i>(Is this a concern?)</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 Environmental Effects, 4.2.3.1 Floodplains: FEMA Floodplains are present in the study area in low elevations along PWI streams and some wetlands. The following streams and wetlands have mapped FEMA floodplains....Bassett Creek (Segment A) <i>(Is this a concern?)</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 Environmental Effects, 4.2.3.3 Long-Term Effects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>... there are multiple potential impacts to wetlands, floodplains, creeks, and channels. These impacts would be mitigated through the appropriate permitting processes, which would include BMPs and design parameters to minimize impacts. At this point in the project's development, specific BMPs and design parameters have not been determined. This would occur during the Preliminary Engineering phase of the project.</li> <li>Table 4.2-2 ...Impacts associated with crossing the channel between Lake of the Isles and Cedar Lake. Bridging the crossing may eliminate impact.</li> <li><i>(Is this a concern?)</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 Environmental Effects, 4.2.3.5 Wetlands and Public Waters: This alignment would result in wetland impacts of approximately 0.9 acre plus 2.0 acres for the Freight Rail Relocation Segment. Potential PWI crossings are shown on Figure 4.2-4, Figure 4.2-5, and Figure 4.2-6. They are: ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proximity to Minnehaha Creek (future greenway corridor)</li> <li>Crossing of unnamed channel between Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles <i>(Is this a concern?)</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 Environmental Effects, Table 4.2-3. Summary of Surface Water Impacts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>... Wetlands: 2.9 acres Multiple wetland types and potential for affecting Minnehaha Creek</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ...Floodplains: ...Crossing channel between Lake of the Isles and Cedar Lake. <i>(Is this a concern?)</i></li> </ul>
<h2>2 Northwest Corner of Lake Calhoun Area</h2>	
<p>The Calhoun Executive Center parking lot sits partially on privately owned land in addition to land owned by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board as part of the Chain of Lakes regional park system. The parking lot provides parking on the weekends and week day evenings for the regional park users and Lake Calhoun. This location, within the regional park system, is the closest major park land to the SW LRT Lake Street Station.</p>	
<h3>2.1 Issue: Access to parks and trails</h3>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parkland adjacent to Lake Calhoun and trails is MPRB land and should be included in the CAC’s response to the DEIS</li> <li>• Concern that there is no safe pedestrian access between LRT station area and Lake Calhoun and adjacent park land.</li> </ul>	
<p>2.1.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Lake Calhoun Executive Center parking lot (partially owned by MPRB) remains available for park users</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>
<p>2.1.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Provide a safe, free-flowing pedestrian and bicycle route with exceptional wayfinding between the LRT station area and Lake Calhoun and adjacent park land.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9.6.2.4 Mitigation (of Indirect, Long-term, impacts such as development that may be stimulated) p. 9-19 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DEIS identifies indirect effects throughout the system, such as when new developments that are not currently planned are constructed as a result of the rail line (land use changes and resulting impacts), there may be impacts on traffic, biking, walking, noise, etc. The DEIS states that no mitigation for such “indirect” impacts will be planned “with the exception of the preferred alternative.”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>(The MPRB may consider a suggesting that any new developments, esp near W Lake Station on Calhoun Commons site or Calhoun Village site, offer continuing and improved views and bike/ped connectivity to Lake Calhoun)</i></li> </ul>

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
<b>2.2 Issue: Loss of Greenspace</b>	
<i>Concerns:</i> Concern that the greenspace will be lost to additional parking and for motor-vehicle accommodations to serve the needs of the LRT users and infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>
2.2.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Preserve greenspace in this area for park visitors and recreational purposes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.1.1 page 7-3               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (LAWCON) stipulates that any land or facility planned, developed, or improved with LAWCON funds cannot be converted to uses other than parks, recreation, or open space unless land of at least equal fair market value and reasonably equivalent usefulness is provided. Anytime a transportation project would cause such a conversion, regardless of funding sources, such replacement land must be provided.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 7.1 page 7-2: For parks, recreation areas, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges, a <i>de minimis</i> impact is one that will not adversely affect the features, attributes, or activities qualifying the property for protection under Section 4(f).</li> </ul>
<b>2.3 Issue: Parking</b>	
<i>Concerns:</i> Concern that parking for park visitors will be depleted by use of LRT users.	
2.3.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Adequate parking is provided for LRT users outside of the park area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[What should happen with this issue/outcome?]</i></li> </ul>
<b>3 Trail access at Abbott Avenue S. (by new Lake Street Station)</b>	
Access to the Midtown Greenway at Abbott Avenue S. is currently the closest trail access point to the proposed Lake Street Station. At this trail entrance, the West Calhoun Neighborhood Association has added park-like features including a kiosk, picnic table, bike racks, decorative fencing and a drinking fountain.	
<b>3.1 Issue: Access to parks and trails</b>	
3.1.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Lake Street station users have convenient access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[Are there any items in the DEIS that relate specifically to this location?]</i></li> </ul>

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
to and from Lake Calhoun and Kenilworth Trail	
3.1.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Wayfinding is provided for Lake Calhoun and trail users from Lake Street station	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>
3.1.3 <b>Outcome:</b> Safe access is provided from Lake Street station to and from Lake Calhoun and trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>
3.1.4 <b>Outcome:</b> Safe bike parking for recreational and commuter users of the Kenilworth Trail and Lake Calhoun visitors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>
<b>4 Park Siding Park</b>	
This small neighborhood park includes a tot-lot, formal gardens, and play equipment. It is used almost exclusively by neighborhood residents on both sides of the proposed trail alignment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.1 page 7-2: For parks, recreation areas, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges, a <i>de minimis</i> impact is one that will not adversely affect the features, attributes, or activities qualifying the property for protection under Section 4(f).</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 Issue: Connectivity and accessibility</b>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parkland providing neighborhood connectively throughout the planned LRT route; concern regarding connectivity being broken in both formal and informal access points</li> <li>• Connectivity and integrity of surrounding neighborhoods</li> <li>• People are crossing the existing rail line and fence from the west side to access this park</li> <li>• Trail connectivity from neighborhood to park</li> <li>• Interruption of wildlife corridor</li> <li>• General question: is there enough room for two sets of tracks, trail, and park access?</li> </ul>	
4.1.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Maintain safe and clear access from both sides of track	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [Need to find DEIS reference for this]</li> </ul>
4.1.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Trail users have safe access to and from the park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• at this time no permanent or temporary uses of parkland are anticipated ? [where did this come from and what does it mean?]</li> </ul>
<b>4.2 Issue: Safety</b>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety issues both when people access park and as users</li> </ul>	

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety is paramount at this narrow point</li> </ul>	
<p>4.2.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Park users of all ages and abilities are safe</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10.5.3.1 Improved Multimodal Environment pg 10-18: Transitway project will improve the existing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure along the alignment, and improve the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists through implemented design guidelines. All pedestrian facilities will be designed in accordance with current design standards and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements to ensure access and mobility for all. <i>[verify this is sufficiently specific for Park Siding]</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>4.3 Issue: Visual appeal</b></p>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visual impact of rail cars/ advertisements on sides of LRT and commercialization of park experience</li> <li>Aesthetic integrity of parkland negatively affected</li> <li>Question: How to deal with LRT users' experience?</li> </ul>	
<p>4.3.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Maintain visual integrity for park users and for residents and users on the west side of the tracks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>[Is there a DEIS reference for this?]</i></li> </ul>
<p>4.3.2 <b>Outcome:</b> The visual impact of the LRT will be compatible with the context of the park</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>[Is there a DEIS reference for this?]</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>4.4 Issue: Noise and vibrations</b></p>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should be minimal noise impacts on park users</li> <li>Vibrations and additional noise</li> <li>Proposed solution: tunnel the train</li> <li>Proposed solution: Use public art to mitigate noise and visual impact</li> </ul>	
<p>4.4.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Park users will not be subject to LRT noise that exceeds applicable standards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.5.4 Temporary and Long-Term Effects, Segment A [LRT 1A and, LRT 3A (LPA)]; Temporary direct impacts, page 3-94: "The conceptual engineering completed for the project identifies approximately 0.016 acre of potential temporary impact to land from Park Siding for grading associated with future trail reconstruction." <i>[Do you want to create a construction-related outcome</i></li> </ul>

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
	<i>specific to Park Siding, or include it with that section under Entire Corridor?]</i>
<b>5 Cedar Lake Parkway and Grand Rounds</b>	
<p>The proposed SW LRT alignment will cross the Grand Rounds at Cedar Lake Parkway. Currently at this intersection, traffic occasionally stops for a passing freight train. The trail users are require to stop for vehicular traffic coming and going from both Dean and Cedar Lake Parkways. Also at this intersection, the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board trail network meets the Kenilworth Trail. To the west of the trail corridor is South Cedar Lake Beach. <i>(Staff will provide more information about who owns what land at this intersection)</i></p>	
<b>5.1 Issue: Flow and safety on Grand Rounds</b>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congestion and stoppages on the Grand Rounds (Cedar Lake Parkway) caused by train crossings inhibits continuous and unimpeded flow on the Grand Rounds</li> <li>• Car backups cause safety issues for bicyclists</li> <li>• Train crossings prevent pedestrians/joggers on the sidewalk along Cedar Lake Parkway from crossing</li> <li>• Significant use conflicts at this intersection between cars, bicyclists, pedestrians with backups due to train crossings</li> <li>• Note that this is policy related with regard to continuous flows along the Grand Rounds</li> <li>• This is a long-standing “choke” point in the park system, but the problems increase by orders of magnitude with an at-grade LRT line</li> <li>• Links will be impeded between the trail along Cedar Lake and the Kenilworth Trail, along with the connection to other MPRB trails</li> <li>• Concern that winter conditions will result in slippery roads and</li> </ul>	

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
<p>cause cars to slide toward rail line.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that emergency vehicle access will be impeded to the beach area.</li> </ul>	
<p>5.1.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Continuous, calm and safe flow of motorized and nonmotorized vehicles and pedestrians along the Grand Rounds and chain of lakes connecting trails</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.3.2.4, pg 6-58: Will result in permanent continuous trail users flow of use; there is sufficient space within the HCRRA's ROW for the Build Alternatives and the interim-use trails to coexist; therefore, with the exception of the Midtown Greenway in Segments C-1 and C-2, long-term impacts on the capacity and operations of the interim-use trails is not anticipated. For safety reasons, it is likely that fencing or other measures to separate the bicycles and pedestrians from the LRVs would be necessary, with crossing of the tracks allowed at roadway intersections and station locations. According to LRT design standards developed by Metro Transit, traffic signals with pedestrian indicators would be required at all locations where trails cross the Build Alternatives. The grade crossings are not anticipated to result in significant delays for trail users. The trail users, however, may be obliged to travel longer distances than today because of fencing and the consolidation of access points at, primarily, station locations.</li> <li>6.2.23 Operational impacts at intersections page 6-25: Traffic Signal Priority (TSP) will be provided to LRVs at all signalized intersections where the guideway is operating in a street. All at-grade intersections along Segments 1, 3, and A would incorporate TSP. <i>(What does this mean?)</i></li> <li>Page 6-24, Case against Co-Location: Also in Segment A with LRT 3A-1 (co-location alternative) only, the ROW needed for this alternative will affect Burnham Road, which is adjacent to the corridor and accessed off of Cedar Lake Parkway. Burnham Road is the main access point for homes fronting on Cedar Lake. It will need to be reconstructed and realigned and its access off of Cedar Lake Parkway would be shifted west. The shift of Burnham Road may also cause the intersection of Cedar Lake Parkway with Burnham Road to be reconstructed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.2 Issue: Grand Rounds (seeking historic designation)</b></p>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note that the Grand Rounds runs along Cedar Lake Parkway and also intersects with the Kenilworth trail, and the continuous flow that defines the Grand Rounds is prevented if</li> </ul>	



<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
<p>the LRT crossing is at grade here</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Grand Rounds is a National Scenic Byway and the State Historic Preservation Office nominated it for listing on the National Register of Historic Places</li> </ul>	
<p>5.2.1 <b>Outcome:</b> The integrity and intention of the Grand Rounds is maintained</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.4 Cultural Resources, page 3-73: “For this project, cultural resources are defined as the buildings, structures, districts, objects and sites that are listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP or National Register).”</li> <li>page 3-79 Segment A [LRT 1A, LRT 3A (LPA), and LRT 3A-1 (Co-location)], “Potential long-term effects may occur at the following properties: Cedar Lake Parkway and the Grand Rounds (potential effects of the changes to the intersection of the LRT corridor with the historic parkway, including the LRT overpass bridge, and, under the co-location alternative, the effects of widening the trail/rail corridor; these changes may affect the parkway itself and may alter its setting).”</li> <li>3.6.3.3 (page 3-116) Cedar Lake-Lake Parkway is a contributing element of the Isles Channel have been determined National Register eligible for inclusion on the NRHP as part of the Grand Rounds</li> <li>7.4.1.4 page 7-20 Historic District. Constructed elements of the project, including the proposed bridge and the guideway, would have a substantial impact on this historic landscape. This issue will be addressed during Section 106 consultation.</li> <li>7.4.1.4 page 7-20 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cedar Lake Parkway and the Cedar Lake-Lake of the Isles Channel have been determined eligible for inclusion on the NRHP as part of the Grand Rounds</li> <li>7.1 page 7-2 For parks, recreation areas, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges, a <i>de minimis</i> impact is one that will not adversely affect the features, attributes, or activities qualifying the property for protection under Section 4(f).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Page 6-26 – 6.2.2.3 <u>No intersections were retained for analysis along Segments 1 and A.</u></li> <li>(Question: does Cedar Lake Parkway meet the criteria?)</li> <li>7.1 page 7-2 For parks, recreation areas, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges,</li> </ul>

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
	<p>a <i>de minimis</i> impact is one that will not adversely affect the features, attributes, or activities qualifying the property for protection under Section 4(f).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.4.1.4 page 7-20 Cedar Lake Parkway and the Cedar Lake-Lake of the Isles Channel have been determined eligible for inclusion on the NRHP as part of the Grand Rounds</li> </ul>
<b>5.3 Issue: Noise</b>	
<i>Concerns:</i> Noise impacts from LRT and crossing harms park and Grand Rounds users' enjoyment and use	
5.3.1 <b>Outcome:</b> LRT and crossing-related noise will not diminish the enjoyment and use of the park and Grand Rounds users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
<b>5.4 Issue: Visual appeal</b>	
<i>Concerns:</i> The great views of Cedar lake and park land would be impeded by the train and tracks, depending on the configuration of the intersection and the train's power source/infrastructure	
5.4.1 <b>Outcome:</b> The view of and from Cedar Lake and surrounding parkland is preserved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
5.4.2 <b>Outcome:</b> The parkland around Cedar Lake remains the natural visual buffer between Cedar Lake and the Southwest LRT Corridor <Staff: how does this relate to Mpls city plans?>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
<b>5.5 Issue: Air quality</b>	
<i>Concerns:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Air pollution would be a serious problem with many cars idling while waiting to cross the LRT route</li> <li>South Beach is very close to this location and air pollution could be harmful to users</li> <li>(Staff to check into applicable air quality regulations so this includes the correct reference, as well as whether there's information on potential harm to water quality if pollution levels increase significantly)</li> </ul>	

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a heavily used park area plus pedestrians, bicyclists</li> </ul>	
<p>5.5.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Ensure conformity with state and federal air quality regulations (make reference to federal Clean Air Act and other standards that would apply in such situations)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.1.3 Existing Conditions, 4.1.3.6 Groundwater Sensitivity: Several areas in the study area lie within zones of very high sensitivity to pollution of the water table system...Portions of the land between Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles... (Is this important?)</li> <li>4.1.4 Long-Term Effects, 4.1.4.2 Groundwater: The Build Alternatives may have long-term impacts on groundwater if a permanent water removal system (dewatering) is required. Permanent water removal is anticipated where the cut extends below the water table. There is a probable need for permanent water removal at one cut on both Segment 1 and Segment 3, and possible needs on Segment A and at a second cut along Segment 3, because of shallow groundwater. Evaluations and associated impacts of permanent water removal at the major excavations are summarized in Appendix H. (Is this important?)</li> </ul>
<p><b>6 Kenilworth Channel, bridge</b></p>	
<p>The proposed alignment of the SW LRT crosses the Kenilworth Channel, a body of water that was built in the early 1900s to connect Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles to form the Minneapolis chain of lakes. The Channel is used all year for recreational purposes from boaters in the summer to skiers and skaters in the winter. The channel also provides access for wildlife. The bridge over the channel for the existing freight tracks and trails is narrow and relatively low to the water (Hennepin County Regional Rail has an easement for the channel crossing).</p>	
<p><b>6.1 Issue: Connectivity and recreational use</b></p>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Structures that may be put in place to protect people and animals from the train, may at the same time prevent or obstruct crossing and access to the channel</li> </ul>	

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This channel is unique in creating the connected chain of lakes, and is heavily used by boaters, skiers, etc.</li> </ul>	
<p>6.1.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Maintain access to the Kenilworth Trail and both Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles from both sides of the Kenilworth Trail</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
<p>6.1.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Maintain human and wildlife access from both sides of the Kenilworth Trail to and along undeveloped channel shoreline</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.1 page 7-2 For parks, recreation areas, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges, a <i>de minimis</i> impact is one that will not adversely affect the features, attributes, or activities qualifying the property for protection under Section 4(f).</li> </ul>
<p>6.1.3 <b>Outcome:</b> Maintain unfettered, year-round passage along the channel (in the water) between the lakes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<p>6.1.4 <b>Outcome:</b> Maintain the current functionality of the channel as the historic water connection between the two lakes, which makes the chain of lakes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.4 Cultural Resources, page 3-73 “For this project, cultural resources are defined as the buildings, structures, districts, objects and sites that are listed on eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP or National Register).”</li> <li>Segment A [LRT 1A, LRT 3A (LPA), and LRT 3A-1 (Co-location)], page 3-79 “Potential long-term effects may occur at the following properties: Kenilworth Lagoon/ Channel, Grand Rounds (potential effects of the construction of new bridge structures within the historic district; the design and footprint of these structures may affect the banks of the historic channel and may affect the district’s overall feeling and setting).”</li> <li>3.6.3.3 (page 3-116) However, the bridge design, bank treatment, and aesthetics for the new facility and the potential replacement or modification of the existing pedestrian bridge would have a substantial effect on this historic landscape. This issue will be addressed during Section 106 consultation.</li> <li>7.4.1.3 page 7-19: In the Freight Rail Relocation segment, <u>the channel between Brownie and Cedar Lakes (including the culvert through which it passes) is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP as part of the Grand Rounds</u>. If the relocation of freight rail service to the BNSF Wayzata Subdivision requires modification of the channel and/or culvert, this could constitute an adverse effect and thus would be considered a Section 4(f) use.</li> <li>page7-20 7.4.1.4 Cedar Lake Parkway and the Cedar Lake-Lake of the Isles Channel have been determined eligible for inclusion on the NRHP as part of the Grand Rounds <b>What designation currently exists or is in process?</b></li> </ul>

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.4.1.3 page 7-19 Cedar Lake Parkway and the Cedar Lake-Lake of the Isles Channel have been determined eligible for inclusion on the NRHP as part of the Grand Rounds. It should be noted that the two timber bridges across the Kenilworth Channel are listed as non-contributing elements within the Grand Rounds. The proposed removal of these non-contributing bridges would, in and of itself, not constitute an adverse effect and therefore would not be considered a Section 4(f) use</li> </ul>
<b>6.2 Issue: Aesthetics, tranquility</b>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preserve habitat for wild life living and moving through the parkland.</li> <li>The noise, vibration, and potential advertising on the trains would severely disrupt the experience of users on/in the channel</li> <li>Great ambiance; a beautiful space</li> <li>This is one of the darkest locations in the city which makes for great stargazing, so light pollution would be an issue</li> <li>The Kenilworth Channel is a uniquely quiet and tranquil space, and frequent trains crossing the channel would disrupt that serenity</li> </ul>	
6.2.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Any support or safety structures should be harmonious, beautiful, and context sensitive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>
6.2.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Maintain natural beauty and serenity of the Kenilworth Channel experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>
<b>6.3 Issue: Safety</b>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety at this crossing due to ice buildup on the bridge</li> <li>Debris, vibrations, icicles, blowing snow may harm summer and winter users in channel underneath bridge</li> </ul>	
6.3.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Ensure that year-round users of the channel area are safe.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
<b>7 Intersection with 21st Street</b>	
<p>The intersection of the Kenilworth Trail and 21st Street is a proposed station location. The station would sit on Hennepin County property, however the west side of the rail line is MPRB property, Cedar Lake Park. At 21st Street, Cedar Lake has a very popular beach and access to a trail network as well as informal foot paths.</p>	
<b>7.1 Issue: Park access and neighborhood connectivity</b>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informal access points from the trail into the woods (between Burnham Road and 21<sup>st</sup> Street) will be eliminated</li> <li>• Entrance to the beach amenity will be changed</li> <li>• Concern about providing access to other points on the Chain of Lakes, as this could be one of the primary LRT stops to access the Chain of Lakes Regional Park</li> <li>• A possible solution could be an improved/formalized path from Burnham Road to 21<sup>st</sup> Street on the west side</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[Need to check for more DEIS references for this location]</i></li> </ul>
<p>7.1.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Attractive, natural, welcoming access to park at 21<sup>st</sup> Street</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>
<p>7.1.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Neighborhood connectivity by easy and safe pedestrian access back and forth between the neighborhoods on the east side of the corridor and the woods on the west side of the corridor</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.1.5.1 Effects to Land Use and Socioeconomics, page 3-4 “Implementation of LRT service and stations along the Segment A alignment would likely result in some land use changes surrounding the stations...” <i>(We would seek to ensure that these changes are consistent with MPRB desired outcomes.)</i></li> </ul>
<b>7.2 Issue: Safety</b>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety concerns for crossings and connections to the neighborhood, trails, and Cedar Lake</li> <li>• Heavy use by youth and children increases safety issues</li> <li>• Concern about speed of LRT across intersection</li> </ul>	
<p>7.2.1 <b>Outcome:</b> All park users can access the park safely, regardless of mode of transport.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is referenced throughout the DEIS that access to the park(s) will be enhanced</li> </ul>

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
7.2.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Safe access is provided that is aesthetically pleasing, without excessive lights and noise.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>
7.2.3 <b>Outcome:</b> Trains cross this location from a stopped condition.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>
<b>7.3 Issue: Aesthetics, tranquility</b>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cedar Lake is uniquely quiet and tranquil in the Chain of Lakes</li> <li>• There could be noise impacts on park users</li> <li>• Concern about commercial development in this location that changes its “up north” feel in an attempt to take advantage of the higher usage created by the LRT.</li> </ul>	
7.3.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Cedar Lake remains a quiet, tranquil, and natural park destination.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>
7.3.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Increase the natural beauty, serenity and experience of the area between Burnam Rd and the 21 <sup>st</sup> St intersection.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>
<b>7.4 Issue: Traffic and Parking Congestion</b>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking issues for the neighborhood and congestion at the location. There is already heavy parking in neighborhood on weekends.</li> <li>• Park users may have to compete with LRT users.</li> <li>• Possible congestion at port-a-potty at beach. Only public restroom along the route.</li> </ul>	
7.4.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Enforce the city policy regarding no park and ride lots at this LRT station.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>
7.4.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Easy, safe and quick drop-off and pick-up.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>
7.4.3 <b>Outcome:</b> Encourage LRT users to use non-motorized transportation to get to the station.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>
7.4.4 <b>Outcome:</b> Encourage park users to use LRT and bike paths to get to this location.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>
7.4.5 <b>Outcome:</b> Maximize accessibility to woods and lake.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
<b>8 Cedar Lake Trail Junction</b>	
<p>The Cedar Lake trail carries pedestrians and riders between downtown Minneapolis and the western suburbs. Just outside of downtown, the trail splits off to the south Kenilworth Trail and the proposed SW LRT alignment. At this location the bike trails are separated into north- and south-bound, and there is a separate pedestrian trail. The land in this location is owned by the County and the MPRB. Per agreement, the prairies and trails are maintained by the MPRB.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[Need to check for DEIS references for this location]</i></li> </ul>
<b>8.1 Issue: Safety</b>	
<i>Concerns:</i> Safety of all trail users crossing the LRT line.	
8.1.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Ensure the safety of walkers, runners, bicyclists and other non-motorized travelers using the Cedar Lake Regional Trail.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>
8.1.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Eliminate pedestrian and bicycle safety issues that would occur if bicycle traffic had to cross the LRT tracks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>
8.1.3 <b>Outcome:</b> Maintain separation of trail users and LRT in all seasons.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>
<b>8.2 Issue: Usage and Access</b>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trail users must have easy access to trails</li> <li>• Concern that the MPRB would lose operations and maintenance funding if visitation to the trail is reduced by the LRT design.</li> <li>• LRT could prevent any opportunity to provide safe, legal access to the trail from communities that are north of LRT line.</li> </ul>	
8.2.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Design does not impede the use or number of bicycle and pedestrian using the federally funded bicycle commuter trail.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>
8.2.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Enhance and formalize access to the trail and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>



<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
Cedar Lake Park from communities north of LRT line.	
<b>8.3 Issue: Connectivity, flow</b>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Free flow of trail users on Cedar Lake and Kenilworth Regional trails would be impeded by an at-grade crossing with LRT.</li> <li>Potential of losing the continuous flow of a bicycle commuter route that is similar in experience to a freeway for motorized vehicles.</li> </ul>	
<p>8.3.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Maintain continuous flow and speed on federally funded commuter bicycle trail at crossing area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.2.2.6 Neighborhoods and community cohesion, page 3-58 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“The implementation of LRT service would not sever roadway or driveway connections...”</li> <li>The Cedar Lake Regional Trail would be severed where it crosses the LRT if it crosses at grade (1,200 feet southwest of the I-394 bridge).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>8.3.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Ensure free flow of all modes of transportation that avoids conflict of multi-uses in the area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
<p>8.3.3 <b>Outcome:</b> Promote compatibility and enhance connectivity between multiple modes of transit in all seasons.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
<b>8.4 Issue: Environmental protection</b>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interruption of wildlife corridor and habitat</li> <li>Prairie restoration in this location is ongoing; don’t want to introduce new invasive species.</li> </ul>	
<p>8.4.1 <b>Outcome:</b> No new invasive species are introduced to the prairie during construction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
<p>8.4.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Maintain and enhance wildlife habitat and existing migratory patterns.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.1 page 7-2 For parks, recreation areas, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges, a <i>de minimis</i> impact is one that will not adversely affect the features, attributes, or activities qualifying the property for protection under Section 4(f).</li> </ul>
<b>8.5 Issue: Visual and auditory appeal</b>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blight of train through prairie area is incongruent with natural</li> </ul>	

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
feel and look of parkland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about additional noise in the area</li> </ul>	
8.5.1 <b>Outcome:</b> The LRT blends in visually with the natural setting of the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
8.5.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Maintain and enhance the natural, park-like look and feel of surrounding land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
<h2>9 Bryn Mawr Meadows Park</h2>	
Bryn Mawr Meadows Park is a neighborhood park with citywide appeal in the Bryn Mawr neighborhood. Amenities include ball fields, tot-lots, wading pools, and tennis courts. The park is adjacent to the Cedar Lake Trail and proposed SW LRT line, but there is currently no formal access to the Cedar Lake Trail from this park.	[Need to check for DEIS references for this location]
<h3>9.1 Issue: Connectivity</h3>	
<i>Concerns:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LRT could prevent any opportunity to provide safe, legal access to the trail from communities that are south and north of 394.</li> <li>Parkland providing neighborhood connectivity throughout the planned LRT route; concern regarding connectivity being broken in both formal and informal access points</li> <li>Concern that wildlife corridor will be interrupted</li> </ul>	
9.1.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Enhance and formalize access to the trail, Bryn Mawr Meadows and LRT from communities south and north of LRT line.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>
9.1.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Continue to maintain and enhance wildlife habitat and existing migratory patterns.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.1 page 7-2 For parks, recreation areas, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges, a <i>de minimis</i> impact is one that will not adversely affect the features, attributes, or activities qualifying the property for protection under Section 4(f).</li> </ul>
<h3>9.2 Issue: Safety</h3>	
<i>Concerns:</i> This is a park with large numbers of youth playing.	
9.2.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Ensure safe separation between park users and the LRT, while providing a formal access to the park.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[anything for this?]</li> </ul>

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
<b>9.3 Issue: Visual appeal</b>	
<i>Concerns:</i> Visual impact of LRT on park users	
9.3.1 <b>Outcome:</b> The LRT blends in visually with the natural setting of the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>
9.3.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Maintain and enhance the open space look and feel of surrounding land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9.2.1 Indirect Effects (p. 9-3) If development pressures result over time in additional density in development, the open space look and feel could be impacted, especially if the MPRB sells some of the existing park land for development. That said, increased density along rail transit lines is desirable from a sustainability perspective, so the concern should perhaps be limited to guidance for the MPRB not to sell park land for development.</li> </ul>
<b>10 Spring Lake Trail Junction</b>	
At this location trail users easily connect to the near by parks and trails including Spring Lake, Kenwood Parkway, and Parade Park, traveling beyond to the sculpture garden, Loring Park, and the Grand Rounds.	<i>[Need to check for DEIS references for this location]</i>
<b>10.1 Issue: Safety</b>	
<i>Concerns:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that access points for emergency vehicles will be compromised by LRT development and operation.</li> <li>• Crossing the tracks from the north and the south</li> </ul>	
10.1.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Emergency vehicles can access parks and trails	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>
<b>10.2 Issue: Flow</b>	
<i>Concerns:</i> Free flow of trail users at Cedar Lake Regional trail and Spring Lake connection	
10.2.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Bike flow and speed is maintained in area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>
10.2.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Enhance connectivity between the north and south neighborhoods through green space connections north of 394 and Spring Lake trail junction south of 394. (Ref *Harrison Plan)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>
10.2.3 <b>Outcome</b> Connectivity to Grand Rounds and supporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
parks and parkways is maintained and enhanced	
<b>10.3 Issue: Coordination with Future Development</b>	
<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that LRT plans will impact the plans for Van White Boulevard.</li> <li>• Concern that LRT plans will impact the plans for the Bassett's Creek Valley plan.</li> <li>• Concern that the LRT plans will not take into consideration possible connections of the community to Spring Lake.</li> <li>• Reduced connectivity between the areas north and south of the LRT line</li> <li>• Another potential transportation barrier between north and south neighborhoods (similar to 394)</li> </ul>	
10.3.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Design incorporates Van White Boulevard plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>
10.3.2 <b>Outcome:</b> LRT design enhances Spring Lake and natural features of the area through which it passes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>
10.3.3 <b>Outcome:</b> Connectivity to neighborhoods and natural amenities is a priority in design.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>
<b>11 Linden Avenue (by asphalt and concrete recycling plant)</b>	
Linden Avenue is a trail access, but is used primarily by city maintenance vehicles to access the asphalt and concrete recycling facility. Trail users at this access point regularly deal with high vehicular traffic with the nearby entrance to I-394. At this location, the SW LRT line and trail separate from MPRB-owned land, marking the end of the CAC's project scope.	<i>[Need to check for DEIS references for this location]</i>
<b>11.1 Issue: Environmental protection</b>	
<i>Concerns:</i> Mature trees along trail	
11.1.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Park lands are protected from anything hazardous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[anything for this?]</i></li> </ul>

<b>CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DEIS CONTENT</b>
11.1.2 <b>Outcome:</b> Maintain and enhance the open space look and feel of surrounding land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>
11.1.3 <b>Outcome:</b> The environmental impacts of Light Rail and Heavy Rail (diesel) upon Linden Avenue are not viewed in a segmented fashion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>
<b>11.2 Issue: Safety</b>	
<i>Concerns:</i> Concern that access points for emergency vehicles will be compromised by LRT development and operation.	
11.2.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Emergency vehicles can access parks and trails	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>
<b>11.3 Issue: Coordination with Future Development</b>	
<i>Concerns:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that LRT plans will impact the plans for Van White Boulevard.</li> <li>• Concern that LRT plans will impact the plans for the Bassett's Creek Valley plan.</li> <li>• Concern that the LRT plans will not take into consideration possible connections of the community to Spring Lake.</li> </ul>	
11.3.1 <b>Outcome:</b> Design incorporates Van White Boulevard plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>
11.3.2 <b>Outcome:</b> LRT design enhances Spring Lake and natural features of the area through which it passes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>
11.3.3 <b>Outcome:</b> Connectivity to neighborhoods and natural amenities is a priority in design.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [anything for this?]</li> </ul>
<i>The same issues and outcomes apply to the Linden Avenue area as the Spring Lake Trail Junction.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [What should we do with this note?]</li> </ul>