

SW LRT CAC Meeting
2 December 2010
MPRB Board Room, 6:30-8:30 p.m.

Agenda Item	Person
1. Welcome and introduction	Scott Neiman
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chair welcome and thank you b. Goals of Meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue identifying issues and outcomes. • Identify additional information needs. 	5 min 6:30-6:35
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Review agenda d. Park Board welcome and charge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare recommendations to the Board on the contents of a formal Comment Letter in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Southwest Light Rail Transit Alternative 3A. The recommendations of the CAC shall focus on desired outcomes relative to historical, cultural, visual, recreational, social, environmental, and safety issues as they relate to lands owned or managed by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. Housekeeping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAC work in accordance with the International Association for Public Participation Core Values • Reminder: notes previous CAC meetings are posted on the project website. • Updates from staff on CAC information requests 	Neiman/ MPRB Staff/Carroll
2. Presentation by Cedar Lake Park Association	CLPA/ Brian Willette
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CLPA presented results from the design charrette their association commissioned, in which architects explored design options for the Southwest LRT corridor. Presenters were Tony Chevalier, a CIDNA resident and landscape architect and Craig Wilson, Lowry Hill resident and architect, both of whom were part of the charrette b. CLPA agreed to post information about their presentation on their website: http://www.cedarlakepark.org/ 	30 min 6:35-7:05
3. Staff updates	7:05-7:10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Air quality: The CAC requested information about relevant regulations as part of their discussion of issues at Cedar Lake Parkway and the Grand Rounds by Cedar Lake. MPRB staff member Alexander Zachary posed these questions to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA): The MPRB does not have its own air quality standards, nor does Minneapolis; both rely on the MPCA. MPCA told MPRB staff that air quality issues at that location were not worth pursuing because the difference in air quality wasn't even measurable. They noted that the worse pollution in Minneapolis is inside Lowry Tunnel, but if you step out 1' outside the tunnel the pollution levels drop by 50% and at 10' 	

it's not discernable. They said there hasn't been a location that violates pollution levels since the mid-1990s and that was at Lexington and University in St. Paul. MPCA also noted that standards are *higher* now than in the past, so what people hear now about bad air quality days it is because those standards are stricter – but in fact air quality has improved over the last few years.

b. Historic properties:

- MPRB staff member Jennifer Ringold and consultant Anne Carroll met with MnDOT historian Dennis Gimmestad on 2 December in response to the MPRB's and CAC's need for information about historic properties within the CAC's purview. This provided some baseline information in preparation for Dennis attending a future CAC meeting and working with the MPRB over time on this project.
- Dennis explained that historic properties were addressed as part of the Section 106 process – which sits outside of NEPA. Section 106 has a strong emphasis on public participation, and uses the NEPA participation processes to gather information (even though it is separate from NEPA).
- The DEIS reports on the 106 work current to last May, and 106 and DEIS come together at the very end of the process with a formal memorandum of agreement
- Even though there is a 45-day comment period on the DEIS, stakeholder input on 106 issues continues through the process
- Stakeholder involvement in Section 106 issues is extremely flexible; agencies tailor it to the issues at the time – there aren't X hearings – it's a collaborative process that is worked out as it moves along
- As part of moving through the process there's guidance on stakeholder participation that would apply to “consulting parties” <The MPRB will submit a request to be designated as such, which is automatically granted to units of government>. See www.achp.gov/docs/citizenguide.pdf to more information on stakeholder participation in the 106 process
- The 106 process works through the various issues during the entire design process, collaborating along the way to identify 106 issues (adverse effects) and with the goal of agreed-upon design solutions
- 106 process will focus on the impact to the historic Grand Rounds and other historic properties in the vicinity of the LRT, *and* on the impact of proposed design options
- The cultural resource survey was not completed at the time the DEIS went to FTA for review, so many properties will be included in the DEIS that have historic status *and* are at *any* stage of evaluation (already listed, previous evaluation and concurrence and considered eligible [Grand Rounds is in this stage], and newly identified properties; the Minneapolis portions of the survey will go to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) probably in early 2011 for their review
- The Grand Rounds are considered “eligible” by FTA and SHPO and are therefore automatically part of 106 process
- The 106 analysis of historic properties such as the Grand Rounds is “feature-oriented” and intended to solicit comments about adverse effects
- For station areas in this 106 process, the area of potential effect was a ¼-mile radius; they also looked at area immediately adjacent to the line
- The “issues and outcomes” structure that the CAC is using should fit very

<p>well into the 106 process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Kenilworth channel was evaluated both as part of the Grand Rounds <i>and</i> as a rail corridor; Kenilworth trail was not considered an eligible rail corridor; timber bridge there is <i>not</i> considered eligible; channel itself <i>is</i> eligible so the question is what the design is for the replacement bridge; with regard to informal crossing of the LRT line, the danger may be in simple needs and ideas getting out of control and out of scale resulting in substantial infrastructure; the historic guidelines permit appropriate contemporary construction • Cedar Lake: lake itself is part of designation but not on the east side (1950s); the 106 process looks at things like quality of views across the lake (w to e) • 21st street: Some of the discussions around the station area plan have included a designated route to the station; as part of the broader 106 process (beyond the CAC's purview) they are examining the proposed pathways through the neighborhood to and from the station interfere with the visual continuity of Kenwood Parkway (and Lake of the Isles parkway) this could be considered an adverse effect if there was a lot of change proposed 	
<p>4. Issues and Outcome based discussion for corridor locations</p>	<p>Neiman/ Carroll Zachary</p>
<p>a. This discussion is geared to identify the impacts or potential issues in various locations of the SW LRT Corridor and follow with preferred outcomes at each site. The discussion will follow that of the tour and video going from south to north and encompass each tour stop in addition to the corridor as a whole. (This list comprises the whole of the CAC's work through the end of the DEIS comment period. Those discussed at previous meetings are noted. We will discuss subsequent items at each meeting.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes document introduction • Trail access at Abbott Avenue S. (10/14/10) • Park Siding Park (10/14/10) • Intersection of Cedar Lake Parkway and Corridor (10/14/10 and 11/04/10) • Kenilworth Channel under the Corridor (11/18/10 and 12/2/10) • Intersection of 21st St and the Corridor (12/2/10, unfinished) • Intersection of Cedar Lake Trail, Kenilworth Trail and Corridor • Bryn Mawr Meadows Park • Connection to Spring Lake, Kenwood Parkway, Parade <p>b. The most current Draft Issues and Outcomes document is posted on the MPRB's website for this CAC's work at http://www.minneapolisparcs.org/default.asp?PageID=1247</p>	<p>60 min 7:10-8:10</p>
<p>5. Opportunities for additional community input</p>	<p>Neiman</p>
<p>a. Current Opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public comment for 10 minutes at the end of each CAC meeting • Email address for people to advise the CAC on park-specific issues and concerns: swlrccac@minneapolisparcs.org • Brief discussion of Public Survey: 	<p>5 min 8:10-8:20</p>

<p>http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/SWLRT-CAC-Draft-Issues-and-Outcomes. <Survey will open shortly and remain open until January 7. Staff will provide CAC members with the link and language to invite people to participate. CAC members will distribute this through their appointing entities as well as through other networks. Staff will provide a press release and notify additional relevant stakeholders.></p>	
<p>6. Housekeeping and next steps</p>	<p>Neiman</p>
<p>a. Anticipated CAC meeting schedule: This schedule assumes a DEIS release in mid-December, but that is determined by the Federal Transit Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next meeting: December 16, allowing an extra hour if necessary to finish the issues and outcomes for the entire corridor • <Once the DEIS is released the 45-day countdown begins, so CAC may need to increase meeting frequency and/or duration> 	
<p>b. Documentation, communications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting information and agenda will be posted on the website in advance • Meeting notes will be the combination of the agenda, materials, and flipcharted record of discussion • Meeting notes will be posted on the website as soon as possible following each CAC meeting • Member names and appointers, along with the chair’s contact information will be on the website • Information requests to staff must be made by the full CAC, relate to the charge, and be relevant to CAC decisions 	
<p>7. Public comment: 10 minutes</p>	<p>Neiman</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One community member made the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Light pollution (per the CAC’s discussion at the Kenilworth channel area) also affects photographers • DEIS assumes the freight rail will be removed from the corridor, but there are several alternatives still being considered so CAC may wish to consider the impact of the freight rail remaining in the corridor • Overuse concerns: At the charrette, the landscape architects were definitely considering the 21st Street location as a “destination” 	<p>8:20-8:30</p>
<p>8. Adjourn</p>	