

SWLRT CAC

ISSUES AND OUTCOMES

CROSSWALK WITH DEIS

9 November 2012

1	Entire Corridor	1
1.1	Issue: Co-location	1
1.2	Issue: Design character	1
1.3	Issue: Park lands	1
1.4	Issue: Bike/pedestrian trail use	1
1.5	Issue: Trail access	3
1.6	Issue: Safety and crime	4
1.7	Issue: Visual and auditory appeal	4
1.8	Issue: Construction Impacts	7
2	Northwest Corner of Lake Calhoun Area	10
2.1	Issue: Park and trail access	10
2.2	Issue: Greenspace	10
2.3	Issue: Parking	10
3	Trail access at Abbott Avenue S. (by new West Lake Station).....	12
3.1	Issue: Park and trail access	12
4	Park Siding Park	13
4.1	Issue: Accessibility and safety	13
4.2	Issue: Visual appeal	13
4.3	Issue: Noise and vibrations	13
5	Cedar Lake Parkway and Grand Rounds	14
5.1	Issue: Flow and safety on Grand Rounds	14
5.2	Issue: Grand Rounds integrity	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.3	Issue: Noise	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.4	Issue: Visual appeal	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.5	Issue: Air quality	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6	Kenilworth Channel, bridge	17
6.1	Issue: Water quality	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.2	Issue: Connectivity and recreational use	17
6.3	Issue: Aesthetics, tranquility	18
6.4	Issue: Safety	18
7	Intersection with 21st Street	19

7.1	Issue: Park access and neighborhood connectivity	19
7.2	Issue: Safety	19
7.3	Issue: Aesthetics, tranquility	19
7.4	Issue: Traffic and parking congestion	19
8	Cedar Lake Trail Junction	20
8.1	Issue: Safety	20
8.2	Issue: Use and access	Error! Bookmark not defined.
8.3	Issue: Connectivity, flow	Error! Bookmark not defined.
8.4	Issue: Environmental protection	20
8.5	Issue: Visual and auditory appeal	20
9	Bryn Mawr Meadows Park	21
9.1	Issue: Connectivity	21
9.2	Issue: Safety	Error! Bookmark not defined.
9.3	Issue: Visual appeal	21
10	Spring Lake Trail Junction	22
10.1	Issue: Safety	22
10.2	Issue: Flow	Error! Bookmark not defined.
10.3	Issue: Coordination with future development	22
11	Linden Avenue (by asphalt and concrete recycling plant)	23
11.1	Issue: Environmental protection	23
11.2	Issue: Safety	23
11.3	Issue: Coordination with future development	Error! Bookmark not defined.

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
1 Entire Corridor	
1.1 Issue: Co-location <p>The MPRB opposes the co-location alternative and supports the findings presented in the DEIS on Section 4(f) impacts related to the co-location alternative. In review of the documents, the loss park land described for the co-location alternative cannot be mitigated within the corridor.</p>	
1.2 Issue: Design character <p>The MPRB recognizes that current development and public use of the corridor from the St. Louis Park boundary to the Penn Station has a linear park character. Retaining this character through LRT and station area design is critical to protecting the activities, features and attributes of the adjacent park land in this corridor.</p>	
1.3 Issue: Park lands	<p><i>(Staff will check about a rail line that appears to be on MPRB land north of 21st)</i></p>
1.3.1 Outcome: Park land along the corridor is preserved as such.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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). <i>(needs to be tied to a specific section)</i>
1.3.2 Outcome: Park property is not used permanently as part of corridor development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“While this doesn’t qualify under 4(f) regulations...” Jennifer will gather further information about 4(f) designation around park land and what it means for the MPRB comment letter</i> <i>Consider a statement that clarifies difference between a development focus from SW to the Mpls border, and a preservation focus from there at least up to Bryn Mawr -- city of Mpls is an established place with heritage</i>
1.4 Issue: Bike/pedestrian trail use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <i>(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]</i>

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 6.2-4. 2030 Daily Person Trips by Mode LRT Alternatives; see table results <i>(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]</i>
<p>1.4.1 Outcome: Bike and pedestrian trails are retained within the corridor .</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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...” <i>(This statement supports the MPRB desired outcome.)</i> 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.
<p>1.4.2 Outcome: The trail design meets the needs of current and projected future users.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9.6.6.3 Anticipated cumulative impacts (p. 9/23) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With or without the Southwest Transitway project, urbanization and population densification in general will increase the use of parks within 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. <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> 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"> 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. <i>(Increase Park accessibility for minority and low income residents. Advocate</i>

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
	<p><i>for inclusion of Penn Station of any stations eliminated be it 21st because Penn services this demographics.)</i></p>
<p>1.4.3 Outcome: Bicycle and walking trail users have a positive, park-like experience, including free of obstructions, with a 2-foot or greater buffer on each side of the trail, and retain a sense of connection to open space.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[DEIS reference?]</i>
<p>1.4.4 Outcome: Replacements for trails that are impacted are of the same or better design quality and width as current trails.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p>1.4.5 Outcome: All trail connections are maintained or improved.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[DEIS reference?]</i>
<p>1.4.6 Outcome: At all points along the corridor, and especially at the narrowest locations, sufficient space remains for trails and trail users.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]</i>
<p>1.5 Issue: Trail access</p>	
<p>1.5.1 Outcome: There is adequate access to the trail from both sides of the LRT track, and access points are a reasonable walking distance apart.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9.6.26.2 Other Transportation Effect, Anticipated indirect effects (p. 9/38): <i>(paraphrase): 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 (this is a positive impact, no mitigation needed, aside from this being another reason to avoid decreasing trail widths)</i> • 9.6.9.3 Environmental Justice, Anticipated cumulative impacts (p. 9/26) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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 part of mitigation referring to Chapter 10, where the word “gentrification” did not appear.)</i> • <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>

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>
1.6 Issue: Safety and crime	
1.6.1 Outcome: All trail users can safely use the trail.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
1.6.2 Outcome: Adequate fire safety infrastructure exists within or proximate to the corridor such that fire suppression and response times meet relevant laws and standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>[DEIS reference?, including emergency vehicle crossing times section]</i>
1.6.3 Outcome: Fire, police, and emergency medical personnel and equipment are able to access park lands adjacent to the corridor and provide response times that meet relevant laws and standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>[DEIS reference?, including emergency vehicle crossing times section...]</i>
1.6.4 Correction: The Minneapolis Park Police and potentially should be included in the references to police agencies related to the corridor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>[needs reference to location in DEIS]</i>
1.7 Issue: Visual and auditory appeal	
1.7.1 Outcome: The visual impact of the LRT and related infrastructure is minimized for trail and park users.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <u>The interim use trails located on HCRRA property are not considered Section 4(f) properties.</u> 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

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
	<p>elements—the fixed guideway, including track, catenary poles, and wires—into the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (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 21st Street and Penn Ave stations.)
<p>1.7.2 Outcome: The vibration impacts are minimized for park and trail users.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • 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. • 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 of special trackwork, vehicle specifications, and special track support systems such as resilient fasteners, ballast mats, resiliently supported ties, and floating slabs.
<p>1.7.3 Outcome: The noise impacts are minimized for trail and park users, especially children, and do not exceed the most restrictive applicable noise standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [which of these are really applicable?] • +++ look at the applicable noise data and classifications from the DEIS and include here as relevant • 9.6.16.3 Noise (p. 9-31) “The transitway project will add a new source of noise.” • 9.6.16.4 Mitigation re Noise (p. 9-31) “The project will not mitigate indirect effects or cumulative impacts.” • (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

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES

DEIS CONTENT

sections.)9.6.7.4 Mitigation re: Visual Quality and Aesthetic (p. 9-25)

- “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.”
- 4 Environmental Effects, 4.7 Noise
 - .. 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.
 - Table 4.7-1. Summary of Noise-Sensitive Land Uses: number of parcels 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 AssessmentUnder 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

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 of the park farther from the tracks. • 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.
1.7.4 Outcome: The train lights have minimal visual impact lights on trail users.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]</i>
1.7.5 Outcome: Natural wildlife habitat and serenity of the trail is maintained.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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).
1.8 Issue: Construction Impacts	
1.8.1 Outcome: Surface and groundwater quality is protected during construction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[Needs a DEIS reference]</i>
1.8.2 Outcome: Reasonable and safe alternative routes are provided for trail users when sections are closed during construction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
	<p>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.</p>
<p>1.8.3 Outcome: 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"> 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.”
<p>1.8.4 Outcome: Soils and slopes are stabilized during construction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [anything for this?]
<p>1.8.5 Outcome: Construction dewatering does not create a long-term reduction in water table levels and does not destroy habitat within the park lands during construction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.... 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.
<p><Any outcomes associated with these?></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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, <u>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.</u> (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>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
	White stations to I-94. <i>(Is this a concern?)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Environmental Effects, 4.2.3.3 Long-Term Effects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ... 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. Table 4.2-2 ...Impacts associated with crossing the channel between Lake of the Isles and Cedar Lake. Bridging the crossing may eliminate impact. <i>(Is this a concern?)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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"> Proximity to Minnehaha Creek (future greenway corridor) Crossing of unnamed channel between Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles <i>(Is this a concern?)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Environmental Effects, Table 4.2-3. Summary of Surface Water Impacts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ... Wetlands: 2.9 acres Multiple wetland types and potential for affecting Minnehaha Creek ...Floodplains: ...Crossing channel between Lake of the Isles and Cedar Lake. <i>(Is this a concern?)</i>

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
2 Northwest Corner of Lake Calhoun Area	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.
2.1 Issue: Park and trail access	
2.1.1 Outcome: The design of this area makes clear that it is a “gateway” to the Minneapolis park system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]</i>
2.1.2 Outcome: A safe, free-flowing pedestrian and bicycle route with exceptional wayfinding between the LRT station area and Lake Calhoun and adjacent park land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]</i>
2.1.3 Outcome: LRT and West Lake Station Area design decisions for this area are based on the design recommendations from a comprehensive and multimodal (bicycle, pedestrian, transit, vehicle) circulation analysis that addresses impacts to the Grand Rounds parkways and trails.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[does this belong here?]</i> • 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"> • 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.” • <i>(The MPRB may wish to suggest 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>
2.1.4 Outcome: Understandable linkages provide users with easy access to and between the station, lakes, and trails.	<i>[anything for this?]</i>
2.1.5 Outcome: Connections between the many park and trail amenities in the area are obvious, safe, designated, and attractive.	<i>[anything for this?]</i>
2.2 Issue: Greenspace	
2.2.1 Outcome: Greenspace at the northwest corner of Lake Calhoun is preserved for park visitors and recreational purposes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]...perhaps in cultural resource section regarding historic designation of Grand Rounds App H, pt 2, pg 714</i>
2.3 Issue: Parking	

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
2.3.1 Outcome: Lake Calhoun Executive Center parking lot (partially owned by MPRB) remains available for park users.	• <i>[anything for this?]</i>
2.3.2 Outcome: There is no loss of parking for park and trail users.	• <i>[any DEIS reference for this?]</i>

DRAFT

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
3 Trail access at Abbott Avenue S. (by new West Lake Station)	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.
3.1 Issue: Park and trail access	
3.1.1 Outcome: West Lake station users and all other users have safe and convenient access to and from Lake Calhoun and the Kenilworth Trail.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[Are there any items in the DEIS that relate specifically to this location?]</i>
3.1.2 Outcome: Wayfinding is provided between the West Lake station and Lake Calhoun and trails.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]</i>
3.1.3 Outcome: Safe and adequate bike parking is provided for recreational and commuter users of the trail and for Lake Calhoun visitors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]</i>

DRAFT

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
4 Park Siding Park	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.
4.1 Issue: Accessibility and safety	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>
4.1.1 Outcome: All users have formal access to the park from both sides of the LRT.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[Need to find DEIS reference for this] Check in Chapter 7 under 4(f)</i> • At this time no permanent or temporary uses of parkland are anticipated ? <i>[where did this come from and what does it mean?]</i> • cite chapter 7, pg 7-8 regarding temporary use
4.1.2 Outcome: As an important trail access point, the trail design accommodates that ingress and egress.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
4.1.3 Outcome: Trail users have safe access to and from the park.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
4.1.4 +++ staff will seek out anything related to community connectivity or proximity to park land on the west side	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Check chapter 3, section 3.2 related to social effects/connectivity (John Erickson)</i>
4.2 Issue: Visual appeal	
4.2.1 Outcome: The visual impact of the LRT is compatible with the context of the park.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[Is there a DEIS reference for this?]</i>
4.3 Issue: Noise and vibrations	
4.3.1 Outcome: Park users, especially young children, are not subject to LRT noise levels that exceed the most restrictive applicable noise standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?] ++ look at links to section 4 and how they define categories of use</i>
<Any outcome for this?>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 specific to Park Siding, or include it with that section under Entire Corridor?]</i>

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
5 Cedar Lake Parkway and Grand Rounds	<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 required 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>(See colored map from staff provided 11/12/12)</i></p>
5.1 Issues: Integrity, flow, safety, noise, visual appeal, air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>(Staff notes that the historical designation language references the landscape, and some of those details are still being worked out)</i> • <i>(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)</i> • <i>Include in recommendation:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need an integrated solution • Grade-separation is essential • Flyover is a bad solution – in fact aggravates some problems • Below-grade rail at this location improves trail user experience, safety, trail access, noise, visual, etc.
5.1.1 Outcome: Trail users have direct access to the trails and direct access to all trail connections at this location.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.3.2.4, pg 6-58 (see below) • <i>(What about risk of significantly increasing the distance trail users will have to travel? – see what comes out of Steve Durant's design...)</i>
5.1.2 Outcome: Through and commuter trail traffic on both the Kenilworth trail and Grand Rounds follows substantially the same route as at present.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
5.1.3 Outcome: Motorized and nonmotorized vehicles and pedestrians along the Grand Rounds and Chain of Lakes connecting trails experience continuous, calm, and safe flow.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
	<p>locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>) • 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. • 3.7 pg 3.131 related to emergency vehicles
<p>5.1.4 Outcome: The Grand Rounds (eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places) fully retains its integrity and intention.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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).” • 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).” • 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 • 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 DEIS impact on this historic landscape. This issue will be addressed during Section 106 consultation. • 7.4.1.4 page 7-20 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • 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,

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
	<p>attributes, or activities qualifying the property for protection under Section 4(f).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 6-26 – 6.2.2.3 <u>No intersections were retained for analysis along Segments 1 and A.</u> • <i>(Question: does Cedar Lake Parkway meet the criteria?)</i> • 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). • 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 • Appendix G for Section 106 consultant report; pg 1 of Segment A; suggests a flyover would cause additional problem
5.1.5 Outcome: Fire, police, and emergency medical personnel and equipment can access South Cedar Lake beach and provide response times that meet relevant laws and standards.	DEIS 3.7.3.3 pg 3-131
5.1.6 Outcome: LRT and crossing-related noise does not diminish the enjoyment and use of the adjacent park land and Grand Rounds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this? What might be in section 4 for these types of land uses?]</i>
5.1.7 Outcome: The view of and from Cedar Lake and surrounding parkland is preserved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEIS notes residential visual impact; must also include park users; DEIS chapter 3 pg 3.115
5.1.8 Outcome: The parkland around Cedar Lake remains a natural visual buffer between Cedar Lake and the Southwest LRT corridor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]</i> DEIS notes residential visual impact; must also include park users; DEIS chapter 3 pg 3.115
5.1.9 Outcome: Air quality at this location meets state and federal standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]</i>

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
6 Kenilworth Channel, bridge	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).
6.1 Issue: Connectivity and recreational use	+++ properly name "Kenilworth Channel"
6.1.1 Outcome: Users have access to the Kenilworth Trail, Cedar Lake, and Lake of the Isles from both sides of the LRT/Kenilworth Trail.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [anything for this?]
6.1.2 Outcome: People and wildlife on both sides of the LRT/Kenilworth Trail have access to and along the undeveloped channel shoreline.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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).
6.1.3 Outcome: Users have unfettered, year-round passage along the channel (in the water/on the ice) between Lake of the Isles and Cedar Lake.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
6.1.4 Outcome: The historic water connection between Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles remains a defining characteristic of the Minneapolis Chain of Lakes Regional Park.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)." • 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)." • 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. • 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

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
	<p>the channel and/or culvert, this could constitute an adverse effect and thus would be considered a Section 4(f) use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <i>(What designation currently exists or is in process?)</i> 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
6.2 Issue: Aesthetics, tranquility	
6.2.1 Outcome: Support and safety structures are harmonious, beautiful, and both historically and context sensitive.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>[anything for this?]</i> DEIS 7.4.1.5, 4(f)
6.2.2 Outcome: The Kenilworth Channel retains its natural beauty and serenity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>[anything for this?]</i>
6.3 Issue: Safety	
6.3.1 Outcome: Year-round channel users are safe from falling debris and ice.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>[anything for this?]</i>

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
7 Intersection with 21st Street	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.
7.1 Issue: Park access and neighborhood connectivity	+++ determine whether there is a taking of park land at this location for the tracks on the west side
7.1.1 Outcome: Access to Cedar Lake Park at 21 st Street is attractive, natural, and welcoming.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [anything for this?]
7.1.2 Outcome: People on the east side of the corridor safely and easily access park lands on the west side.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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...” (We would seek to ensure that these changes are consistent with MPRB desired outcomes.)
7.2 Issue: Safety	
7.2.1 Outcome: All Cedar Lake Park users have safe and pleasant access to and from the park, regardless of mode of transport.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is referenced throughout the DEIS that access to the park(s) will be enhanced
7.2.2 Outcome: Station design enhances safety and access for Cedar Lake Park users.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [anything for this?]
7.3 Issue: Aesthetics, noise	
7.3.1 Outcome: Cedar Lake remains a quiet, tranquil, and natural park destination.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [anything for this?]
7.3.2 Outcome: The area between Burnham Rd and 21 st Street is naturally beautiful and serene.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 4, noise; this section of the corridor should be classified <i>instead</i> as a natural area, category 1; 4.7.3.5, 4-94; also Appendix H, 115
7.4 Issue: Traffic and parking congestion	
7.4.1 Outcome: There are no park-and-ride lots at this LRT station (Minneapolis regulations).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
7.4.2 Outcome: Thorough analyses result in a parking and traffic plan with no negative impacts on park lands or users.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [anything for this?]

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
8 Cedar Lake Trail Junction	The Cedar Lake Regional 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.
8.1 Issue: Safety, use, access, connectivity	
8.1.1 Outcome: Pedestrians and bicyclists safely and easily get from one side of the LRT tracks to the other.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [anything for this?]
8.1.2 Outcome: Multiple users and modes of transportation coexist comfortably and safely year-round.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [anything for this?]
8.1.3 Outcome: Walkers, runners, bicyclists, and other non-motorized travelers safely use the Cedar Lake Regional Trail.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [anything for this?]
8.1.4 Outcome: All trail connections are safe and easy to navigate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
8.1.5 Outcome: The federally funded bicycle commuter trail is fully functional, including continuous flow and speed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.3.2.4 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).
8.1.6 Outcome: Communities north of the LRT easily access the trail and Cedar Lake Park.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.2.2.6 Neighborhoods and community cohesion, page 3-58 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The implementation of LRT service would not sever roadway or driveway connections...”
8.2 Issue: Environmental protection	
8.2.1 Outcome: Measures are taken during construction to ensure new invasive species are not introduced to the park land prairie area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [anything for this?] This has been aligned with MPRB jurisdiction.
8.2.2 Outcome: Wildlife habitat and existing migratory (?) patterns are maintained.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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).
8.3 Issue: Visual and auditory appeal	
8.3.1 Outcome: The LRT does not distract visually with the natural setting of the parkland.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [anything for this?] This has been aligned with MPRB jurisdiction.
8.3.2 Outcome: The park land in this area retains the natural, park-like look and feel of the surrounding landscape.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [anything for this?] This has been aligned with MPRB jurisdiction.

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
9 Bryn Mawr Meadows Park	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.
9.1 Issue: Safety and connectivity	
9.1.1 Outcome: Communities on both sides of the corridor easily access the trail and Bryn Mawr Meadows.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [anything for this?]
9.1.2 Outcome: People safely Bryn Mawr Meadows and the trail.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [anything for this?]
9.1.3 Outcome: Wildlife habitat is maintained??	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • Need to discuss if there is habitat in this area.
9.2 Issue: Visual appeal	
9.2.1 Outcome: The LRT blends in visually with the natural setting of the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [anything for this?]
9.2.2 Outcome: Maintain and enhance the open space look and feel of surrounding park land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
10 Spring Lake Trail Junction	At this location trail users easily connect to the nearby parks and trails including Spring Lake, Kenwood Parkway, and Parade Park, traveling beyond to the sculpture garden, Loring Park, and the Grand Rounds.
10.1 Issue: Safety, flow, and connectivity	
10.1.1 Outcome: Fire, police, and emergency medical personnel and equipment can access the trail and Spring Lake and provide response times that meet relevant laws and standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]</i>
10.1.2 Outcome: Trail users easily and safely connect to Grand Rounds, parks, and parkways.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]</i>
10.1.3 Outcome: The design prioritizes connectivity to neighborhoods and natural amenities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]</i>
10.1.4 Outcome: Bicyclists in this area maintain continuous flow and speed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]</i>
10.2 Issue: Coordination with future development	
10.2.1 Outcome: Design incorporates Van White Boulevard plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?] Does not appear to be in MPRB's jurisdiction. Needs further discussion.</i>
10.2.2 Outcome: LRT design does not impact Spring Lake and natural features of the area through which it passes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]</i>

CAC ISSUES AND OUTCOMES	DEIS CONTENT
11 Linden Avenue (by asphalt and concrete recycling plant)	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.
11.1 Issue: Safety, flow, and connectivity	
11.1.1 Outcome: Fire, police, and emergency medical personnel and equipment can access the trail and provide response times that meet relevant laws and standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]</i>
11.1.2 Outcome: Trail users easily and safely connect to Grand Rounds, parks, and parkways.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]</i>
11.1.3 Outcome: The design prioritizes connectivity to neighborhoods and natural amenities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]</i>
11.1.4 Outcome: Bicyclists in this area maintain continuous flow and speed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[anything for this?]</i>

DRAFT